



Minutes of the WADA Foundation Board Meeting 13 May 2015, Montreal, Canada

The meeting began at 8.30 a.m.

1. Welcome, roll call and observers

THE CHAIRMAN formally welcomed the members to the meeting of the Foundation Board of the World Anti-Doping Agency. The members were starting early and he intended to keep business moving through because he knew that there were people who had other commitments and had to leave early that afternoon. He announced apologies from Ms Beckie Scott, the Chair of the WADA Athlete Committee, who was unable to join the Foundation Board but who had managed to join the Executive Committee the previous day by teleconference. From the public authorities, there were apologies from the representatives of Ethiopia and Gabon. He went round the table, not in any particular order, mainly because he had a small map that allowed him to see where everybody was, to welcome Mr Jonathan Coleman, representing Oceania, Mr Godkin, representing Australia, Mr Jiang, representing China, Mr Boileau, representing Mr Gosal from Canada, Mr Tamashiro, representing CONSUDE, and Mr Diaz representing Puerto Rico, and he was pleased to see that his friend Mr Nicholson was present. Mr Vaso was an observer but had an association with FIFA, Mr Kang was an observer from the Republic of Korea, and he welcomed Ms Widvey from Norway. She was an Executive Committee member representing Europe. Professor Henrique de Rose was representing ANOC as an observer. A new member, Mr Pigozzi, was from ANOC, Mr Olopeng was a new member representing Botswana, Mr Attard was representing Malta, Dr Budgett was representing Mr Baumann, the Secretary General of FIBA, Mr Matteo Vallini was representing Mr Kasper, and Mr Shirama was representing the minister from Japan.

The following members attended the meeting: Sir Craig Reddie, President and Chairman of WADA; Rev. Dr Makhenkesi Stofile, WADA Vice-Chairman, South African Ambassador to Germany; Mr Toni Pascual, Chairman, IPC Anti-Doping Committee; Martin Vaso, representing Mr Joseph Blatter, Member of the IOC, President of FIFA; Dr Budgett, representing Mr Patrick Baumann, Member of the IOC, Secretary General, FIBA; Dr Robin Mitchell, Member of the IOC, President, Oceania National Olympic Committees; Mr Richard Pound, IOC Member; Ms Rania Elwani, ANOC Representative; Mr Fabio Pigozzi, President, International Federation of Sports Medicine; Professor Eduardo Henrique de Rose, President, PASO Medical Commission; Mr Andrey Kryukov, Executive Board Member, Kazakhstan National Olympic Committee; Mr Ryan, representing Dr Tamás Aján, Member of the IOC, President of the IWF; Professor Ugur Erdener, Member of the IOC, President, World Archery; Mr Francesco Ricci Bitti, President, ITF; Mr Vallini, representing Mr Gian Franco Kasper, Member of the IOC, President of FIS; Mr Anders Besseberg, President of the IBU; Ms Claudia Bokel, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Adam Pengilly, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Nicholson, representing Ms Kirsty Coventry, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Tony Estanguet, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Romain Schneider, Minister of Sports, Luxembourg; Mr Attard, representing Mr Chris Agius, Hon. Parliamentary Secretary for Research, Innovation, Youth and Sport, Republic of Malta; Mr Philippe Muyters, Flemish

Minister for Finance, Budget, Work, Town and Country Planning and Sport; Ms Markovic, representing Ms Gabriella Battaini-Dracconi, Deputy Secretary General, Council of Europe; Mr Pavel Kolobkov, Deputy Minister of Sport, Russian Federation; Mr Thapelo Olopeng, Minister of Youth, Sport and Culture, Botswana; Mr Michael K. Gottlieb, National Program Director, White House Drug Policy Office, Executive Office of the President, USA; Mr Tamashiro, representing Ms Natalia Riffo, President, CONSUDE; Mr Diaz, representing Mr Ramón Orta Rodríguez, President of CONCECADE; Mr Shirama, representing Mr Hideki Niwa, State Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan; Mr Kang, representing Mr Chong Kim, Vice Minister, Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Republic of Korea; Dr Mohammed Saleh Al Konbaz, President, Saudi Arabian Anti-Doping Committee; Mr Jiang Zhixue, representing Mr Xiao Tian, Vice Minister, State Sport General Administration, China; Mr Godkin, representing Ms Sussan Ley, Minister for Sport, Australia; Mr Coleman, Minister for Sport and Recreation, New Zealand; Mr Boileau, representing Mr Bal Gosal, Minister of State (Sport), Canada; Ms Valérie Fourneyron, Health, Medical and Research Committee Chairperson, Member of Parliament, National Assembly, France; Mr Edwin Moses, Education Committee Chairman; Mr René Bouchard, Chair of the Compliance Review Committee; Mr David Howman, WADA Director General; Mr Tim Ricketts, Standards and Harmonisation Director, WADA; Mr Rob Koehler, Education and Programme Development Director, WADA; Ms Catherine MacLean, Communications Director, WADA; Dr Alan Vernec, Medical Director, WADA; Dr Olivier Rabin, Science Director, WADA; Mr Olivier Niggli, Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel, WADA; Mr Kazuhiro Hayashi, Asia/Oceania Regional Office Director; Ms Maria José Pesce, Latin America Regional Office Director; Mr Frédéric Donzé, Director of the European Regional Office and IF Relations, WADA; and Mr Rodney Swigelaar, Africa Regional Office Director.

The following observers signed the roll call: Yeowon Kang, Shin Asakawa, Tatsuya Sugai, Ayako Ito, Yaya Yamamoto, Valérie Amant, Alexandre Husting, Christian Thill, William Hybl, Jordan Miranda, Peter Maiurro, Magdolna Trombitas, Pedro de Oliveira Ramos, Vagner Vargas, Joseph de Pencier, Kenny Lee, Falcon Sedimo, Lucielen Barbosa, George Hilton, Marco Klein, An Vermeersch, Kari Tolliko, Rune Andersen, Kjersti Aastad, Eva Bruusgaard, Marit Wiig, Bruno Hildebrand, Joe Van Ryn, Chen Zhiyu, Sergey Khrychikov, Natalia Zhelanova, Oliver Thurston, Harold Adams and Graeme Steel.

– **1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest**

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members if they believed that they had conflicts of interest on any of the items on the agenda. If so, he asked the members to declare them. If there were no disclosures of conflicts of interest, the members could proceed with the meeting.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 16 November 2014 in Paris

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the minutes of the previous Foundation Board meeting held at the Assemblée Nationale in Paris on 16 November 2014. He asked if there were any particular observations. The minutes had been circulated and he was not aware of any particular issues that had been brought to the attention of the WADA management. In the absence of any comments, he asked if they could be regarded as a correct record of the day's meeting. He declared the minutes approved.

DECISION

Minutes of the meeting of the Foundation Board on 16 November 2014 approved and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members about some of the matters in his written report to update them on some issues that had arisen since the time of its writing. There were currently 177 ratifications for the UNESCO convention; four countries had their ratification processes in line, either awaiting legal approval in Paris or on the way to Paris, and they were Honduras, Solomon Islands, Djibouti and Kiribati. It was important for government members to note in their diaries the conference of parties for UNESCO, to be chaired by the Foundation Board member Dr Saleh Konbaz, from Saudi Arabia, in Paris on 29 and 30 October. It was an important meeting for governments and for UNESCO because, at that meeting, the members would be receiving a monitoring report on progress made by governments in relation to the convention, and other policy issues would be discussed. It was not a WADA meeting, but WADA had been very active together with the UNESCO people to ensure that the agenda would be interesting and fruitful in terms of outcomes, so he looked forward to seeing how that panned out.

At Interpol, there was a new secretary general. Mr Ron Noble had finished his term, and WADA was taking the opportunity to arrange a meeting between the new secretary general and the WADA President to discuss the memorandum of understanding with Interpol and how that could be furthered in terms of the way in which the two interacted. One of those interactions had taken place the previous week, when Interpol, with WADA's help and encouragement, had issued a statement indicating the availability of a very dangerous supplement, colloquially called DNP, which had caused two deaths in the wider athlete community, one in the UK and one in France. It was a dietary supplement, one that was part of the non-regulated industry, well used in the body-building world, and in fact promoted by some in that world, but it was very dangerous and lethal. WADA had warned the athletes of the world to stay away from it.

NADO development currently fell under the responsibility of Mr Koehler. The members would see a list of countries in which developing NADOs were getting help or needed help in Mr Koehler's report. He had isolated two countries that had been in his report over the past year or so. The first was Brazil, and he could tell the members that the Executive Committee had had a very fruitful meeting with the minister of Brazil (present as an observer) and his team from Brazil, and he had assured the Executive Committee that the laws and rules required to ensure that the NADO in Brazil was fully operational would be in place in June that year, meaning that the NADO would be able to conduct the testing programme required for the test events to be held in Brazil in the lead-up to the Olympic Games the following year.

Kenya was the other country that would fall off his list and revert to Mr Koehler's list. Considerable progress had been made compared to 18 months previously, when WADA had been very frustrated at the lack of progress and response to a couple of documentary programmes in that country indicating the ready availability of banned substances through pharmacies or even doctors. The government was taking action, Athletics Kenya (the major sporting body in that country) had joined and WADA was advancing matters. The information gathered did not really lead to athletes; it led to members of the wider athlete entourage, and he hoped that the officials in Kenya would use that wisely and appropriately. In the management report that was part of his overall report, the members would see that WADA had nearly completed the necessary and approved hirings to respond to all the additional work required pursuant to the revised rules. There was a new Communications Director, Ms Catherine McLean, from whom the members would hear later in the day, and there were other members of the team, in Montreal and Lausanne.

He had outlined the priority activities identified for 2015 and, when he said priority activities, about 75% of the work was mandated by the WADA constitution and the Code: WADA had to carry out a number of activities on an annual basis. In addition to those, the management was asked by the Executive Committee and the Foundation Board to carry out further activities, and then there were those that the management felt had to be done as a matter of proper initiative. That year, he had identified them in his report. The first was that WADA would continue to assist signatories not only to make sure that their rules were in line but also to practise those rules. It was one thing to have excellent rules; it was another thing to make sure that they were practised and practised well, and that would be a key priority. The management would advance the Athlete Biological Passport, which was a project that needed to be furthered. He was aware that it was not yet a mandatory part of anti-doping programmes and the management wanted to make sure that it progressed in an appropriate fashion. The management would promote the voice of the clean athlete, and the members would see that that was consistently a number one priority for WADA. The management would address the issue of quality of analysis in laboratories, as the members and others were often asking whether WADA could be confident that each laboratory could conduct analyses of samples received in the same high quality consistent fashion, and that was a matter for the science team to address to ensure that WADA could answer that question in the affirmative.

WADA had commenced the new tasks required in the Code of information gathering, storing and sharing. WADA had already conducted a training programme in Lausanne, and would continue to advance that and look at the way in which investigations could be and should be conducted in different parts of the world.

WADA would enhance ADAMS, and the members would see a segment on what had been called 'ADAMS 2016' but was currently called the 'new ADAMS', which would come into being the following year, and that was a high priority. WADA would not just be developing the new ADAMS; it would also be enhancing the current ADAMS.

Regarding the UNESCO conference of parties, it was a priority for WADA to ensure that the governments had a successful conference.

As to the special research fund, those members present in November would recall that there had been commitments from governments, which had since been accepted by the IOC. The amount was 5.9 million US dollars, and there had been some fluctuation due to exchange rates, so he expected matching funds from the IOC for that amount. WADA had received nearly 4.5 million from the governments to date, had received matching funds of 1.6 million dollars from the IOC and was awaiting the next payment from the IOC which would ensure that WADA had a pretty good fund for research purposes. That was a separate special fund; it was not in the annual WADA budget, it would be in a separate account, and it was in place for innovative research, in both applied and social science.

Regarding the major leagues, WADA had an agreement with the Partnership for Clean Competition, which was a body set up in the USA, made up of the NFL, MLB, USADA and the USOC. They had put forward a commitment of 6 million dollars to the special research fund. The IOC had accepted 1.5 of those 6 million dollars as coming from governments. For the remainder, 4.5 million dollars, the PCC had agreed to work with WADA to ensure that the money was still spent on relevant and appropriate research projects, and WADA would be sitting on its grants committee and board to ensure the appropriate liaison.

In practice, the MLB people continued to be proactive; their programme was getting closer to the Code, and WADA had been looked after by them in terms of hosting several

events in New York. He was very pleased at the cooperation and progress that had been made there.

For the NHL, WADA was partnering with it in relation to the programme it would conduct during the Hockey World Cup, which was to be held in Toronto in 2016. WADA needed to work further with the NHL to develop its anti-doping programme, and similarly with the NFL, which had introduced human growth hormone testing and made other changes to its programme, but he hoped that it would get closer to the Code as it went forward. There was no mandate on the major leagues to join WADA and be Code signatories. They were not government-funded, they were not Olympic sports; they were privately owned and run, and WADA's task was to try and use its persuasive powers to try to cajole them into forming part of the WADA gold standard anti-doping programme. He awaited a meeting with the NBA. FIBA had been helpful in advancing such a meeting. There had been some difficulties with the PGA tour, as there were major differences between the golf programme and the Code, and WADA had been affected by a court case that did not involve it between the PGA tour and one of the tour members, and had had to take part in it and spend a lot of money on that. Mr Niggli would refer to that in his report. On the radar in the professional leagues was the Canadian Football League, and WADA was talking to the CCES to try and help it get the CFL to move closer to the Code in its testing programme.

There was a list in his report of what were known as cooperation projects and, as WADA moved forward, it sought to collaborate with signatories in developing anti-doping programmes. An initiative had been taken by Anti-Doping Norway to convene a result management conference in Oslo in late August, in conjunction with the Council of Europe and WADA. Another initiative taken by Anti-Doping Norway had resulted in the development of a national programme in Turkey, and WADA had joined in another tripartite agreement to help Turkey establish its NADO in an appropriate way.

The final collaboration he wished to confirm was the meeting held in Lausanne in late March, convened by Mr Donzé, bringing together IFs and NADOs, to discuss how each could help and work with one another and answer some of the issues raised by Mr Ricci Bitti at almost every meeting for the past four or five years, so WADA was moving in the right direction to create further liaison between the two.

He had tabled a paper in relation to NFs, and the reason behind that had been to make sure that the members were aware of an issue occurring at national level. Over the past few years, there had been a number of appeals regarding decisions taken nationally and whereby, upon appeal, WADA had found that the NF had not had Code-compliant rules, or rules consistent with its IF parent. WADA had suggested to the IFs that they consider inserting a clause, as some already did, indicating that the member NFs should have anti-doping rules consistent with the IF rules, and would be deemed to have those unless there was some other agreement with the parent to put different rules in place. That had been raised the previous day at the Executive Committee, and the WADA management would go ahead and prepare some drafts for discussion with the IFs as to how that could be appropriately implemented.

Finally, there was an addendum to address the matter raised by Mr Pound in November and the recommendations made by the Working Group on Compliance. Each of the recommendations had been addressed by WADA management and everything had been handed over to the Independent Compliance Review Committee for implementation and appropriate work.

He also wished to report to the members on the matters discussed and approved the previous day at the Executive Committee meeting. The first decision was that the Executive Committee had approved two social science research grants totalling 155,000 US dollars. A recommendation had been approved to allocate one million dollars of the new special research fund to social science research projects. The Executive Committee had approved the request from the University Laboratory of Chile in Santiago to be granted candidate laboratory status. That put the laboratory in Chile on the first step in the process to achieve accreditation, and it was very necessary, as that part of the world, South America, really did need another laboratory.

The Executive Committee had granted reaccreditation to the LBCD laboratory in Rio de Janeiro in Brazil. It had completed the necessary remedial work. Similarly, WADA had granted accreditation to the TDKM laboratory in Ankara in Turkey. The same process had been adopted, as the laboratory had lost its accreditation some years previously, and WADA was now very pleased to welcome the laboratory back among those laboratories with WADA accreditation.

Finally, the Executive Committee had approved four technical documents for laboratories. He did not really want to go through them one by one. One related to minimum criteria for mass spectrometry, one was on the minimum required performance levels for detection and identification of non-threshold substances, the third related to nandrolone, and the fourth related to growth hormone and the isoform detection process. Those would all come into effect on 1 September 2015.

That completed his report on the issues of the Executive Committee meeting the previous day.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for observations or comments on the Director General's report.

MS BOKEL wished to provide an update to the members on the CAS. A letter had been sent to the athletes' commissions of the NOCs as well as the IFs stating that, given that athletes' commissions were an integral part of the sporting world, they could formally appoint or have the possibility to propose arbitrators in view of the nominations on the CAS lists. As athlete representatives, they thought that the CAS had done a very good thing.

MR POUND asked what plans or programmes were in place to counter a lot of the pseudo-science that came out, in and around the Athlete Biological Passport and micro-dosing and so forth. He appreciated that WADA would not be likely to persuade journalists that the science WADA was relying on was proper and good, but WADA should find some way to answer such things so that, if and when a case went to the CAS, the pseudo-science had been discredited in advance. That appeared to him to be the real audience and where things would be decided.

While he was all for having social science research done to pick a number of a million dollars and set that aside for social science research without having some kind of a framework established as to what WADA was looking for and what areas of research were to be pursued, it seemed to him to be putting the cart before the horse. It was all very well to have that allocated, but WADA should not spend any until it knew where it was going.

PROFESSOR ERDENER thanked Mr Howman for his activity report. Regarding the UNESCO convention, the Olympic Movement looked forward to seeing some concrete results and actions, especially concerning the UNESCO policy project.

MR RICCI BITTI thanked Mr Howman for his extensive report and for mentioning his persistence; he was happy to hear about meetings between the IFs and NADOs. He believed that such cooperation and complementarity was key for the development of an effective anti-doping system, so he thanked Mr Howman for taking on board his message, and thanked Mr Donzé for organising the successful meeting.

He echoed what Mr Pound had said, perhaps more from a financial point of view. He supported and agreed to the allocation, but WADA needed more information, and perhaps the framework should be established when WADA had some more ideas. Social science was undoubtedly part of the research but it appeared to be too early to decide what to do when WADA did not know where it was going.

He had a specific question about the Pechstein case. The sport movement believed that it was an important threat to the system of arbitration in place in sport, so he asked if the Legal Department had noticed that some other cases were making reference to that, which would be very dangerous.

MR ESTANGUET noted that the athletes welcomed the improvements in Kenya. It was good to see ADOs and stakeholders working together to solve problems in the interest of clean athletes, but the athletes were still worried about places in the world in which the fight against doping in sport was being attacked. The new allegations and information mentioned worried the athletes, who wanted to know how the information would be shared with other ADOs and he recommended transparency, fast and strong action to solve the issue and the problem to show the athletes' community that WADA was protecting the athletes and to gain the trust that had to be developed with the athletes. That had been a long case, and athletes had been talking about it for a long time, and WADA definitely had to show that it was accelerating things.

MS MARKOVIC thanked the Director General for his comprehensive report. She said that the European governments had discussed the issue of social science research projects and she supported the concerns expressed by Messrs Pound and Ricci Bitti.

MR TAMASHIRO informed the Foundation Board that he was representing Peru. He referred to the decisions adopted by WADA and the regional office to strengthen and consolidate the work carried out in South America. It was a very important stage of work to consolidate the laboratory in Chile, and that would work hand in hand with the efforts being made in Uruguay to strengthen all of the activities undertaken in South America to combat doping in sport. That was just a comment.

As Chairman of the Education Committee, MR MOSES commented on the social science research. There had been an item, item 7.2, discussed the previous day by the Executive Committee, which explained the questions on social science research, the content, the objectives and the results from several different tranches of research, so he referred anybody with any questions to that.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL thanked Ms Bokel for her information. He was sure that all would benefit if the CAS were strengthened appropriately to deal with the issues raised in the Pechstein case; that would be of great benefit in general, as CAS was a very important body, not just for doping cases but also for sport cases worldwide.

He told Mr Pound about plans to counter pseudo-science. WADA received issues almost on a daily basis and had to deal with matters that were slightly off-centre. He thought that Mr Pound was referring to a programme broadcast recently in France on a trial project on

the Athlete Biological Passport. WADA had not had the data in relation to the project until after the programme. It had since been discovered that it had been one of the categories to which Mr Pound had referred and, upon receipt of the information gathered, the profiles of the athletes that had been micro-dosing had revealed that, of the five that could be determined to have profiles, two would have been deemed positive cases, and three were such that the profiles would have indicated that they needed target testing. What it was saying at the end of the day was that the passport worked, and WADA had made statements in the media to say that and to say that the way in which that particular project had been carried out was left of centre. WADA would continue to look at such issues and, in particular, ensure that, if anybody had access to the Athlete Biological Passport model, it be monitored in an appropriate research project and under WADA research conditions.

The other issue raised by Mr Pound was in relation to the decision taken the previous day by the Executive Committee to allocate one million dollars to social science research. That was a decision that had been taken in principle only, and there were a couple of steps that needed to be put into place. The first was the need for a list of appropriate projects for the special fund to be put together by the Education Committee seeking applications. The same process would be adopted by the science team, and there was a list of special projects that had been discussed the previous day and would be put out over the coming days. Only when the applications were received would they be considered and then allocated money from the special fund. They would still need to go through a process, including sign-off by the Executive Committee in the normal way. He hoped that allayed the fears expressed. He told Professor Erdener that WADA was concerned about UNESCO as well and was certainly very interested in the policy project. It was a UNESCO project and not a WADA project. WADA was waiting for UNESCO to come back with the outcomes and, as soon as WADA received those, it would be passing the information on to its members.

He told Mr Ricci Bitti that he had answered the question on social science research. On the Pechstein case, WADA was aware of at least one, if not two or three cases, before the European Court of Human Rights, each of which had raised the issues that had been raised in the Pechstein case. None of those cases had yet reached a decision. Pechstein herself had gone to that particular court, so there were cases out there and the legal profession was not slow to pick up on such things, so WADA could anticipate that there might be others.

He told Mr Estanguet that he understood that athletes needed more information in relation to what WADA had learned from Kenya. What WADA had learned did not relate so much to the athletes as to the entourage and the fact that, in that country, the pharmacists and the medical profession had been making banned substances available to coaches and trainers and athletes was of concern. The authorities in Kenya would take steps if any crimes had been committed and would pass on the information to others who could take action. WADA did not yet have any information of breaches of the Code, but the frequent visits to Kenya had led to the Kenyan authorities understanding their responsibilities in that regard. If WADA learned of information that should be given to the IFs or to a NADO, WADA would ensure that such information was passed on. That was the best he could advise the members.

He thought he had answered the question in relation to social science research, and he thanked the Peruvian representative for his comments. He was certainly aware that the South American region needed assistance, and the progress with the laboratory in Chile and the blood laboratory in Uruguay were significant steps to help.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it was quite an important issue, with wide-ranging responses. Quite clearly, the decision in social science research was that WADA would wish to be involved as part of the process, but only once the applications had been received.

MR POUND said that he had a follow-up question on the pseudo-science or bad science issue. The real audience was not the media. WADA had to have some way of putting on record the shortcomings and the good side of the science, because one wanted first to discourage people from calling the so-called experts before the CAS and have them discredit it already but, even more importantly, when it got to the CAS, the CAS needed to understand that there was a proper scientific basis for the decision that WADA was taking. As was the case with cycling, WADA had to answer every single occasion when such bad reports were out there in order to keep the record clear.

THE CHAIRMAN responded that the point was taken.

– **3.1 CIRC report analysis**

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the management had been asked to prepare the paper because the CIRC, a significant independent commission established by the UCI, had been put into place to conduct a wide-ranging investigation into the causes of the pattern of doping that had developed in that sport and allegations that had implicated the UCI and other governing bodies and officials in ineffective investigation of such doping practices. The report, which had come out in late February that year, had included a number of findings and recommendations. Some of those had an impact on anti-doping globally and many related to the UCI itself, including governance and anti-doping issues. WADA had responded to the global issues step by step, indicating how it would pursue each one when appropriate. WADA had also liaised with the UCI in relation to the other matters that had more to do with cycling, including the prevalence of doping, the use of the Athlete Biological Passport within the sport of cycling, quality testing and others, and WADA was working together with the UCI to answer the issues raised in the report.

The final issue related to the Vrijman report, which had implicated WADA quite significantly in 2006 but which had since turned out to be a non-independent report written by a former president of the UCI and Lance Armstrong's lawyers. WADA had actually had to spend a lot of money on lawyers and a lot of time and resources to counter the suggestions that it had been involved in some of those things in 2005 and 2006, and really the report had been a fraudulent report, the goal of which had been more to reflect the defence of Lance Armstrong than to deal with the substance of the allegations. That had been regrettable; WADA had received no comment or statement from those implicated in that and he looked forward to receiving something in due course.

MS MARKOVIC said that the European governments wished to say that there was great support for WADA in taking measures to prevent possible misuse of the Athlete Biological Passport, in particular by modifying access rights for athletes.

The findings of the CIRC report were worrying and the European governments would closely follow further developments. The governments would review the CIRC recommendations and implement relevant measures to address and identify the issues. Her final point was that the governments would also ask whether the sport movement had considered the findings of the CIRC report, particularly on the principles of good governance. It was considered important by European governments and, if the sport movement had considered the report, when and how would the sport movement be following up on the recommendations of the report?

DR BUDGETT said that he would like to look at item 7 of the recommendations that WADA had responded to in the CIRC report and note the importance of research, and also that, thanks to the special fund, significant research would be done over the coming two or three years, and it was important to continue that into the future.

MR PENGILLY responded to Ms Markovic about governance within the Olympic Movement and the sport movement. Everybody recognised that all governance needed to be improved and the sport environment was no different. One of the key recommendations from Agenda 2020 was that it needed to be addressed and the basic universal principles of good governance within the Olympic Movement and sport movement needed to be adhered to and acknowledged within the Olympic Movement, so he thought that the sport movement recognised that it needed to make progress, and was doing so as part of the wider 2020 recommendations.

Regarding prevalence, he was encouraged to see that the recommendation within the report regarding research and understanding the prevalence of doping in sporting populations had been recommended and also at the Health, Medical and Research Committee meeting the previous day. It was a challenging task, not dissimilar to understanding the extent of occupational fraud, but it was an important task; after all, how could one assess the effectiveness of anti-doping if one did not know the extent of a problem? He would encourage and support that some of the research funding would go towards the goal of understanding prevalence of doping in various sporting populations.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he had the duty as the president of ASOIF to express his view on the comment made by Ms Markovic on the conclusions of the CIRC report. He could reassure her and the Council of Europe that sport was very aware that governance was one of the items. The association he had the honour to chair had a forum every year on governance and the association worked very hard to improve it. On the other side, he noted that WADA was very keen to preserve its autonomy as reconfirmed by the UN resolution and, in terms of pure doping, he put the ball back in the other court, as the sports believed that they had done more than the governments, irrespective of governance.

MR MOSES commented on the CIRC report. He noted that the whole cycling controversy had been going on for years, more than a decade in fact, and he wanted to say, with regard to a lot of the decisions and actions that Mr Pound had made as the chairman of WADA when it had first begun and a lot of the spin to which he had had to respond, a lot of the facts had really come to light as a result of the CIRC report, and it had been 12 or 14 years since it had all happened, and he thought that it took a lot of courage and dedication, and sometimes one had to take a lot of flak to really defeat and also be correct about the positions and protect the integrity of sport, and also help cycling protect the integrity of its own sport. The Partnership for Clean Competition had met the previous weekend at the offices of MLB, and he was glad to report that one of the old enemies of WADA was currently one of WADA's best friends, as the things that Mr Pound had said and done ten years previously had really helped to change MLB. That was the kind of courage that was necessary in the world of doping, in which one had to be hard and tough and take the public relations hits and the political hits. He thought that Mr Pound had done a great job and, 10 or 15 years later, Mr Pound had been proven right, and he had made a difference. Cycling had changed, MLB had changed, and a lot of professional sports wanted to use the WADA Code, as they understood that WADA was doing the right thing.

MR POUND thanked Mr Moses for his kind words. One of the things that came out of the cycling report was that it had been a concerted attack on WADA; he had happened to be the president at the time and that went with the job. That was a federation that had been trying

to bring down WADA and cast doubt on the effectiveness of the organisation, so it was important on the sport side and the government side to recognise that and be alert to the possibility that it might happen again.

THE CHAIRMAN commented that Mr Pound must be reasonably pleased at the content of the CIRC report and the decisions that the independent commission had made. He hoped that cycling and WADA and everybody else could move on.

– 3.2 New ADAMS

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the new ADAMS paper was before the members. It had been separated from the report on the current ADAMS to indicate the process and progress made in relation to the new ADAMS. The paper essentially spoke for itself, but there were one or two other things he should add to it. Before issuing the RFP (request for proposals) from service providers, WADA had gathered comments, ideas and suggestions from a wide range of stakeholders. That had been done over a number of weeks, the latter part of the previous year and the early part of 2015, and it had included athletes, NADOs and sport federations and so on. WADA had received about 700 comments and ideas on what might be useful when WADA looked at creating a new ADAMS. They had all been entered into the RFP and were part of the development process of the project. WADA had engaged an external group to help, so the service provider was currently in place under contract as a response to the RFP, there was an external user group to which WADA looked to guide WADA in the development, and again athletes would be engaged at the level of the NADO or the IF, as WADA really wanted to know from athletes who were using the system, and it would be those in the registered testing pools and so on who would be of most assistance to the process. The management had updated the Athlete Committee about it at its meeting in March and would continue to involve the Athlete Committee. If anybody around the table had any other ideas about how to further involve those who would use ADAMS, he would be extremely pleased to receive suggestions. WADA had received one good one the previous day from Mr Estanguet to look at the way in which coaches and managers or members of the entourage who were guiding athletes in the use of ADAMS might also be appropriately involved and at least very much educated as WADA went forward. He would be happy to receive any comments or questions if there were any.

MS BOKEL thanked Mr Howman for mentioning the athletes specifically. It was crucial, as whereabouts was a daily business for athletes. They had to be in ADAMS many times, and it should be done in as user friendly a way as possible. Thinking back to the old ADAMS, and having asked for the floor many times to request enhancements and asking about progress, she was keen about sticking to the timeline, whilst knowing that IT was never easy when it came to timelines. One of the things that she could see as a potential issue was with the old ADAMS and the new ADAMS at the same time. When the change would take place and how WADA was dealing with the enhancements to the old ADAMS were important issues. There were still countries and federations in the world that were not using ADAMS, and it was time for WADA to try to see how to get everybody into the same system to enhance it and know that everybody in the world could work with it so that everything could be dealt with in the most efficient way.

MR POUND asked if there was a plan to have a beta version of the new ADAMS put out to a restricted group of users to gather feedback before the whole thing was rolled out. If one had a number of athletes on each continent and coaches using it and pointing out difficulties and what was good about it, that might be built into the final product before it was issued.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded that the issue raised by Ms Bokel in relation to those who were not currently using ADAMS was of concern. Under the revision to the Code, WADA had to approve other systems so, if there were signatories using other systems, they had to go through an approval process to continue to use them until the new ADAMS came into place. In November, WADA would set out the criteria for those approvals to come forward. Part of the new ADAMS would be an ability for the other systems to connect to ADAMS, to be made available at the expense of those wishing to use it. WADA would not be providing a multi-million-dollar programme to allow those others to come on board, but WADA would give them the opportunity to pay for that and, if they so wished, that would be a possibility. WADA would in principle like to have ADAMS as a mandatory component for everybody. It was not currently in the Code, but there was the link to approve other systems and WADA would have the ability to link in with those systems as it went forward with the new ADAMS.

He told Mr Pound that there was a user group, which would be global, and was currently working. As WADA rolled it out, it would address the other issues raised by Ms Bokel, about how to educate and the transition from the old to the new ADAMS. That was a project that would start developing in the latter part of 2015 and in the beginning of 2016. He did not anticipate that new system being in place until the final quarter of 2016, and that was with fingers crossed.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

4. Operations/management

– 4.1 Endorsement of Foundation Board composition for Swiss authorities

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that, as usual, they had to formally approve the composition of the Foundation Board for referral to the Swiss authorities. An affirmative decision that that could be forwarded to the Swiss authorities was needed.

DECISION

Composition of the Foundation Board approved for the Swiss authorities.

– 4.2 Operational performance indicators

THE CHAIRMAN asked about the operational performance indicators.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the members had the list before them and he would be happy to answer any questions.

MR COLEMAN commented that there was an extremely long list of indicators that consisted of outputs rather than outcomes. He wondered whether there should be more of a focus on outcomes rather than just transactional activities.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that, by the end of the year, the members would be given the outcomes. At that stage in time, part-way through the year, the members had the list of activities, which would lead to outcomes.

DECISION

Operational performance indicators noted.

5. Athletes

– 5.1 Athlete Committee chair report

THE CHAIRMAN said that, unfortunately, Ms Scott could not be present for family reasons, although she had called in to the Executive Committee the previous day from Edmonton, and there had been an open discussion. Mr Estanguet had been deliberately involved in that discussion on the grounds that he would be asked to present the athletes' report to the Foundation Board. He was grateful to Mr Estanguet for doing so.

MR ESTANGUET thanked the President. The WADA Athlete Committee had met on 24 and 25 March in Lausanne during the symposium. On the first day, the athletes had attended the athlete panel session on Breaking the Code of Silence. It had been very interesting to see the extent to which the athletes were involved in the knowledge and information on doping issues. WADA probably had to find a way to encourage ADOs to ask the athletes to collaborate in sharing information. It had been a very new debate; it was not easy for athletes to discuss such issues publicly, but the Athlete Committee definitely wanted to encourage the use of tip lines around the world to help the athletes speak about information they had on different cases, and also encouraged ADOs to ask for the support of the athletes in different sharing of information and knowledge activities.

The Athlete Committee had met as usual on the second day and worked on different issues, and the main concerns were again about supplements. There was clearly a lack of regulation on the topic and WADA needed to work with the industry on a label to regulate such products. There were still too many athletes in trouble over the use of supplements and WADA clearly needed the help of the Foundation Board to support athletes in tackling the issue and finding solutions to contain the problem of supplements. As the Director General had mentioned in his report, there had been two recent deaths related to the use of supplements, so it was dramatic. There were different tools to fight against supplement use, such as education, involving the entourage and so on. WADA probably ought to work on social research and the committee encouraged such work, but also asked the governments and UNESCO to tackle the point and find a way of regulating supplements worldwide.

The Athlete Committee had also discussed other topics, including banned athletes and how they were monitored during their period of sanction. The committee was still concerned when it saw banned athletes coming back to the field and winning new titles, and there were still many questions about that, so WADA had to be strong and work out how to monitor banned athletes during the sanction period.

There had also been some questions about prohibited association. Regarding the rule associated with prohibited association, the athletes were concerned about how they would be notified and how to find information about people still involved in sport even if they should not be, so WADA needed to assist athletes with such access to information.

The Athlete Committee had also talked about the integrity of the ADOs responsible for anti-doping sample collection. For athlete trust, the same procedures worldwide were vital, and there should not be any people asking for photos with athletes when they had to test them, or getting too close to athletes. The same procedures had to be used. The committee had received differing messages from athletes tested around the world. Many questions were being asked about the new whereabouts phone application, which athletes were anticipating to better tackle the whereabouts issue, and there were many questions about communication. As the members knew, many documentaries were made to attack the fight against doping in sport and some athletes were part of such documentaries, so he believed

that WADA should have a communication strategy and make sure that it used and involve the athletes to find ambassadors among them to also send out a positive message about the fight against doping in sport and not simply be attacked and send out a negative message to the population, so WADA had to assist athletes in different federations and events to be able to relay such positive messages.

The Athlete Committee had recently had a conference call and was working on developing an athlete committee network among NOCs and IFs, so every member of the WADA Athlete Committee was liaising with another athlete committee. The committee members were working well, and the committee was very dynamic thanks to its chair, Ms Scott.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that there was a great deal of energy. It was probably a real plus to have the Athlete Committee meet during the symposium in March, which was the major effort made in the anti-doping world. Having the athletes there had always seemed to him to be the right thing to do. Were there any comments?

MR PENGILLY thanked Mr Estanguet for his report. In the Director General's report, the prioritisation of activities had been mentioned, the third being to promote the voice of clean athletes. It had been clearly stated over a number of years that supplements were a key issue for athletes. It was important to be aware that informed appropriate supplementation benefited athlete performance, and he gave the members some examples. Creatine was one, particularly if one was a vegetarian. Another would be if an athlete was travelling the world and did not have control over the time or content of the meals provided at the hotel. An athlete would be foolish not to eat something straight after training to recover properly for the next day and future days, and perhaps take a protein supplement to help to do that. Therefore, simply saying 'don't do it' was unrealistic and frankly out of touch. Everybody had a responsibility and athletes had a responsibility to make informed decisions, to reduce the risk (as everybody knew that there was one). Sport had to help improve the information and communicate it to their athletes. Governments had a responsibility to take a proper look at it and consider it as a public health issue and determine whether it required regulation. As the Foundation Board had heard, two people had died. WADA certainly needed to study it seriously and look at ways to improve it at least and, if not, address it.

MR PASCUAL said that he was worried about the statement that athletes might be concerned about the fact that not all medallists were tested at some major events. It was not always the best way to use doping control resources when there was an extensive pre-competition programme, or when the major risk was the use of substances taken out-of-competition. Particularly for the IPC, which had so many impairment categories and so many medal events, risking the overall anti-doping programme by testing the first four medallists plus one would risk the overall structure of the anti-doping approach, so it was not that obvious that that was the way to go. As part of the education, there was an athlete on the committee, and there had been education as to the reasons for that approach.

MR POUND referred to point number 4 on page 2 of the report, which stated that the Athlete Committee had agreed that there was considerable importance in pre-games testing programmes conducted globally before international events. That seemed to him to possibly run counter to the observations of the Working Group on the Ineffectiveness of Testing: to announce that 3,000 tests would be performed in the next couple of months leading up to the major event was not an effective way of testing, and he wondered whether it would be worth advising the committee that that was probably not as effective in terms of avoiding doping as it was a PR exercise on the part of the event organiser. The second point was that he thought it would be helpful at some point for the Athlete Committee to make the observation that there were two standards that applied in anti-doping, one for individual

sports and the other for team sports, and the threshold for team sports was so much lower than that for individual events that it weakened the credibility of the whole programme in his view.

MR PIGOZZI commented on what had been reported on the issue of supplements. It had very important scientific and educational implications. From a scientific point of view, it was necessary to take into consideration that only a few supplements had a safe and ergogenic effect and the list of substances that did not work or for which no clear scientific support existed was instead much longer, and probably destined to increase, as no scientific claims on new products continued to appear, so it was really important to give proper and scientifically based information. He also stressed the importance of the quality control assessment for supplements to prevent contamination, because the products were not marketed as drugs but as food products, so it was a very complicated issue due to existing regulations to intervene on that very sensitive matter, and the full support of the relevant bodies concerned at international level was needed.

DR BUDGETT backed up what Professor Pigozzi had said, because the supplement issue was very serious and he acknowledged how serious the athletes felt it was, and they were right, but they should be treated as medicines, and the source should be as safe as it was for medicines, and athletes really should use the supplements only under the guidance of a medical professional, be it a doctor or a nutritionist or somebody like that. There were a few examples of cases in which one would use supplements, for example with vitamin C, creatinine and, in some specific cases, Vitamin D, but the vast majority of the supplements that were consumed were consumed where food would be a good alternative, so there was the challenge of the huge marketing power of the supplements industry, and WADA was really looking at something that was about behaviour change for athletes. It would never be possible to make supplements safe; one could try and make them safer, but one could never make them completely safe, so he thought that it was another example of social science research to look at how to change athlete behaviour and regulate the industry at the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN said that a very interesting series of comments had been made, and Mr Estanguet had quite a list of thoughts to respond to.

MR ESTANGUET replied that he had written down all of the comments, for which he thanked the members. Regarding the control of the medallists mentioned by Dr Pascual, the athletes were in a situation whereby they knew that there was a strategy to better use the amount of money available to deliver controls, and it was not possible to control every athlete, but also it was necessary to guarantee the image that was presented when there was a champion. Everybody wanted the champion to be clean. People still criticised when the champion was not controlled. WADA had to find the best balance in that situation, so that it would not be attacked if the medallists were not controlled, although it was acknowledged that it was not during the competition that WADA would have the best chance to catch cheats.

He fully agreed with the comments made by Mr Pound. The athletes knew that there was a difference between individual and team sports, and it was not easy, as most of the athletes came from individual sports. It was not so easy to harmonise the two sides, but he fully agreed.

As to what Professor De Rose had said about the contamination of supplements, he took the point, and knew that WADA was fighting and was weak when fighting against the food industry. That was why he had been asking for government support, as it was an issue that

would be solved only with government support. WADA definitely needed the governments' support and expertise.

As to what Dr Budgett had said, he thought that everybody agreed that it was an important task, and WADA had to accelerate on that point to ensure results on the supplements issue.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Estanguet. He thought that there was quite a lot of food for thought for the Athlete Committee. He agreed absolutely that it would be much better if there were a way of regulating such products. It was very difficult to do it, sometimes on a national basis and certainly on a worldwide basis. When he had been trying to understand the supplement business and see if there was any way of turning it to WADA's advantage, he had asked for a senior anti-doping official's view on athletes, and the anti-doping official had rather disappointed him by saying that he had once asked an athlete why the athlete had taken a supplement as opposed to some good food, and the athlete had said that supplements were cheaper. The problem had a very wide range of practicalities. In any case, that had been a very interesting discussion.

DECISION

Athlete Committee chair report noted.

6. Finance

– 6.1 Government/IOC contributions update

MR RICCI BITTI said that he would take the members through the papers that they had received. The main task of the Foundation Board that day would be to approve the 2014 year-end accounts, which had been approved the previous day by the Executive Committee, including the report of the auditors, which would come later on.

Starting with the first item on the agenda, the contributions situation was currently satisfactory. He could tell the members that the contributions were higher than stated in the documents: 75.45% as, in the past few hours, some further contributions had been made. That was more or less in line with previous years. On top of that, he had confirmation of contributions received for a total of 612,704 dollars, from the usual donors: Russia, Japan, UK's anti-doping authority and Kuwait (a new donor, which had committed to continue making donations in the future), and he thanked the donors.

DECISION

Government/IOC contributions update noted.

– 6.2 2014 year-end accounts

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members about the major items that made up the year-end accounts. 98.89% of contributions had been received, in line with the previous year, and WADA had also received the additional contributions he had mentioned previously (and he again thanked the donors) for a total of 631,952 US dollars. In total, WADA had posted an excess over expenses of 1,136,225 dollars, a little bit worse than the budget deficit forecast of 884,217 dollars. The main reason was the exchange rate loss, which amounted to 951,000 dollars. On the plus side, the exchange rate loss was an unrealised loss, and fortunately did not have an impact on the cash flow or reserves, but only on the accounts. The trend and volatility of the US dollar, accounting in US dollars and spending in different

currencies made that happen. He noted that WADA did not have an easy solution, but the Finance and Administration Committee and the management were considering looking at it, as some measures should be taken if it continued. It was not easy. The easy solution would be hedging, but hedging would mean additional cost and cash cost so, for the amount WADA was managing, he was not sure that there was an easy solution and he hoped that the volatility trend would go down.

Capital expenditure, another important item, had been 1.685 million dollars - 600,000 dollars less than budgeted. That obviously created a surplus and a good cash reserve for the year-end, but the projects were not completed, so they would undoubtedly carry over to 2015. His only comment in terms of unexpected additional incurred costs had to do with the ARD Russian investigation, and it was fair to say, unfortunately, from a financial point of view, that the cost would continue in 2015 as the members would see later when he dealt with the quarterly statements.

The financial position of the agency was stable but, looking to the future, it was imperative to increase funding and reduce costs if possible (one could always dream) if the Foundation Board wanted to maintain all of the activities that WADA was doing. The IOC matching the research fund had been helpful, as it had allowed the Finance and Administration Committee to reduce the research budget significantly for 2015, but obviously that was not an ideal solution, and he would say that WADA needed to reconsider constantly, and that would be the case for the 2016 budget again. WADA needed to maintain activities and needed more resources.

He would shortly ask Ms Beauparlant, the auditor, to make some comments. He had two comments about the auditor's report, which again had been very positive, and no deficiencies had been found. There were only two small notes at the end, two mis-statements in terms of allocations. One related to the accrual for a salary paid in two steps every month in the past; WADA had adjusted that and paid only monthly, and that would be solved. The other related to the unrecorded debt for a bond that would be expiring in 2015, so that money had been considered immaterial from the impact on the accounts. Given the immateriality of the mis-statements, it had been decided not to change the year-end accounts.

He asked Ms Beauparlant to make her report.

MS BEAUPARLANT informed the members that she was a partner at the Montreal office, and had been in charge of auditing the WADA financial statements for the past few years. Her colleague in the Lausanne office was primarily responsible for signing off on the audit report on the financial statements. She was present that morning to provide the members with a status update on the audit work, and to cover the significant accounting and financial reporting matters dealt with during the audit. The audit of the WADA financial statements for 2014 had been substantially completed; therefore, she was ready, subject to the approval of the financial statements by the WADA Foundation Board, to release a report without qualifications or reference to violations of the law. As an auditor of the agency, her responsibility was to release an audit opinion on the financial statements, and also to confirm the existence of an internal control system designed for the preparation of financial reporting. She was currently in a position to conclude that the financial statements for the year ending on 31 December 2014 gave a true and fair view of the financial position, the results of operation and the cash flows of WADA, in accordance with the IFRS, and complied with Swiss law and the foundation deed. She also confirmed that an internal control system was in place for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with the requirements of the Foundation Board. The audit work had been conducted in line with the audit plan. As part of planning the audit, she had discussed with

the management the key risks as well as audit areas of focus and the audit approach. During the course of the audit, she had reviewed management accounting policies and positions, management judgements and estimates in establishing the financial statements, and the financial statements disclosures, and had found them to be appropriate. During the year that ended on 31 December 2014, there had been no unusual transaction to be accounted for, no new IFRS standards or disclosures that had a significant impact on the financial statements, no new accounting methodology adopted nor change in accounting policies and, as mentioned by Mr Ricci Bitti, no internal control deficiencies or recommendation for improvement to be brought to the attention of the Foundation Board. The mis-statements identified during the audit did not have an impact on the audit opinion due to their immateriality with regard to the financial statements taken as a whole. Those were the highlights of the audit and, unless there were any questions, that concluded her report. In closing, she sincerely thanked the agency's management and staff who had assisted her in carrying out her work, in particular Mr Howman, Ms Pisani and Ms Vizioli.

MR RICCI BITTI asked the President to call a formal vote on the year-end accounts 2014.

MR MUYTERS asked for clarification on two points. In attachment 2, he sought some clarification on the rise in personnel and salary costs. The second question had to do with page 9 of attachment 3, on science and research. He saw that the science and research budget was 14% above what had been foreseen in the beginning and he asked for an explanation for that.

MR RICCI BITTI replied that WADA had had to put in place more staff for the two major approvals made the previous year: the implementation of the Code and the new ADAMS. The former in particular required more people. He did not think that there had been an increase in salaries, although there had been an increase in staff, as more people were necessary. The second answer was that research was always done by rolling projects over from the previous year and those engaged in during the year. The two items sometimes went off the budget, but it was a matter of rolling management, which could have the consequence that had been correctly noted by Mr Muyters.

MR COLEMAN asked a question, and he had made the point the previous day. In terms of a low inflationary environment, WADA was in deficit, so what steps would be taken for WADA to live within its means in coming years? Obviously, the audit opinion was absolutely perfect, but was there a case there for an external review of the effectiveness of spending? He asked because there was a long list of priorities; it was obvious that there were some outcomes WADA wanted to achieve, and could the Foundation Board be sure that the strategy, budget and desired outcomes were all aligned? There had to be an approach rather than just going and asking for an increase of 3% in terms of contributions for the next financial year. To make the case to contributors, there had to be a clear demonstration of a long-term strategy; he appreciated the strategic document, but really a four-year planning cycle and a demonstration of how spending would be reallocated to achieve the organisation's key priorities was an issue that the Finance and Administration Committee really needed to demonstrate to members.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he was sorry to say that the question was not for the Finance and Administration Committee in general; it was a strategic question. The Finance and Administration Committee was ready to do an exercise that was a financial parallel to the strategic plan for three years, but he assured Mr Coleman that, since 2002, the Finance and Administration Committee had done what had been asked many times. The Finance and Administration Committee would do it again, and it would do exactly what had been

requested for the 2015 budget, taking into account Mr Coleman's advice, which he had noted the previous day. Two years more was enough. That was his view, as it was in parallel with strategic planning, but Mr Coleman's question was more to do with strategy. The Finance and Administration Committee was ready to do whatever was asked of it, but already intended to do multi-year planning, as also requested by the European government representative.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that WADA had always been happy, looking at a set of accounts, to try to improve presentation; however, that did not alter the fact that the accounts for the year ending 31 December 2014 were before the members for approval.

DECISION

2014 year-end accounts approved.

– 6.3 2015 quarterly accounts (quarter 1)

MR RICCI BITTI referred to a printed mistake regarding the contributions in the members' papers. The figure of 39% received was not true; fortunately, it was 56% of the total budget, which meant that a major portion had been received, as usual in the first part of the year, making one think that WADA was very well off, although it was not completely true, because WADA's expenses were seasonal, so the members should not dream that the profit of 8.86 million dollars would last for long, as it would have to be spent in the second part of the year.

The expenditure to date, to respond to the two major comments about what was slightly over the average, was the legal costs, and he would not expand on that, as the legal report would explain why WADA had had to spend the money. Again, the ARD research had not been expected or budgeted for, and that had obviously had an impact, but the review of the 2015 budget would be made in July as usual by the Finance and Administration Committee. Another high (but justified) cost, which represented 35% of the total budget, had been for the Lausanne office, and had included the very important anti-doping symposium, and obviously the cost had already been posted; that was why the expenses were so high.

DECISION

2015 quarterly accounts noted.

– 6.4 2016 budget – preliminary planning

MR RICCI BITTI stated that the WADA Finance and Administration Committee was obviously reviewing the budget already approved for 2015 and considering carefully the variations between the actual and budget and, once the trend was clear (which was obviously not the case at the beginning of the year) in July, the Finance and Administration Committee would study and propose the budget for 2016. He could anticipate some comments, one of which was related to the question of contributions, and he believed that, if WADA wanted, and that might be of interest to Mr Coleman, to reinstate air travel costs for members, WADA would not be able to do that without an increase of 3%. It was just a practicality. The Finance and Administration Committee would make a proposal on that. WADA depended somewhat on fluctuation, but he hoped it would be solid, as it had been, or more or less constant. It was hard to make priorities as, to maintain activities, a cost reduction without cutting the activities would not be possible, so the Foundation Board could recommend that the Finance and Administration Committee consider activities, but the Finance and Administration Committee was required to act in accordance with the activities being carried out, and they were considered to be the minimum to make the agency effective in responding to all requirements. Two big items compared to the other usual

items had to be considered, and he mentioned two for 2016: the reinstatement of the travel costs, considered to be in the range of 700,000 dollars, and then the Olympic Games, always a special expenditure, and WADA was involved in the Independent Observer programme and the Athlete Outreach programme, and the personnel of course had to be assigned to the Olympic Games for 15-20 days, so those two costs would be important in 2016 and, as soon as the Finance and Administration Committee had worked out all the variants of the 2015 budget at the July meeting, usually a very long meeting, it would consider putting forward a budget for 2016 in line with the indications. He assured the members that, based on the tradition started the previous year, the Finance and Administration Committee would consider two new practices, one different option in terms of percentage, so the members could choose whichever option best suited them, and then the financial exercise, which would include the one-year budget plus two years.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were comments.

MR MUYTERS thanked Mr Ricci Bitti for his explanation. Europe and Oceania were happy that there would be different possible options for the 2016 budget and he hoped the Foundation Board members were in agreement with a multi-year forecast. Concerning the travel costs, he thought that, when a multiple-year plan was seen, the discussion on travel expenses could be reopened but, before there was a multiple-year forecast, Europe thought that it would not be good to reinstate travel expenditure for members to attend the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings unless specific members asked for compensation.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he had no objection, but the positions were different. The philosophy on the sport side was that the bodies should pay for travel expenses to make them a little more independent, less accountable, but it did not change that much. Substantially, it was not so important; it was more philosophical.

MR POUND made a suggestion to the Finance and Administration Committee with respect to the budget for the Olympic Games in Rio. Based on what had been discovered at the Olympic broadcasting services, the costs were much higher than promised. Unless the Finance and Administration Committee had really up-to-date information, not only would costs be higher, but the amount of accommodation available would be lower.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he had the unlucky privilege of being a member of the coordination committee, and he confirmed that Mr Pound was right: the costs of the rooms were going up, and the number of rooms was going down. Nevertheless, staff members had to be there, and the WADA people would surely take care of budgeting accurately based on accurate information from Brazil. The information was not always accurate, but Mr Pound's point was taken, and it was a good one.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, as far as the Olympic Games in Rio were concerned, WADA would certainly take the information on board. There were certain members of the WADA staff who would be required in Rio to help the IOC run the anti-doping programme, so assistance would be sought in the appropriate places and the members would look at the costs at the Finance and Administration Committee meeting in London in July.

DECISION

2016 budget update noted.

7. Education

– 7.1 Education Committee chair report

THE CHAIRMAN invited Mr Moses to give the members his verbal report as chair of the Education Committee.

MR MOSES said that, as the ADOs focused on the implementation of the 2015 Code, the importance of the Education Committee continued to grow, and it continued to play an important role in guiding the global approach. The meeting had been on 8 and 9 April in Montreal to discuss the current and future WADA education programmes, and it had been a very good and insightful meeting, including a very balanced set of people from all aspects of sport, who were very eager to provide input and fresh and creative ideas. The Education Committee had also welcomed Ms Mariana Quintanilla, a new member of the WADA Athlete Committee; it was very beneficial to the committee to have an Athlete Committee member present. In fact, he wished to ensure that the Athlete Committee and the Education Committee continued to work and share agendas from the meetings and, when available, a member from each body should attend the meeting. It was very important to maintain a good relationship with Ms Fourneyron from the Health, Medical and Research Committee, as the subjects that it dealt with were pertinent to the Education Committee.

The Education Committee also commended the WADA team for the quality of the work and the commitment to promoting education globally.

In terms of key points, there were four main themes, the first of which was partnerships. The ADOs should involve athletes more in protecting clean sport. That was one of the conclusions that had been reached. It had also been agreed that there was a need to continue to promote the importance of education among leaders and decision-makers to obtain more support for education programmes. The Education Committee urged WADA to work closely with the IOC and see how it could be more involved in contributing to relevant commissions, perhaps with WADA members on them. The Education Committee felt that WADA members had a lot of expertise and should perhaps be more involved with some of the IOC commissions. The committee also encouraged WADA to offer cooperation to the IOC with respect to the social science research programmes for the purpose of sharing ideas and avoiding the unnecessary duplication of research.

When it came to resources, the Education Committee encouraged the creation of resource kits for parents of athletes. The committee also requested that WADA see what could be done to further educate athletes and support personnel about supplements. That was key. In terms of approaches to education, the Education Committee wanted to send a strong message that athletes needed to play a positive role in promoting clean sport and supporting ADOs, as there were a lot of athletes in the world who could be very helpful publicly supporting such programmes, and the support should be more of a positive approach versus a punitive approach; for example, athletes should be congratulated for being in a testing pool. Because they were in a testing pool, it was much more likely that ADOs and WADA would be able to provide a cleaner, more ethical and stable playing field. WADA needed to take advantage of that psychology, and the fact that WADA was there to help and WADA was testing everybody and trying to maintain the balance in clean sport. Everybody had the right to compete in a clean and ethical sport, and that needed to be promoted as opposed to the punitive model. The social science research done to date confirmed that that approach was very valid. In fact, when it came to why such research

was undertaken in the first place, he wanted to take a minute to read an explanation as to why research was carried out: 'a focus on legislation alone is insufficient to bring about behaviour change, as those restrictions can be circumvented. It has been shown that there is a correlation between the level of knowledge and doping attitudes and behaviours, meaning that the more educated about anti-doping an athlete is, the more negative his attitudes to being involved in doping would be. On the flip-side, the many athletes who have never had any anti-doping education can display positive attitudes towards doping and be more likely to move in that direction'. It was therefore a clear call for education to instil values that supported doping-free sport. That was the approach that the Education Committee thought ought to be taken and that was what the social science research was about: finding out the psychology, the continuum, where doping started, where it could potentially start and what it turned out to be. There was a need to recognise athletes for fair play, and definitely in a positive light.

In 2015, there would be a global education conference, to be held by the CCES and WADA in Ottawa on 2 and 3 October that year to bring together researchers and experts to examine how ADOs could review their education programmes and enhance them to strengthen the global fight against doping in sport, and the Education Committee had also reinforced the need for ADOs to attend the conference.

Finally, as mentioned by the Director General, three social science research projects had been approved for funding by the Executive Committee the previous day. He asked Mr Koehler to provide an overview of all of the projects.

DECISION

Education Committee chair report noted.

– 7.2 Education report

MR KOEHLER highlighted the fact that the members had before them the social science research general update on research conducted to date, and it provided a brief summary on why it was important to have education, who should be doing education, the targets of education, the type of content that was needed, where education should take place, when the ideal time for it to take place was and how to actually deliver the education programmes. The document also outlined every research project funded by WADA to date, the outcomes and the summaries, and it also explained how that research had been used to further enhance WADA education programmes.

He recognised that WADA was not the only organisation doing social science research, and a global review had been commissioned to look at all research that had been conducted to date. The idea was not to duplicate activities but to find new ways to ensure that education programmes were being enhanced. It would be finalised on 3 August, and it was being done by Professor Backhouse.

Supplements had been mentioned that morning and, while it was recognised that, in an ideal world, governments would regulate supplements, the long-term solution was education, and WADA was looking at using resources already out there instead of recreating the wheel to do that.

The online sport physician's tool kit would be ready for launch in the coming month. It had been delayed, as the IOC had wanted to add some elements to it. It had turned out to be a very beneficial partnership. The programme had been enhanced and tested with physicians.

Similarly, the ALPHA (Athlete Learning Programme for Health and Anti-Doping) programme had been launched the previous year. It had taken some time to get the translations completed, but WADA was in the final process of launching it with French and Spanish in the coming months.

He was also pleased to announce that the university textbook would be officially launched during the Universiade Games in Guangzhou. There were ten universities that had been piloting the project and providing feedback, and the chairman of the Education Committee would be attending the launch.

Finally, he wished to mention the model guidelines that had been produced with the revised 2015 Code. One of the elements in the guideline had been to develop a standardised survey to be released over the coming months to look at and evaluate the effectiveness of education programmes and measure attitudes, beliefs and behaviour over the long term to see if WADA was actually making a difference, ensuring also that national programmes were doing it so that it would be possible to do comparative studies to see where athletes' beliefs and behaviours were and how to shape them to ensure clean sport. It was long-term prevention that would take time, and he hoped that the tool would provide the necessary information to ensure successful education.

MS BOKEL thought that, as had been mentioned, it was a good thing for the Athlete Committee and the Education Committee to work together. She had a question regarding not the social science research itself but the five Ws. She had flipped through the document briefly, as she had been unable to read it entirely. It seemed to be a comprehensive way of looking at education, but the question she had was who should educate the athletes: the IF, the NADO, WADA, or the NF? It was an important question to ask, as one could always point fingers at different organisations that should have done the education.

MR KOELHER responded that the simple answer was that everybody had a role to play in education, but it was important to recognise that some IFs were five steps away from an athlete. WADA was looking at a model whereby IFs (and that would be further developed) would be responsible for running outreach programmes after events and sharing information with NADOs, and NADOs would carry out effective prevention activities. WADA was trying to break it down so that people were not duplicating activities and were complementing them. There would hopefully be more details at the next meeting on how that would be broken down to avoid confusion.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether he could assume that, as the work on the model guidelines was done, it might just give an indication of the likely requirements to spend one million dollars.

MR KOEHLER replied that he would be happy to take that.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it seemed to him that it should guide the kind of research that WADA would want to do, and he would have thought that that was ideal.

MR KOEHLER agreed with the Chairman.

DECISION

Education report noted.

8. Health, Medical and Research

– 8.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee Chair report

MS FOURNEYRON said that, ahead of the presentations from Dr Rabin and Dr Vernec, she wished to make a few comments on the outcome of the five months she had spent as chairperson of the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

Tying in with what had just been discussed, i.e. research, she had been in Doha the previous week representing the President at the fifth annual symposium on Global Trends in Anti-Doping Research, organised by the ADLQ. The focus of the symposium had been developments and trends in past, present and future anti-doping research. One slide that was particularly relevant showed the way in which, since WADA had been founded, the resources earmarked for research had evolved, as well as the percentage of the budget devoted by the agency to research since its creation, with the first start-up period between 2000-2004. She pointed out that that was the period during which there had been significant resources (six to seven million dollars), and that was precisely when it had been possible to make significant progress on CERA, EPO, insulin equivalents, insulin analogues (2008), and the Athlete Biological Passport (2009). During that time, WADA had been able to take major strides forward and make significant advances. In 2014 and 2015, research budgets had been cut, and she was not blaming anybody, but the Executive Committee had chosen to give priority to the new ADAMS and focus on compliance with the new Code. She pointed to the new special research fund, created by the IOC and the public authorities, and emphasised the work of the President and Director General when it came to obtaining matching funds. The fund was going to be able to take advantage of methodological experience built up ever since the Health, Medical and Research Committee had been established. She also emphasised the ever-closer cooperation between the anti-doping world and the pharmaceutical sector. She pointed to the success of the Second International Conference on the Pharmaceutical Industry and the Fight against Doping, which had been held in Tokyo and brought together more than 300 participants, and thanked the Government of Japan, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology and JADA for their involvement. Significant progress had been made in January 2015 in Tokyo, with global framework agreements with certain giants in the pharmaceutical sector, such as GlaxoSmithKline, Roche, Novartis and Pfizer, since December to exchange information about new drugs being developed, and that was a very promising cooperation. WADA had to continue to step up multilateral and bilateral partnerships.

As part of the strategy to protect clean athletes, she highlighted the memorandum of understanding between WADA and the IMI on the sharing of information and data. With respect to the pharmaceutical industry in future years, it was working on issues such as the aging population and loss of autonomy, and therefore it was looking for drugs that could help that population but could be misused. As such, the powerful partnership also formed an essential component of WADA's action.

Finally, there was a multiannual partnership between the PCC, the Partnership for Clean Competition, and WADA. There was also the partnership with the major leagues.

WADA had new resources, but that meant that it had to be even more focused, demanding and specific in terms of how they were to be used. The 13-million-dollar research fund had been earmarked for specific instructions or visible and powerful strategic orientations. That meant that WADA had to focus on a limited number of projects and not

scatter money left, right and centre. WADA had recently had to devote a great deal of money to lawsuits and research had received slightly less money. WADA should not be using funds in small increments. The new funding was an opportunity for WADA to indicate which issues would be the focus of its research efforts. WADA had to open up debate on four specific priorities regarding science and medicine: the detection of autologous blood transfer, the improvement of the Athlete Biological Passport and detection thresholds, micro-dosing and endocrine parameters, OMICs and glucocorticosteroids. The current situation relating to the latter could not be allowed to continue.

The priorities should also go hand-in-hand with a change in methodology with regard to RFPs. Rather than waiting for research teams to go to WADA, WADA should be proactive and contact those teams that could work on priority areas. A framework document would be submitted to the Foundation Board for approval at its next meeting. The number of TUEs had been rising significantly and there were numerous NADOs that were still not entering TUEs into ADAMS.

In conclusion, she focused on an issue relating to methods. Since January, with the support of the Director General and the President, she had taken part in a number of the meetings of the expert groups (List, TUE and Laboratory), and she noted the high calibre and commitment of the members of the groups, ably supported by a very hard-working staff. Of course, progress was always possible; one could always do better, and she hoped to see an improvement in the way in which WADA operated internally and externally. Internally, WADA should improve cross-disciplinarity and information-sharing among the committees. She had suggested that, before the Health, Medical and Research Committee met, the various expert group chairs get together. When a substance was modified by the List Expert Group, there were consequences on the TUE and Laboratory expert groups as well, so it was important to bring the various groups up to date on matters; that seemed essential to her. Exchange between the groups and the administration still took place vertically, in silos, and that could lead to frustration. The experts felt that they were not really being listened to. Scientists also would like to see greater cross-disciplinarity and cooperation with external partners. That had also been mentioned in Doha. Occasionally, laboratories worked on an issue with the support of WADA and then discovered that other laboratories were working on the same issue without anybody knowing what the other laboratory had been doing. She had wanted to report after just a few months in her new position. WADA was definitely the driving force when it came to scientific and anti-doping research, and the pilot obviously had to involve all the anti-doping stakeholders.

DECISION

Health, Medical and Research Committee
Chair report noted.

– **8.2 Science report**

- **8.2.1 Draft 2016 Prohibited List update**

DR RABIN referred to the document relating to the draft 2016 List of Prohibited Substances and Methods. The draft 2016 List had been completed by the List Expert Group and made available for consultation as of 6 May 2015, with a deadline for comments by 22 July. That would be a fairly long consultation period and, as usual, once WADA had collected all the comments and suggestions from the stakeholders, they would be reviewed and, if necessary, revised at the August List Expert Group meeting and then by the Health, Medical and Research Committee members for presentation to the Executive Committee in

September. That was the usual process followed every year. The consultation process should give all the stakeholders enough time to provide their comments to WADA.

MR POUND said that he had had an interesting discussion not long ago with somebody who had thought that the process of developing the List was not transparent, and he had explained the way WADA went through it. Just about that time, he had received his copy of the preliminary report that urged him to keep it confidential. He wondered if there was some policy reason why WADA would not want anybody who was interested, stakeholder or not, to see that process, and if there was something he was missing; otherwise, he would be delighted to send it around.

MS FOURNEYRON responded that Dr Rabin had recalled the method that WADA currently applied. WADA wanted to share the List development further and further upstream. She did not think that WADA was concealing information. Once the List Expert Group had made proposals, they were distributed, so she did not know whether there was something that called for the document to be kept confidential. That was the method that she had seen and it appeared to her to be satisfactory.

DR RABIN added that there had initially been concern about the List receiving non-technical and not necessarily well-supported comments from people not involved in anti-doping or with sufficient background to provide valuable comments. WADA received a lot of comments on the document, which was one of the key documents and one of the most visible so, historically speaking, WADA had kept the consultation phase to the stakeholders and not completely open to the public. That might need to be revisited to see if it would be of benefit to open it up to everybody or whether the current process ensured the necessary scientific, medical, administrative or educational comments required to review the List every year.

DECISION

Science report noted.

– **8.3 Medical report**

DR VERNEC thanked Ms Fourneyron for her presence at the expert group meetings. As mentioned, there had been 897 TUEs granted in ADAMS in 2014, representing a 41% increase compared to 2013, and the upward trend was continuing. Some of that was because there were 16 new ADOs entering TUEs into ADAMS for the first time. However, there were still numerous ADOs not using ADAMS for a variety of reasons, which of course restricted WADA's ability to monitor TUEs. On WADA TUE reviews, presently on WADA's own initiative, it was reviewing two granted TUEs for testosterone in basketball and biathlon. There had been a DHEA case, and a TUE had been granted for that the previous year. The WADA TUEC had reviewed it and denied the TUE. The athlete had appealed the decision to the CAS and, at a CAS hearing the previous December, the CAS had confirmed the WADA TUEC decision. Regarding the medical section, a lot of work was being put into the TUE physician guidelines for medical conditions, and that had been very helpful to TUE committees around the world. The latest addition had been one on neuropathic pain management, and WADA was actively working on and almost completing one on cardiovascular conditions. That was all that he had to say about the medical aspect.

DECISION

Medical report noted.

– 8.4 Athlete Biological Passport

DR VERNEC recalled that the Athlete Biological Passport monitored biological variables over time to indirectly detect doping. He referred to the haematological module, running since 2009, and the steroidal module, running since 2014. The haematological module had reached a certain level of maturity, although there was still a lot of work to be done to engage more ADOs and continue to refine the module. Since 2010, there had been 81 anti-doping rule violations by the Athlete Biological Passport, and that meant that there had been no prohibited substance detected in urine or blood; nevertheless, the athletes had been sanctioned. On top of that, there were more than 400 athletes who had been sanctioned for blood doping and, to a large degree, that was because of the targeting of the Athlete Biological Passport, which allowed ADOs to intelligently and strategically plan which urine samples to test for EPO for example.

As far as the steroidal module was concerned, it operated basically on the same process and principles as the haematological module. As soon as a doping control form was entered into ADAMS, a passport was created and, if there were a number of samples entered and then there was an abnormal profile, there would be an atypical passport finding. Because not everybody was entering data into ADAMS, WADA had had to develop a parallel system that was less efficient, and that was what the suspicious steroid profile was about. The members could read the technical document if they wanted to know more. The point he wanted to make was that, when one used the Athlete Biological Passport and the adaptive model currently in ADAMS, there were 71% more positive IRMFs per ATPF than with the suspicious steroid profile, so a certain efficiency was gained by using the passport.

One of the key principles of the passport was that there was one athlete and one passport, and of course that meant using ADAMS. WADA had made a correction, based on stakeholder feedback, so that a secondary ADO other than the passport custodian would be able to evaluate the full passport. On monitoring and assistance, there had been some hirings, including Mr Aiken, who was a science manager working full time on the Athlete Biological Passport, so WADA had considerably stepped up the monitoring of passport programmes, and was engaging one-on-one with a number of organisations to improve their Athlete Biological Passport programmes. WADA had just started that over the past few months, but he was quite pleased with the step up in quality of some of the programmes. It was one thing to run an anti-doping programme, and another to run a very effective and strategic one. WADA would continue to do that.

WADA's scientists assisted ADOs during Athlete Biological Passport cases, and there were two cases coming up at the CAS, and Athlete Biological Passport monitoring and data mining provided important information for ongoing investigations.

He concluded by mentioning some of the meetings held over the past few months. One of them had been an operational meeting, for which WADA had brought together a number of different stakeholders to look at practical issues, including passport custodians, sharing, and the use of APMUs, and there had been a lot of good outcomes particularly suggestions for ADAMS. There was always some discussion about getting the samples to laboratories on time, and generally the recommendation was 36 hours, with analysis done within 48 hours. Of course, it was challenging because of weekends, and it was challenging in certain parts of the world. A group of experts had been looking at the blood sample temperature transport, and had come up with the concept of a blood stability score, whereby if samples were kept at a very cold temperature for a significant amount of time, WADA could look at expanding that 36-hour period based on a combination of temperature and time. There had been a scientific meeting the previous week in Rome, and WADA had reviewed scientific cases and

patterns of doping together with the WADA Athlete Biological Passport experts, and there had also been some suggestions relating to some of the targeted research for the Athlete Biological Passport, including the key ones focusing on developing new doping biomarkers for all of the modules, and one of the recommendations would be more storage of samples for later testing, specifically for the Athlete Biological Passport, regardless of other recommendations on sample storage.

In Qatar on 2 and 3 November, WADA would bring together a number of experts and laboratory people and athlete passport managers to try and increase the knowledge of some of the specialists. The passport and adaptive model were only part one of the evaluation; it could trigger an atypical passport finding, but WADA needed experts evaluating passports to complete that. That was a challenge, and WADA needed to up-skill a number of specialists around the world. That was scheduled for November 2015.

In closing, the steroidal passport had increased in efficiency. He looked forward to having a lot more data to share the following year. WADA would continue to work with its partners in advising and assisting them with improving their passport programmes. The Athlete Biological Passport was never a standalone programme; it worked hand in hand with all the analytical testing and investigations that were part of an ADO programme.

MR PASCUAL asked whether, because of the whole structure of APMUs and numerous experts looking at the profiles, with the cost that entailed, there had been any effort made to put all the knowledge into an algorithm that ADAMS was able to handle, so that one went to the experts only to confirm what ADAMS had indicated about the anomaly in the profile, not just using a couple of things but trying to increase the artificial intelligence of ADAMS in evaluating those results. For the blood passport, it was perhaps simpler, but from the IPC or from a laboratory perspective, there had been changes in profiles resulting in nothing to be concerned about or simply perfectly normal endogenous variations, which could probably be better incorporated in ADAMS so that the information was already there and could help simplify the whole process.

MR BOILEAU stated that clearly some good progress had been made, but it was quite alarming at the same time. He wondered if it might be possible to expand on the information concerning blood doping and why there was not a higher conversion rate of positive analysis for blood doping and anti-doping violations. He was talking about the 81 anti-doping violation and the 400 traditional positive analysis for blood that was triggered by the Athlete Biological Passport.

DR VERNEC responded to Dr Pascual. WADA often talked about the same principles and processes, but the members would be well aware that the steroidal module was much more heavily laboratory-orientated. WADA was always trying to automate it more and to refine the algorithm. Ideally, he would like to put all the data in so that there would be a result of doping or no doping, but WADA could not do that; there were too many confounding factors, which was why there had to be experts reviewing that. The concept of an APMU (and there were currently nine in the world) was that there were many smaller ADOs that did not have the resources or the expertise to learn about the passport in detail, which was why people were brought into the APMU. It was still in process; it would be evaluated and there would be changes as WADA moved forward, and the members' comments would always be appreciated.

As far as he understood the other comment, and he thought that it had to do with why more people were not being caught by the Athlete Biological Passport, one of the great principles in anti-doping was that false positives were not wanted, so the entire sport

community and stakeholders were making sure that, if they decided that somebody was doping, they definitely were doping, so it had to be a very tight system. He was impressed with the fact that there were 80 cases (just two years previously, he had been talking about 12), and that there were more cases coming up and more in the pipeline. These were people who had not had any EPO positive; there had been no ESAs or other test, other than the fact that they had had abnormal profiles with perhaps some other information obtained. As he had mentioned, over 400 cases had been directed by that, but one of the things about which WADA did not talk enough due to lack of detail was the deterrent effect. If one looked at the CIRC report, it stated that, once the Athlete Biological Passport had come in, there had been quite a paradigm shift and a significant change, not eradication of doping in cycling (the members should not fool themselves), but certainly an improvement in the situation and, as mentioned, the gross doping that had been happening in early 2000 had essentially stopped, and nobody was running around putting two bags of blood inside and then running off to a competition two days later. He thought that WADA had made a good start; he did not think that anybody was resting on their laurels, and there was still a lot of work to be done to improve the Athlete Biological Passport.

THE CHAIRMAN commented that it was quite high-level stuff; perhaps it would be a good idea to think about how to bring it to the Foundation Board in a slightly more pointed way. He was grateful for all the work that had been done.

DECISION

Athlete Biological Passport update noted.

9. Legal

- **9.1 Legal and investigations report**
- **9.2 Independent commission**

Starting on a positive note, MR NIGGLI informed the members that there was good news. The members would be surprised to hear that it had to do with data protection. After several years of discussion, WADA had agreed with the Swiss on a way of solving the issue of the transfer of data to Canada. With the agreement of the Swiss data protection authority, WADA would renew its ADAMS agreement with all of the ADAMS users and, instead of signing the agreements with WADA Montreal, the users would sign them with WADA Lausanne, so the data would enter Switzerland and would then be transferred to Canada under a data transfer agreement that had been approved by the Swiss authorities and under which all data protection requirements would be met. That meant that the transfer of data and use of ADAMS should no longer be an issue for any organisation in Europe, because Switzerland was deemed adequate under European Union legislation. It was therefore no longer a reason not to use the system.

Probably out of desperation, WADA had also worked hard with the Canadian authorities, both the Quebec Government and the Federal Government, to try to have WADA fall under the jurisdiction of the federal law on data protection, which had been the initial issue, because WADA being a not-for-profit agency had been under Quebec law as opposed to federal law, which was recognised by the European authorities as adequate. There was currently a bill before the parliament, which should be approved over the coming three weeks, under which WADA would then fall under the jurisdiction of the federal law for data protection, and that would also solve the issue of transfer of data. On that front, the transfer of data was no longer an issue and certainly no longer an excuse for some people not to use ADAMS.

That being said, there were still data protection issues pending in Europe, and the EU was preparing legislation. The latest he had heard from the European Commission in Brussels was that it would be up to each Member State to ensure that it had proper legislation in place under which it would recognise that anti-doping was in the public interest and, on that basis, the collection, sharing and transfer of information would become legal under the new regulation. Therefore, there was still great concern about the overall situation. WADA was really relying on its European partners to ensure that whatever solution was found was one that would work.

On the legal cases, quite a bit of money had been spent. There were a few big cases ongoing. He informed the members that WADA had appealed on Friday the cases from the Australian football leagues (34, potentially 35, cases). That would not help with the budget, but it had really been felt that it was very important from the point of view of principles. The initial decision had been questioning the ability to pursue non-analytical cases, and the level of proof required to win the cases and, at a time when the new Code was entering into force and putting a lot of emphasis on non-analytical cases, it was important to set the right precedent. Those cases were being appealed at the CAS.

WADA had been facing costly litigation, not least case number 3 under pending litigation, which was a golfing case in the USA in which WADA was not even a party. It was a case between an athlete and the PGA, and WADA had been dragged into that case by the PGA and the athlete, asking about the 'discovery' of documents from WADA which had proven to be a very time-consuming exercise, requiring the involvement of lawyers from the USA and Canada, and it had cost WADA hundreds and thousands of dollars. WADA would try to recoup some of the costs if it could, but it would not be easy.

There was a residual case from the Armstrong case concerning Armstrong's manager, Bruyneel, which was still ongoing. That was also a costly case. The UCI and USADA were helping WADA to fund it.

WADA had done a number of cases recently in Brazil upon request and in conjunction with the Brazilian ADO, which had also committed to provide funding for the help received, so that should mitigate current expenses.

On investigations, WADA had organised training courses on intelligence management. The first course had been held as a pilot in Paris some weeks previously; it had been very successful and very helpful. The next course would be in Lausanne and open to all ADOs, NADOs and IFs. The first course had been fully subscribed after just a few days, and there would be other editions. WADA was trying to help all ADOs understand what their responsibilities were under the new Code and how to do such things without overcomplicating matters, managing the information in a sensible fashion so that it could be useful from an anti-doping point of view, in particular with regard to the non-analytical cases.

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the two bits of good news about data protection.

MR SCHNEIDER stated that he wanted to say something about data protection and the new European regulation. It was really a technical and political issue. It was with pleasure that he said something about the regulation currently being discussed in Brussels, dealing with the protection of private data, which WADA feared might jeopardise the fight against doping in sport. Luxembourg would hold the European presidency for six months, and discussions were officially to conclude at the end of the presidency. He was talking about a draft regulation that had to go through two readings in Brussels. The Latvian presidency and

the future Luxembourg presidency had communicated WADA's concerns at informal and formal meetings and would continue to make that point. WADA's concerns had been taken into account within the horizontal regulation. Anti-doping was in the public interest according to article 87 and was one of the few items mentioned, which meant that Europe was definitely taking it into account and would do its utmost to ensure that it remained in the final document. The draft regulation was quite similar to the 1995 directive, which it would be replacing. The only thing that changed was that athletes' feelings were no longer considered to be a valid reason regarding the collection of personal data. He understood WADA's concerns and of course the future president would be available to WADA to keep the agency informed and help it with regard to data protection and work out possible solutions to maintain an effective fight against doping in sport.

MR POUND re-recorded his disappointment with the outcome of the Backstrom case. There was an athlete who had tested positive during the Sochi Olympic Games walking around and wearing a silver medal, and WADA had fumbled the ball in not pursuing that case to its proper conclusion.

MS BESSEBERG said that he was not pleased with a point in the new Code that IFs, when they had a report from a laboratory about an atypical test, should announce it to the federation and the athlete. That was completely wrong, as it was top-secret information and, out of that, intelligent targeted testing should be done to catch the athlete if there were suspicions. In the past, his federation had been able to follow up an atypical test with intelligent targeted testing to catch athletes taking new generations of EPO. He said that, when asking for Code compliance, his federation had wanted to stick to the old rule, that it be kept a secret, and had got permission from WADA to continue in that way, but it should be the same for everybody because, when one left a footprint, one should do one's utmost to catch those cheats, in case there were cheats behind the atypical tests. In most cases, he was afraid that there were cheats behind atypical tests. The Code should be changed to be more effective when it came to catching the cheats and protecting the clean athletes. He had no problem; his federation had been granted the exception, but it should apply to everybody.

PROFESSOR DE ROSE thanked Mr Niggli for his report. He had two comments. In Brazil, the decision of the adverse analytical findings came from each of the NFs and most of the federations currently used arbitration systems that were very good: they called three experts and normally reached the right decision, but some of the federations still had the old system and went to sport tribunals, with people who were experts in the law of the sport but did not know anti-doping rules, so he welcomed the ABCD's action, trying to ensure decisions that were compliant with the Code and with WADA. The second point was that the Olympic Movement would like to take the opportunity to put forward the question of the potential benefit of retaining not only the TUE certificate for 10 years, but also the underlying medical files, in particular in the context of reanalysis programmes to assess a possible legal solution that might need to be found.

MR PIGOZZI said that he wished to support what Professor De Rose had stated; it was always advisable to support any medical report or a certificate from a forensic medicine point of view with the relevant medical files, so he strongly supported the Olympic Movement's recommendation.

MR NIGGLI said that WADA would certainly be working closely with the Luxembourg presidency to see how things could be done, and he was glad if WADA was worrying about nothing and hoped that the future would prove that WADA had been wrong, but he thought that WADA had to be very careful and work with its partners. He thought he had answered

Mr Pound at the previous Foundation Board meeting on that particular topic, and the matter was already in the minutes.

To Mr Besseberg, he thought that there was a misunderstanding regarding the Code provision, as the Code stated that 'anti-doping organisations shall conduct a required investigation when there is an atypical finding', which was what Mr Besseberg was saying, and certainly they should try to find out what was behind the finding. The only thing that the Code said was that, after investigation was completed, which could be a long time down the line, there was an obligation to inform the people who had been under investigation and other organisations. Every organisation had an opportunity to secretly do what they had to do to try to find out what it was but, at the end of the day, when a conclusion was reached, either that there was a case and it was opened and everybody was notified as to the adverse analytical finding or that there was no case to answer, in which case one had to notify that, as other parties might have a right of appeal on that and decide that, at the end of the day, perhaps there had been a case. There was certainly no request for the IF to disclose it to the athletes when it wanted to carry out the investigation.

In response to what Professor De Rose and Mr Pigozzi had said on the process, there was no disagreement in principle with what they were saying, and he was looking to the Council of Europe, because the process had been to come up with a document on the retention time for each type of data. That had been discussed in a working group, and the conclusion had been that WADA would retain the TUE certificate for a longer period than the underlying medical documentation, for data protection reasons, because the sensitivity of the medical documents was higher; but, if there were rational and good reasons to retain the documentation, that was certainly something that could be discussed again, as it was not written in stone, and the principle in data protection was that it was driven by need. He would be happy to have the discussion again and see if it might be possible to amend the retention time if that made sense.

THE CHAIRMAN concluded that that had been very helpful and productive.

DECISION

Legal update noted.

10. World Anti-Doping Code

MR NIGGLI said that Mr Bouchard, the Chair of the Compliance Review Expert Group, was present. The group had been appointed as an independent body to overview and oversee the work that WADA was doing on compliance. There were three documents in the members' files: one about the general process that WADA was following in terms of putting into place the compliance programme, and that followed on from what had been discussed previously. WADA was establishing a process for monitoring whether or not rules were in place and enforced properly. WADA would also start ISO accreditation of that process. All that was in progress. In the other document (10.2), the members would see those countries in progress and, in the third document, (10.3), the members would see those countries for which there was a non-compliance recommendation, but he would hand the floor to Mr Bouchard, who would explain the work that his group had done and how it had ended up with the recommendation.

- **10.1 Compliance activities plan 2015 and other compliance-related issues**
- **10.2 Implementation of World Anti-Doping Code and International Standards 2015 – rules update**
- **10.3 Non-compliance**

MR BOUCHARD said that he was very pleased to inform the members about the work of the Compliance Review Committee. In terms of the work conducted so far, the committee had had two meetings, as indicated in the documents, one in February and another one in April, so it was early days. The group was starting its work, and he would go through the content of the work. The first meeting had been devoted mostly to briefings, and the members had received a briefing on the components of the compliance monitoring programme and an overview of the ISO implementation process, and had also reviewed some of the peculiarities of implementation of the Code in certain countries, for instance, where legislation needed to be amended. The group had discussed at length the proposed tier model for countries and IFs, and had also reviewed a number of outstanding cases or issues brought to the attention of the members. The group had been briefed at length on the nature of the issues of each of the cases, and had been given access to the exchange of official documents between the task force and the relevant organisations. A good information session had been provided by WADA staff, but the group had not just listened; it had also made a number of recommendations to the task force, and he would go through some of them but, before he did so, he wanted to put some of the recommendations into context because the work was only beginning, especially when talking about the tier model. The group would look at other things and would bring back some further recommendations to the Foundation Board, but it was important to put it into perspective. In terms of the tier model for countries, the group had been presented with a list of criteria that could be used to identify countries in the tier model, and had asked that the indicators be changed a bit, because there had been a small number of indicators, and the group had wanted a larger number of indicators focusing mostly on sports. The group had talked about the IFs, and had revised the IF model, bringing some sport types to a lower tier, parachuting being one of them. Looking at criteria, the group had made some changes, but had also said that they should be used internally in a flexible way, for the beginning at least. There had been a discussion about ranking the criteria, and it had been thought that, at the beginning of the process, it would probably be better to keep them flexible and for internal purposes only. The group had also recommended that non-compliance be one of the criteria. It had felt that, when a country or signatory was considered non-compliant, it should be taken into account in the tier model. The group had also recommended that the tier model be reviewed on a regular basis, believing that annual revision to take into account different movements and a changing environment was important. The group had been firm on some of the recommendations, but had also tried to make sure that the task force would give assistance to the signatories. There were two areas that the group had felt were quite important, and it had talked about a chart that would allow countries to have a better understanding of what they needed to be compliant with. The group had also talked about the possibility of each signatory filling out a questionnaire or a survey, and had talked about the level of details and the questions, which should have a specific focus with a choice, to make sure that the information would be easy to fill in, understand and compare. The group wanted to make sure that it would be firm, but also provide assistance and keep the communication lines open.

There had also been a long discussion concerning signatories whose rules were not yet in line with the Code. There were two categories, the first being signatories who had sent their rules to WADA, were discussing them with WADA and with whom progress was being

made. The second category comprised signatories who had not yet provided information or a first draft of rules, or even responded to letters sent by WADA to engage them. On the first group, those who had sent their rules to WADA and with whom discussions were in progress, since the meeting on 2 April, there had been further progress, and signatories continued to make progress on their rules. The group's view was that progress was being made, so that could allow the signatories to be compliant with the Code between then and the November meeting. Having said that, the group had felt it important that progress continue, and progress be accelerated between then and the November meeting, as the group would review the list during that time, and might consider recommending that some of the signatories be declared non-compliant. But, as he spoke, it was felt that progress was being made and that it should be encouraged to ensure that more signatories would be in line with the Code.

For the second group, the discussion had been a little different. As he had said, this was the group of signatories who had not yet provided information to the WADA staff. That was 18 months after the World Conference on Doping in Sport in South Africa in 2013, also taking into account the fact that model rules had been made available by WADA to all signatories, and numerous letters had been sent or attempts made to engage the signatories. The group felt that the signatories should be declared non-compliant by the Foundation Board at that meeting. Having said that, since the previous day, two signatories had forwarded letters to WADA. Andorra and Liberia had started to engage, and maybe they could be taken off the list since they had engaged in discussion with WADA and had indicated that they were currently making changes to their legislation or current rules. There was more importance on the fact that the communication lines were being kept open, so that all were working towards the same goal and pulling in the same direction. The group had made recommendations on how to deal with issues encountered by some organisations, and he was thinking of FIBA, World Rugby and the ICC. Some of the recommendations were included in the package, so he would not spend too much time on that point, but the group had taken into account some of the comments and arguments put forward by those organisations and, as he would conclude, the members would see where the group stood on some of the requests for exceptions, as a number of things came to mind when looking at the issues, although there were three principles that were high in the members' minds. The members of the group were very engaged and committed, and brought different perspectives, but it was a very coherent group. As a group, it placed emphasis on the importance of harmonisation, the resolution process in the Code, and on the respect of the rights of the athletes.

MR KOLOBKOV expressed his appreciation of the approach to non-compliance adopted by WADA. Europe had taken the issue of possible non-compliance very seriously, and the European public authorities had done their best to present compliant rules by 1 January, understanding that legislative processes could be lengthy and complicated. The Council of Europe had recently been in touch with the governments of the countries that risked being declared non-compliant, with a view to encourage them to remedy the situation. The final European country remaining on the list, Andorra, had been repeatedly contacted by the Council of Europe, and a letter from the Government of Andorra containing the necessary explanation and assurances had been received the previous day and handed over to WADA. Currently, no European country appeared on the non-compliant list, and the Council of Europe remained committed to continue supporting WADA in ensuring that its European signatories fully respected their obligations under the Code.

MR PENGILLY thanked WADA for the work that had been going on. It looked like a good start was being made. He had a question that might require a follow-up. He asked for an explanation of the situation if or when a cheat was caught in one of the seven nations or

one of those on the in-progress list compared with when a cheat was caught in one of the nations that had Code-compliant rules and the implications of that.

MS MARKOVIC said that she thought that Mr Pengilly had asked a very good question, but she had not wanted to ask it. She wanted to compliment the writers of the report. It was very important to follow up on Code-compliance and implementation of all the provisions. She wanted to support what the two previous speakers had said. The Council of Europe cooperated well with WADA in a very mutually beneficial way, first to ensure high-quality compliance monitoring, because monitoring was terribly important for the future, and second to provide assistance when it came to improving national anti-doping legislation and ensuring equal treatment of all athletes.

MR POUND said that, as he understood it, WADA was about to take the momentous decision of declaring non-compliant a number of countries that simply had not replied after 18 months and after repeated requests. WADA would not do anything about those that were non-compliant but who were talking to WADA, and WADA would not do anything about monitoring the implementation of the Code, all of which led him to ask what WADA was really doing to protect the clean athletes. That was meant to be WADA's overriding mission. He shared Mr Pengilly's concern, and he thought that Mr Pengilly probably knew the answer to the question he had asked about what happened to somebody in a non-compliant jurisdiction compared to somebody in a compliant jurisdiction, which was that the ones who were not compliant would gain an advantage because the sanction in the 2015 Code could not be applied to them, as they were not signatories, so WADA had a lot of work to do to get itself to the point whereby it was really monitoring compliance with the Code.

MR BOUCHARD commented on the final question. There was no doubt that a lot of emphasis would be put on monitoring. At that stage of the game, it was probably a good idea to set the stage properly and find the right criteria against which to measure monitoring. He would like to be more advanced, but he would like to get it right, so the foundation needed to be right before moving further ahead. He assured the members that what was to come would focus on monitoring. On the countries for which there was a recommendation that they be declared non-compliant, he explained the rationale of the group. Because there had been no engagement at all over 18 months, the group was asking that they be declared non-compliant. For the remaining countries, since 2 April, the group had seen that they had moved and were providing rules. WADA was giving the benefit of the doubt but was keeping an eye on them, which was why he was saying that it was important that the movement and progress continue. There had been a discussion, and the group would review the list again before November and see whether there had been progress, after which it would come up with further recommendations regarding non-compliance in November.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if Mr Pound thought that the process and the assurance of monitoring enabled him to understand, if not agree to, the fact that this was a very small group, which, clearly, if it had given WADA the information, could become compliant.

MR POUND replied that he got the theory, but he was concerned about the speed and the rigour. At that stage, he would be inclined to say that the countries on the A list should be declared non-compliant and the countries on the B list were being monitored very closely and could become officially non-compliant if they did not respond by such-and-such a date.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it had been put to WADA under the new Code as being a high priority. A highly expert representative group had been put together. He asked Mr Bouchard to take on board the comments made by Mr Pound about the monitoring of the situation

and come back to the Foundation Board. WADA had always rather felt that it would take some time, and clearly it was the first step: whether the right rules were in place so that all could play under the same set of rules. Clearly, as it developed, other standards would be applied and people would be more or less compliant as the process developed. On that basis, he supposed that a recommendation was being made regarding the countries in attachment 1 of 10.3 (six countries).

MR PENGILLY said that he thought he did know the answer to his own question and would follow up on it. Assuming that Mr Pound was correct, unfortunately that left the athletes in a very unfair situation, so he wanted to make three comments. The first was that the Foundation Board deem the countries non-compliant but, just as importantly, the Foundation Board should get a clear and appropriate time-scale for those on the in-progress list, including a deadline for implementation of rules. Point two would be that those responsible for sporting competitions, in the world in which he lived and worked, namely the major event organisations and IFs, create a framework of timely, firm, fair consequences and sanctions to deal with any non-compliance. The third thing, which related to the conference call that the Athlete Committee had had a few days previously with Mr Howman, in which the Director General had said that the timescale to create the compliance monitoring programme would not be until 2017 (he was glad that he had been sitting down when he had heard that), would be that the creation of that monitoring programme be prioritised and accelerated to be prepared in early 2016 so that the tier 1 anti-doping organisations could be assessed before the Olympic Games in Rio.

MR RYAN said that, just assuming that WADA's Foundation Board did follow the proposal under attachment 1, and he supported that it do so, WADA should be very careful with the language it used because, in effect, by declaring a relatively small number of signatories non-compliant, the inference was that all the others were compliant and, in his area, there were some federations about which there was ongoing discussion, even though WADA might be very close to them having Code-compliant rules. The communication needed some care and attention to make it clear that WADA was declaring the few signatories non-compliant but it was not yet the case that all the other signatories were compliant.

MR BOUCHARD agreed with the remarks and took note of them.

MR POUND asked whether, when the Foundation Board voted on that, and assuming that the vote was in favour of the declaration, that included a direction to the staff to notify the responsible authorities at once, for example the IOC, and that WADA would expect them to do their duty.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL replied in the affirmative that it was a requirement of WADA under the Code and WADA would report accordingly pursuant to article 23.5.5.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there was sufficient information to accept the recommendation that had come from the compliance group that WADA had set up, having regard to the suggestion that wording be used very carefully indeed for the other two groups, that El Salvador, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone and the Virgin Islands be declared non-compliant and the necessary steps taken thereafter.

MR RICCI BITTI asked about the actions that followed the decision to make those countries non-compliant. Perhaps WADA should really inform the stakeholders about the situation of the other ones too.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether an interim report was being suggested, and that, since WADA was doing that, it should go to the other stakeholders with the statistics of the work that had been done by the compliance group and that WADA should categorise the stakeholders into three groups. Was that what Mr Ricci Bitti wanted?

MR RICCI BITTI said that he assumed that Mr Pound had meant that, if the stakeholders knew, they could help accelerate the process. He did not know. It was an option.

DR STOFIE observed that it seemed to him that there were three categories within the compliance/non-compliance terminology. The first was the ideal group, the stakeholders who had developed their regulations and were operationally compliant with the regulations. The two groups with which the Foundation Board was dealing were the no progress and the in progress group. With respect to those who had made no progress over the past 18 months, he thought they should be given a timeframe within which to indicate their participation in the process or not, at the end of which time, their bushy tails would be cut off, in terms of previous ways of dealing with such things, non-participation, non-hosting and so on. Those details could be sorted out. In terms of the second group of stakeholders in progress, they should also be told that they could not be in progress forever and given a timeframe by which their regulations should have been submitted and approved, failing which they would be non-compliant. The terminology being used was too general, as there were three different categories and they should be treated as such.

MR MUYTERS said that he thought that the group in progress could comprise countries at different stages. There might be some countries nearing the end of the process and the parliament had to decide; other ones might have just started the process. It was not a good idea to send letters to those who had done everything that the government could do and interfere with what the parliament had to do, so he did not think that a single action for all the countries in progress was appropriate.

MR POUND insisted that, by the time the Foundation Board next met in November, it would be two full years since the Code had been adopted and there could be nobody on the face of the planet in governments who did not know that and who did not know that they should have been compliant by 1 January that year. He did not think WADA had to run around with kid gloves apologising for governments not getting their act together; that was their job.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, in the in progress group, there were a number of cases in which the difference between compliance and non-compliance was minimal, three or four words in a regulation, and the members would see in their earlier report that some of the federations and people had needed a political approach. That political approach had delivered compliance in next to no time at all. Group 1 was easy, in that it was acknowledged that the countries had proper rules in place; group 2 was more complicated since, when the countries did not all have complete rules in force, it was necessary to find wording on the basis of rules in force, and Mr Bouchard and his group should be instructed to give some form of sliding scale on when WADA would expect all of the countries to have rules in force; and the third group was a small group of stakeholders, and WADA had picked off two already who had done precisely nothing. Unfortunately, apart from Korea, they were relatively small countries and WADA did not want to feel bad in any way; but, if one made exceptions there, one was driving a horse and cart through everything else. He thought that the Foundation Board should go ahead, take the recommendation and deal with the small group of countries. Mr Bouchard should note that the monitoring duty was placed on his group, and he would hasten that a little bit by saying that the Executive Committee would want to see clearly what progress had been made in September.

He asked the members of the Foundation Board if they wished to declare non-compliant El Salvador, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone and the Virgin Islands. Was that their wish? Then it would be so. Sierra Leone had suffered terribly from the ebola virus recently and WADA should just note that, under article 23.5.6 of the Code, there was helpful wording. It said that, 'WADA shall consider explanations for non-compliance and, in extraordinary situations, may recommend to the IOC, IPC, IFs and major event organisations that they provisionally excuse the non-compliance'. Those wise words in the Code seemed to him to fit the Sierra Leone situation, but Sierra Leone would have to explain non-compliance. That seemed to him to be a rather humane thing to do.

It was never going to be easy, but he thanked Mr Bouchard for the steps taken. The divergence of opinion could be clearly heard. There were some who wanted to be much firmer, others who did not, and others who found as he did that the legislative process in some countries was much slower than WADA wanted it to be. He was quite happy to have that kind of debate on the question of whether they had a set of rules, but the problem would come at a future time whether they had an effective NADO. He would rather have the intellectual debate at that stage, when he knew that WADA was likely to be faced with rather more serious issues in future years. He was grateful to the Foundation Board and particularly grateful to Mr Bouchard and his group.

DECISION

Proposed compliance activities plan 2015 approved; World Anti-Doping Code update noted.

11. Communications

THE CHAIRMAN introduced the new Communications Director, Ms Catherine MacLean, who would talk about what she was planning on the communications side and indicate what WADA needed to do to develop the new communications strategy.

MS MACLEAN informed the members that they would have had an opportunity to look at her report, but she wanted to give them an idea of where she had come from and where WADA was headed in terms of communications strategy. She was a former competitive swimmer, having been lured to the sport by an East German swimming sensation, Kornelia Ender, after she had won four gold medals at the Montreal Olympic Games in 1976. As many of the members would know, it had later been proven that there had been systemic doping in the East German swimming programme and Kornelia Ender had been exposed as one of the athletes doping. She had spent 23 years with Alcan and then Rio Tinto, a global metals and mining giant, and then two years as an independent consultant supporting a London-based company and its operations in Sierra Leone. She had been with WADA since December, and she was really happy to return to her sporting roots. It was proving to be a very complex and fast-moving world, and she could not say that she had full command of the topic. The Director General had told her when she had joined that it would take her a year-and-a-half to get fully on top of things and she was starting to believe that it might be the case. She had joined at a very interesting time, at the end of Mr Reddie's first year in his role, shortly after the approval of the five-year-plan, just before the roll-out of the new Code, a few months before the release of the CIRC report and at a time of heightened interest in a number of cases going on around the world and other topics such as supplements and the Athlete Biological Passport. As the new communications director, she was taking the necessary time to understand about the organisation and its mandate, the anti-doping movement, the government world and other topics of importance. She had

taken the time to understand the communications landscape; she had a relatively small yet capable and dedicated team that had a very large mandate. WADA and the topic of anti-doping were of great interest to the media and a variety of other stakeholders, so that provided for an unrelenting pace. She had been fortunate to join just months after the completion of a communications audit done by an external consultancy to look at the effectiveness of communications, so it had been a good source of data for her joining the organisation. One of the key outcomes of the audit had been that WADA needed to develop a stronger, clearer and more persuasive voice to protect the clean athlete and become the leading voice of anti-doping in sport, heard and respected internationally. As the members knew, WADA was first and foremost a regulatory and monitoring body, but it also played a strong role as a service organisation, offering an array of high-value, high-quality services, including athlete outreach and anti-doping education, anti-doping capacity-building and intelligence across a broad array of services. It was particularly WADA's service role that required more awareness-building and promotion with key stakeholders, including IFs and NADOs. In order to do that, it was generally agreed that WADA should evolve from being perceived purely as a regulator to being perceived also as a leading brand in the world of sport and the wider world, one that was leading the collaborative campaign against anti-doping, or supporting the clean athlete, which was actually the language she wanted to head towards. The department had embarked on a strategic communications planning exercise, identifying where WADA was, where it wanted to go and how to get there, and subsequently putting metrics in place and measuring performance. Ultimately, the communications would support the priorities outlined in the five-year strategic plan and the annual priorities; in short, WADA had to be telling the right story to the right people using the right channels, with a focus on quality as opposed to quantity, because there was no question that there was plenty of quantity, but was WADA focusing on the right things? This was a collaborative process, so she anticipated being able to share the plan over the short stretch with the Chairman, the Director General, her fellow directors and other stakeholders, and it was her hope that, the next time they met, she would have a strategy to share, and even some metrics on how WADA was moving the anti-doping movement forward and protecting the voice of the clean athlete.

THE CHAIRMAN said that Ms MacLean was very welcome, and he was keen to work with her and see her strategy develop.

DECISION

Communications update noted.

12. International Federations

– 12.1 2015 Anti-Doping Organisation Symposium report

MR DONZÉ said that he would present all his reports together (the European regional office, relations with IFs and the WADA symposium for ADOs).

WADA's European regional office had a very specific role, as the main point of contact with IFs and IF umbrella organisations, but it did more than that. It had significant activities with other European sporting bodies such as the EOC, it dealt regularly with the Eastern European RADO, the only RADO based in Europe and, over the past few years, work with European governments and European intergovernmental institutions had grown significantly, together of course with the WADA headquarters and, in that regard, he was very pleased that WADA had been able to create a new position, manager of relations with governments and NADOs in Europe, and had recruited a very able new person, who would start in the beginning of August in Lausanne, and he was confident that that would

contribute to further strengthen the very healthy and good relationships with European governments, intergovernmental institutions and NADOs.

What had the office been doing in Lausanne in terms of main activities? In terms of main activities, the office had worked mostly on working with IFs to support them in amending their anti-doping rules, in collaboration with the WADA Legal Department in particular. The members had seen that there were very few IFs that did not have anti-doping rules compliant with the 2015 Code, and the office had started working closely with IFs in terms of the implementation and practise of the 2015 Code, and that was really the bulk of the work done over the past few months in Lausanne. It had been done through a number of channels, ways and means, including direct contacts. The office had been very active at the 2015 SportAccord Convention, held in Sochi, Russia, some weeks previously. There had been significant interaction with IFs and IF umbrella organisations, and the office had made presentations at the general assembly and meetings of the IF umbrella organisations. The office continued to do that with other WADA departments through webinars and other support resources, so what was done in Lausanne had a lot to do with IF support. The office was involved in the development of all of the WADA projects and activities that had an impact on IFs to ensure that the impact was well understood and that everything being done was actually applicable to IFs.

There had been several references made at the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings to the IF-NADO collaboration projects that had been started in conjunction with Mr Koehler and his NADO Relations Department and Mr Ricketts and his Standards and Harmonisation Department. There had been an attempt to use the WADA 2015 ADO symposium to optimise synergies and organise site meetings and, the day after the WADA 2015 ADO symposium, on 27 March, there had been a very interesting meeting, at which six IFs and six NADOs had been brought together to initiate discussions on how to further strengthen collaboration between the two sets of stakeholders. There were numerous successful partnerships between IFs and NADOs, but more could be done in that regard. It had been a promising first meeting, and there would be other meetings. The NADOs had met in Montreal a few weeks previously, and Mr Koehler would report on that as part of an ad hoc NADO working group, and the IFs would separately continue discussions started at a meeting to be held on 23 June in Lausanne. All the people, IFs and NADOs would meet again on 15 October in Lausanne and the goal of all the work was to try to identify a number of key principles, ways and means of furthering cooperation between the two important sets of stakeholders, ultimately for the benefit of anti-doping and clean athletes. All would have heard about the 2015 European Games. As the members would know, Europe was the only continent that did not have continental games, and the EOC had decided to create European Games, the first edition of which would be held from 12-28 June in Baku, Azerbaijan, and WADA had been very active in supporting the EOC and the organising committee to develop a robust and rigorous programme. WADA would be present with an Independent Observer and programme assistance team, as well as an Athlete Outreach team, and there had been good interaction with EOC which he hoped would allow for sustainability in terms of the event's anti-doping programme, also including the local stakeholders, the Eastern European RADO and the Azeri NADO, which he hoped would take advantage of the event to strengthen its own activities.

Last but not least in that short list of a few significant projects organised recently, the office had been working with colleagues and friends at the IOC and ASOIF to reiterate and replicate what had been done pre-London 2012 and organise a pre-Rio Olympic Games meeting of summer Olympic IFs in October that year. The meeting would bring together all summer Olympic IFs, anti-doping practitioners and maybe medical commission chairs, as well as representatives from Rio 2016, WADA, the EOC and ASOIF to try as much as

possible to strengthen cooperation and optimise all the anti-doping programmes that would be conducted in the lead-up to the Rio Olympic Games starting in August 2016.

Last but not least, he wished to say a few words about the 2015 WADA Anti-Doping Organisation Symposium. The office had been responsible for the symposium since 2012, and it had developed quite a bit over the past few years. WADA had organised the symposium in Lausanne for anti-doping practitioners from 24 to 26 March that year. The event had grown consistently over the years, to the point that it had become the largest WADA event and most important gathering of anti-doping practitioners around the world, and it was WADA's largest annual event, which was reflected in that year's figures and numbers, with a record number of over 470 participants, representing a significant number of different ADOs (in total, 180 different ADOs). WADA had tested a number of new features that year. Whereas the symposium had been held over two days in the past, it had been held over three days that year, following feedback from participants at previous events, which had allowed WADA to hold a full day of practical workshops in relation to a number of new features of the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code, so the focus had really been on the practice of the World Anti-Doping Code. There had been a number of other new features, including the presence requested by previous participants of WADA-accredited laboratories. They had participated in the third and final day of the symposium, enabling significant and useful interaction with ADOs. WADA had opened for the first time the symposium to the WADA-accredited laboratories, allowing for synergies. WADA had opened for the first time the first day of the symposium to the media, a great way to publicise the symposium, but also to invite input from investigative journalists. The symposium had benefited from the participation of the WADA Athlete Committee and ADOs from around the world.

It was great to have a symposium of 470 participants, but the main outcomes of the symposium were (following participant feedback) that the symposium had been recognised by participants as a very good platform, not only in terms of information sharing, experience sharing, sharing of trust and confidence between the various players in the fight against doping in sport, but also in terms of ultimately enhancing the quality of anti-doping across the board and the protection of clean athletes. The office had looked at all of the formal and informal feedback received from the participants, and a number of features would take place the following year. The symposium would be held again over a three-day period in Lausanne from 14-16 March the following year at the same venue. He was working with a small steering committee on putting together an agenda, and would consult with the various stakeholders, and he looked forward to holding another successful symposium the following year in Lausanne.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the symposium had been a huge success.

MR RYAN thanked WADA and Mr Donzé for joining with the IOC and ASOIF in the initiative in October to bring together all of the 28 sports on the programme of the Olympic Games in Rio and all the key stakeholders to make sure that all the parties involved would be aligned to ensure that the fight against doping in sport connected with the Rio Olympic Games was maximised.

MR SCHNEIDER congratulated WADA on the job done to promote anti-doping programmes in different European countries and proposed continuing cooperation in the working group, noting that the European representatives on the WADA Executive Committee and Foundation Board were there to help and provide the necessary support.

DECISION

IF report (including 2015 Anti-Doping Organisation Symposium update) noted.

13. NADO/RADO relations

MR KOEHLER said that he wanted to provide a few highlights from his report; more importantly, some of the things he would raise were not in his report, as they had not been available at the time of writing it.

In terms of RADOs, he was pleased to say that WADA was in the final stages of developing a small RADO in South America, looking at involving Bolivia, Paraguay, Ecuador and Peru, and he should have a further update in November.

He highlighted some of the organisations that had helped financially and through their contribution to the success of the RADOs. The Japanese Government through MEXT had contributed to support the Asian RADOs for the past few years, and had contributed 145,000 US dollars for the development of those programmes the previous year. Similarly, the Australian Government had been helping support the Oceania RADO over the past four years through a staffing and education grant of 60,000 dollars, and the New Zealand Sports Drug Agency also provided a testing grant to level the playing field in the region.

WADA had received confirmation from Olympic Solidarity that it would be contributing 200,000 dollars to help with education with all of the RADOs, and that money would be used for the implementation of programmes. Finally, the Kuwaiti Government and the OCA had agreed to host the fourth RADO conference in January 2016 and would bear all the costs for accommodation and local meal costs for all participants.

WADA would be having meetings in June with Argentina to help develop the NADO there. Argentina would be hosting the Youth Olympic Games and, at the same time, WADA would evaluate the Chilean NADO to see the progress made thus far.

Regarding India, WADA had been trying to engage it further to help assist with the development of its programmes. There had been a change in director general, and WADA had been trying over the past few months to ensure a partnership agreement with ASADA. WADA had not been successful to date; however, he had received an e-mail the previous day indicating that India was willing to move forward. If things did not progress, Mr Bouchard would be hearing from him to see what WADA might have to do with India. In terms of Egypt, WADA representatives had visited recently with Mr Swigelaar from the African regional office. There were several areas for improvement in that country, from the independence of the board to the way in which they were structuring their testing programme, to result management and the appointment of staff working in the organisation. The SAIDFS was assisting, but there was plenty of work to do in Egypt before a programme was put in place.

He also wanted to mention the work that WADA was doing with the Institute for NADOs. There had been good meetings with the representatives in Lausanne, and he thought that the institute was moving in the right direction when it came to helping and supporting NADOs.

He wanted to provide an update and more of a brief summary of some of the key outcomes of the 30 April and 1 May NADO Ad Hoc Working Group, and he would highlight a

few elements that had come out of that discussion that WADA would further develop with the NADOs. The first area had been looking at WADA-NADO cooperation. In the past, there had been the feeling that NADOs were not getting the attention that they deserved, but that feeling had since changed and it was believed that WADA was spending more time working with NADOs and supporting them, as they were the main leaders in the fight against doping in sport. They had a few expectations of WADA, as they were the ones daily protecting the clean athletes and carrying out the majority of tests. They wanted to ensure that WADA continued to maintain its balance between government and sport, and that it maintained its independence to ensure that any investigations that needed to be carried out were done in a swift manner and that WADA tackled those issues on an ongoing basis. It had been further agreed that ADAMS needed to be the global clearing house, and everybody's information needed to be in there to protect the clean athlete and to ensure the further coordination of anti-doping globally. There had been some talk, and a lot had come out regarding NADO and IF cooperation. It had been recognised that there were differences between IFs and NADOs, but it was more a matter of recognising that and respecting one another's autonomy, actually working closer together to ensure that the same goal was achieved, which was protecting the clean athlete, recognising that doing testing and result management was the NADOs' daily business, and that was all they did, and they in fact did carry out the majority of tests globally. One of the areas that was common to all of the ADOs was the lack of funding. They felt that they were underfunded and that the best way to tackle that was through the UNESCO convention, which bound governments to ensure that they adequately funded NADOs instead of cutting costs on a regular basis. There had been a strong call for all NADOs to start implementing one provision of the Code, which was to test foreign athletes on their soil; in fact, out of that meeting, WADA had learnt that ASADA had actually allocated 10% of its testing resources to testing foreign athletes in their country, and WADA encouraged all NADOs to do that. There had been the common goal of making sure that WADA was not looking at test numbers, that it was focusing on quality when it came to ADO testing. There had been some discussion on the CAS; the NADOs recognised its importance, but felt that it was no longer simple and cost-effective and that the procedures were becoming long and expensive. They thought that it would be useful for the CAS to post all decisions, so that there was a repository of information and case studies that people could use when trying to make decisions. They felt that there was a need to address the structural issues and the independence of the CAS to make sure that it was independent as they moved forward.

Finally, there had been two more recommendations. It was time to move forward to find out the optimum amount of tests to be done in each country to find out the best deterrents and detection required, so how many tests, what was required and looking at the prevalence of doping in countries so as to have a better benchmark to be successful, and that included increasing the amount of education and prevention in each of the countries. Furthermore, the NADOs believed that there needed to be a stronger strategy and a communication strategy on sample storage, to see what kind of deterrence level that led to and what results there would be in the future. Those were the outcomes of the NADO working group and a brief summary of his report.

THE CHAIRMAN congratulated Mr Koehler on the work completed. It was interesting to see that Kuwait would host WADA again. It had been a very successful meeting a couple of years previously. He thought that all the RADOs from around the world had been there. It was a step forward.

DECISION

NADO/RADO relations update noted.

14. Anti-Doping Administration Management System (ADAMS)

THE CHAIRMAN observed that he was supposed to advise that the paper spoke for itself and that there were no further comments necessary. It seemed to him that the ADAMS report was a straightforward factual report of what had happened and how many people were involved; a modest 938,157 analytical findings were part of the statistics. If anybody had any questions, presumably a member of staff would help him out by answering them. Were there questions on the current state of ADAMS? Everybody knew what WADA was trying to do with the new ADAMS, but this was the existing ADAMS.

DECISION

ADAMS update noted.

15. Government relations

MS JANSEN informed the members that she would give a brief update on UNESCO-related matters. The first was to report that WADA had 177 ratifications. There were 18 countries yet to complete, and up on the slide the members would see those 18 countries. WADA reached out through its Foundation Board members, its regional office directors and RADOs to encourage them to finalise. There were four countries that had made very good progress, and she wished to extend her thanks to Dr Mitchell for all the work he had done in Oceania with regard to Kiribati and the Solomon Islands. Their instruments were on the way to UNESCO. Honduras had completed the process, and what remained was for the instrument to be sent to UNESCO. Ms Pesce and the regional office and Foundation Board members had been instrumental in pushing that forward. With regard to Djibouti, the instrument was with the minister for foreign affairs for signing, and the regional office director in South Africa had been instrumental in pushing that along.

The conference of parties meeting in Paris was confirmed for 29 and 30 October that year. It was to be the tenth anniversary of the convention, and she encouraged attendance by ministers and senior anti-doping officials, showing robust leadership and discussions at the meeting for the convention and also about its future.

With regard to the conference of parties meeting and planning, UNESCO was working with WADA to prepare a strong conference of parties and, as the Director General had noted, WADA was working with them on some key agenda items going forward. There would be an election of the conference of parties bureau and the voluntary fund approval committee, and there was to be a global report on convention compliance; to that end, UNESCO had sent out a questionnaire in April, encouraging all states parties to complete. A total of 76 had completed to date and the deadline had been extended to 18 May. There was to be a report and review of the UNESCO ad logic system, the work of the bureau had been reviewed and its role was to be strengthened in the future, with a paper that was to be considered on that. Regarding the UNESCO voluntary fund, there was to be a report on the work achieved there and any possible changes to be considered to the fund.

With regard to the voluntary fund, there had been a meeting on 28 April. WADA was a member of the approval committee and was there in an advisory capacity. 15 projects had been approved, 13 national and two regional. Both of the regional projects had been put forward by RADOs. A total of 2.4 million dollars were available within the fund. The committee had decided that the next meeting would be held on 27 October, immediately prior to the conference of parties meeting. WADA encouraged that applications be made to

the fund and sent early to UNESCO, by August that year, so that the back and forth could be completed and so that a project would be ready to go forward. Finally, she added that the fund was a major contributor to the work of the governments, the NADOs and the RADOs, and the programme focused on three areas: anti-doping education, mentoring and capacity development and policy development. That concluded her presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that UNESCO had a major meeting in October. Were there any questions of Ms Janssen?

DECISION

Government relations update noted.

16. Standards and harmonisation

MR RICKETTS stated that he would briefly elaborate on two parts of the standards and harmonisation report. The first was an update on the implementation of the Technical Document for Sport-Specific Analysis, which had come into effect on 1 January, and it required all ADOs to conduct a minimum level of analysis for specific prohibited substances, including growth hormone, EPO in its various versions and growth hormone releasing factors across various sports and disciplines. That was a mandatory requirement under the Code which had been discretionary in the past. The expert group appointed to develop the technical document continued its role; two new members had been appointed to the group, and it had first met in February that year. As part of the implementation process of the new technical document, WADA would seek feedback from stakeholders in July that year, and the expert group would again meet in late August to review that feedback with any required changes put forward to the November meetings. WADA was also in the process of running reports to determine which signatories had not started any analysis for the prohibited substances and would seek explanations and provide guidance and assistance as required. It was still too early to report on any specific statistics, but the figures for the first few months of the year were promising and WADA was seeing a wider level of testing across sports for those substances that had not had testing done on them in the past and also by a wider group of organisations.

The second aspect of his report was WADA's annual testing figures report. Such statistical reports were very important when it came to understanding what was happening in the anti-doping world in the area of testing and provided guidance for all stakeholders. The testing figures report had been published for a number of years and was continually being enhanced. It contained the number of samples analysed by WADA-accredited laboratories, and was broken down into various categories, such as sport, testing authority and laboratories. The report also contained the number of adverse analytical findings in those categories and the organisations they belonged to. He was looking to publish the report shortly following the circulation of a draft of it among the ADOs. Following on from that report, in the past, WADA had received feedback that the report should contain the number of anti-doping rule violations, as not all adverse analytical findings led to an anti-doping rule violation and a period of sanction. Obviously, there were circumstances in which an adverse analytical finding might not go forward; a valid TUE was one such example. As a result, WADA had responded to the feedback and was currently preparing a separate report from the testing figures report to start with data from 2013, since it was more complete than the 2014 data. As per the testing figures report, it would also identify the number of adverse analytical findings by sport and by testing authority and the number that had actually led to an anti-doping rule violation. It would also include the reasons why those adverse analytical findings had not gone forward to an anti-doping rule violation. The

number of pending cases would also be outlined, and there were still some pending cases from 2013 (he thought that WADA was up to around 90% completion), so the pending case figures alone would be important and hopefully put some pressure on the organisations to complete the outstanding cases as quickly as possible. The report would also contain the number of non-anti-doping rule violations, meaning those that did not involve the analysis of a sample, such as possession, trafficking, etc., and that might also involve athlete support personnel. The non-analytical data was of course subject to WADA having received notice and decisions on such cases, and in 2013 there had been over 300 such anti-doping rule violations. The report should therefore fill the void that stakeholders had sought in reporting of statistics, which the media might also find of interest.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that the development of the technical document in particular seemed to be heading in the right direction.

DECISION

Standards and harmonisation update noted.

17. Regional offices

– 17.1 Lausanne

See IF relations update.

– 17.2 Cape Town

MR SWIGELAAR informed the members that the regional office continued to rely on partners in the region to progress anti-doping programme development. He mentioned the good relationships with ANOCA and the African Union. The Annual African International Sports Convention (CISA) had been, since its inception, a very advantageous forum to attend, as it continued to provide opportunities to engage with local African and international stakeholders. That year's conference had been held in Rwanda, and he was sure that Ms Bokel would have very fond memories of her experience in that country.

In September that year, Brazzaville in Congo would host the All Africa Games. WADA was partnering with the custodian of the event, the African Union, and the local organising committee to ensure that a viable, relevant and comprehensive anti-doping programme would be evident at the games. A memorandum of understanding had been signed between WADA and the African Union in support of the collaboration. The office was also ensuring that the various RADOs would play a role during the games, and that lent to the belief that the office needed to capacitate and ensure that they gained experience at such events. While progress had been rather slow from the side of the organisers, he looked forward to success in that regard.

Regarding Egypt, further to what Mr Koehler had stated earlier, he noted that it was a very important sporting nation in the continent and, considering that Egypt was interested in receiving accreditation for an anti-doping laboratory, it was imperative that the authorities have a robust anti-doping programme in place. He had been there and seen progress, but WADA needed to continue working with the stakeholders in Egypt.

The regional office had been very much involved in supporting the Kenyan Government, the newly established NADO, the NOC and other stakeholders to ensure that the development of the national anti-doping programme progressed as expected. The partnership with the Norwegian and Chinese NADOs in assisting the Kenyans had also been very positive and was another clear example of the need to have partnerships in anti-

doping. The project was progressing satisfactorily, and WADA was currently implementing capacity-building initiatives for the NADO staff, following significant progress insofar as the political landscape was concerned, with much support from the Kenyan Government and other stakeholders.

The South African Institute for Drug Free Sport continued to partner with WADA in assisting the Zone V RADO, also based in Kenya, primarily providing technical training and support to the RADO and its members.

The South African Institute for Drug-Free Sport was present that day as part of a study tour undertaken to discuss how to further develop and augment the existing informal relationship among other things. In addition, the regional office had been working very closely with SAIDFS with regard to the Bloemfontein laboratory and the challenges faced over the past few years. Things were progressing at the laboratory, but the office continued to work with it to ensure its viability, management and technical systems remained above reproach, especially considering that the Bloemfontein laboratory was currently the only laboratory of its kind in Africa.

He looked forward to continued work with SAIDFS and he thanked them for their continued support and partnership in furthering anti-doping in Africa.

– **17.3 Montevideo**

MS PESCE said that the details of the work carried out in Latin America were outlined in her report. Over the past month, the office had intensified cooperation with those countries that did not yet have rules in line with the Code. 83% of the countries in the region did have their rules fully in line and the office was following up with the remaining seven countries that were working on it. Fortunately, 22 of the 41 countries from the region were part of a RADO, which was very helpful when it came to achieving alignment. As for anti-doping education, the voluntary fund, which had 56 approved projects in the region to date, was the preferred channel for awareness-raising and education, especially for young athletes and the sport community. In coordination with the Government of Venezuela, the office had organised the fourth South American anti-doping legal seminar, which had included the active participation of lawyers from South American NADOs. It had been a great opportunity to build capacity in the region and hold side meetings with the participants and be updated on the development of their anti-doping programmes.

She shared a short video that captured highlights from the seminar and the enthusiasm of the participants. The music was the national music of Paraguay.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that the seminars always appeared to be very happy occasions; maybe it was the music that went with them.

MR TAMASHIRO said that he wanted to thank WADA for the opportunity it was giving to South America. It was extremely important for South America to be able to organise such seminars and exchanges that would be of benefit to the entire region. The office had the duty to continue training specialists in the different commissions. Peru was also working hard to host the first Latin American seminar on medicine, and he thanked WADA for the commitment of all the directors, who would be attending such a seminar for the first time in Peru. They would be more than welcome. There was a lot of expectation from the professionals in the field. That would begin with a strategic plan to favour the goal of WADA to have doping-free sport.

MR DIAZ informed the Foundation Board that he was speaking on behalf of CONCECADE. The organisation had two regional agencies, one in the Antilles and one in Central America, plus five national agencies. He echoed the comment by his Peruvian colleague and thanked WADA and the regional office in Montevideo for the work that it was doing. He expressed how important his countries considered such seminars for the entire region. WADA could help the professionals to develop their work and would have an opportunity to meet, network and follow up on the challenges and opportunities each of the national and regional agencies might have. He thanked WADA, and congratulated the staff on the constant communication with the various countries to address future challenges.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he understood the amount of work that was done and WADA was happy to provide as much assistance as possible.

– 17.4 Tokyo

MR HAYASHI stated that the Asian and Oceanian regional office assisted and encouraged all the signatories in the region to implement the 2015 Code. The office worked in partnership with a network of major stakeholders, RADOs, the sport movement, governments, UNESCO and NADOs. The RADO was a core partner, covering almost all of the countries in the region. Through the RADO framework and activities, anti-doping policy programmes were promoted in the region. The sport movement, especially the OCA and the Oceanian NOCs, were important partners. They provided the RADO with various opportunities for WADA capacity-building through various programmes such as the international DCO exchange programmes and other educational social awareness programmes.

The sport movement demonstrated the strong ADOs through various sporting events and games. The role of the governments as partners was significant, not only in terms of funding but also in terms of assisting ADO activities. Annual intergovernmental meetings encouraged the governments to fulfil their roles and responsibilities under the new Code and international UNESCO convention. UNESCO was an indispensable supporter of the WADA regional development programme. Through ratification of the convention, the governments had received the policy tools to develop anti-doping programmes in individual countries and, through the UNESCO fund, they had received the programmes to be implemented. Two out of three countries in the region had already benefitted from the UNESCO fund. He appreciated UNESCO's support and the advanced NADO activities for the leadership and also initiatives, especially from Saudi Arabia, Qatar, China and Korea. Finally, he wished to thank the Japanese Government and JADA for hosting the international conference on the pharmaceutical industry and anti-doping. He showed the board a one-minute video clip.

THE CHAIRMAN said that particular congratulations should go to JADA and the ministry for their assistance with the international conference, which had been a great success. Much good had come out of it, certainly from WADA's point of view.

DECISION

Regional office updates noted.

18. Any other business/future meetings

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the country of Liberia might find itself in the same situation as he had mentioned earlier regarding Sierra Leone.

He thanked everybody for their attendance, and thanked in particular Mr Howman and the very professional staff for the way in which the meetings had been run. WADA covered a great deal of work at its Foundation Board meetings, and the interaction between staff and members that day had been outstanding. He thanked the interpreters. The next Executive Committee meeting would be in Copenhagen in September, and then in November the Executive Committee would go to Colorado Springs. Mr Hybl and his staff had been present but had left that morning, and he was sure that WADA would be very warmly welcome. One of the nice accidents of timing was that, when the members were there, they would be able to celebrate the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the US Anti-Doping Agency. Wishing the members a safe journey home and thanking them all for the contribution, he declared the meeting closed.

DECISION

Executive Committee - 16 September,
Copenhagen, Denmark;
Executive Committee - 17 November 2015,
Colorado Springs, USA;
Foundation Board - 18 November 2015, Colorado
Springs, USA.
Executive Committee - 11 May 2016, Montreal,
Canada;
Foundation Board - 12 May 2016, Montreal,
Canada;
Executive Committee - 21 September 2016,
Warsaw, Poland.

The meeting adjourned at 2.30 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

SIR CRAIG REEDIE
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA