

**Minutes of the WADA Foundation Board Meeting,
18 May 2014, Montreal, Canada**

The meeting began at 8.30 a.m.

1. Welcome, roll call and observers

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the members to the meeting of the Foundation Board of the World Anti-Doping Agency. He thanked everybody in the room for their many warm wishes to him taking over the presidency of the agency. He had been at the table for a long time and greatly respected all the work that was done by the people in that room and their expressions of goodwill, both on the sport movement side and the public authorities side. As recently as the previous day, he had had a friendly and helpful meeting with the EU representatives and the Council of Europe, and he thought that WADA was on the brink of an opportunity to make substantial progress in the fight against doping in sport, and it was really encouraging to see such a full turnout with so many observers. He hoped that WADA would be able to move forward.

Looking around the table, he thought that he should formally welcome some new faces. Mr Rodríguez was there from Puerto Rico for the first time. He welcomed back Ms Elwani, who had been the athlete representative and had since changed responsibilities. It was the first meeting for Mr Kim from Korea, a major venue for major sports events over the next few years. He was very welcome to the meeting that morning. He welcomed Mr Tony Estanguet, Olympic champion in canoeing, representing the athletes of the world. From Ethiopia, Mr Yateda was attending the meeting for the first time. A familiar face as an observer and member of the Finance and Administration Committee, Mr Gottlieb was representing the USA. Mr Seretse was from Botswana, and Ms Scott, who currently chaired the WADA Athlete Committee, again changed status and was representing ANOC. Also present was the new Chairman of the Education Committee, who served the fight against doping in sport as the chairman and president of USADA, present in his position as the Chairman of the Education Committee, and it was a great pleasure to welcome Mr Edwin Moses.

He distributed the roll call and asked the members and observers to sign it.

The following members attended the meeting: Sir Craig Reedie, President of WADA; Rev. Dr Makhenkesi Stofile, WADA Vice-President, South African Ambassador to Germany; Mr Toni Pascual, Chairman, IPC Anti-Doping Committee; Professor Dvorak, representing Mr Joseph Blatter, Member of the IOC, President of FIFA; Mr 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; Professor Eduardo Henrique de Rose, President, PASO Medical Commission; Ms Beckie Scott, ANOC Representative; Mr Andrey Kryukov, Executive Board Member, Kazakhstan National Olympic Committee; 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 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; 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 Leo Varadkar, Minister for Transport, Tourism and Sport, Ireland; Ms Vermeersch, representing Mr Philippe Muyters, Flemish Minister for Finance, Budget, Work, Town and Country Planning and Sport; Ms Gabriella

Battaini-Dragoni, Deputy Secretary General, Council of Europe; Mr Pavel Kolobkov, Deputy Minister of Sport, Russian Federation; Mr Abdisa Yadeta, Commissioner, Federal Sports Commission, Ethiopia; Mr Vincent T. Seretse, Minister of Youth and Sport and Culture, Botswana; Mr Ghoniem, representing Mr Khaled Abdel Aziz, Minister of Youth and Sports, Egypt; Mr Michael K. Gottlieb, National Program Director, White House Drug Policy Office, Executive Office of the President, USA; Mr Ernesto Irueta, President, CONSUDE; Mr Ramón Orta Rodríguez, President of CONCECADE; Mr Yoshitaka Sakurada, Minister in Charge of Sports, Japan; 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 Duan Shijie, former Vice Minister, State Sport General Administration, China; Mr Godkin, representing Mr Peter Dutton, Minister for Sport, Australia; Mr Gendall, representing Mr Murray McCully, Minister for Sport and Recreation, New Zealand; Mr MacAdam, representing Mr Bal Gosal, Minister of State (Sport), Canada; Mr David Howman, WADA Director General; Mr Rune Andersen, Standards and Harmonisation Director, WADA; Mr Frédéric Donzé, Director of the European Regional Office and IF Relations, WADA; Mr Rob Koehler, Education and Programme Development Director, WADA; Ms Julie Masse, Communications Director, WADA; Dr Alan Verneq, Medical Director, WADA; Dr Olivier Rabin, Science Director, WADA; Mr Olivier Niggli, Finance and Legal Director, WADA; Mr Kazuhiro Hayashi, Asia/Oceania Regional Office Director; Ms Maria José Pesce, Latin America Regional Office Director; and Mr Rodney Swigelaar, Africa Regional Office Director.

The following observers signed the roll call: Andy Parkinson, Alain Lobognon, Sang-min Lee, Martin Vaso, Seung-jin Choi, Byung-jin Park, Kenny Lee, Louise Barton, Una May, Roxanne Malo-Lauzon, Linda Beauparlant, Yang Yumin, Chen Zhiyu, Doug MacQuarrie, Joe Van Ryn, Natalia Zhelanova, Liene Kozlovska, Falcon D. Sedimo, Alexandre Husting, Alexander Schischlik, Françoise Dagouret, Christian Thill, Andrew Ryan, Marcellin Dally, Yves Defoort, Joseph de Pencier, Kari Tollikko, Magdolna Trombitas, Yaya Yamamoto, Shin Asakawa, Atsuyuki Asano, Yoshihisa Nagayama, Sergey Khrychikov, Robert Manfred, Takashi Nakagawa, Ayako Ito, Olivier Keraudren, Laurent Belleguic and Marc Braibant.

– 1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any conflicts of interest that any of the members would like to have on the record.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 15 November 2013 in Johannesburg

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the minutes of the previous Foundation Board meeting in Johannesburg at the World Conference on Doping in Sport the previous year. They had been circulated. They were very full, and he did not think that there had been any comments on them. Would anybody like to comment on them? In that case, he assumed that they were approved.

DECISION

Minutes of the meeting of the Foundation Board on 15 November 2013 approved and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that his written report was in their files. He would raise one or two matters contained within it.

With regard to UNESCO, there would be a full report from the chairman of the conference of parties of UNESCO, the Foundation Board member Dr Saleh Al Konbaz from Saudi Arabia. There had recently been a very successful meeting of the WADA management with the management at UNESCO the previous December, specifically to discuss issues relating to the 2015 conference of parties, matters relating to monitoring and convention responsibilities. There had been a significant, good and positive response to some of the suggestions WADA had made, and WADA had likewise received some positive comments from UNESCO as to how to continue the partnership.

As far as Interpol and the World Customs Organisation were concerned, WADA was in a position whereby it needed secondees for both organisations. Mr Matthieu Holz would be completing his secondment from the French Gendarmerie in June that year, so there would therefore be a vacancy at Interpol. He asked the governments to see whether somebody within their state might be seconded to Interpol as a liaison in doping issues. WADA also needed a secondee for the World Customs Organisation in Brussels.

In his report, he had mentioned a number of the major NADOs with which WADA was working to help them attain the level and quality of service to athletes in their countries that those athletes deserved. In Brazil, there was still much work to be done with the national agency. It was called ABCD, had a staff of 17 people and would commence testing that year with 800 tests to be conducted in the country. He knew that the NADO needed help and WADA would work with it. WADA had advised the IOC of the issues it felt needed to be addressed in advance of the Olympic Games in 2016 in Rio, and would work with the IOC in a very small specialised task force to help the agency train the number of DCOs and chaperones required for the Olympic Games but, more importantly, to conduct proper testing programmes over the next couple of years for the national athletes and those who would be visiting Brazil for training and so on.

Regarding India, WADA had postponed the trip planned for June, notably because of the change in government in India. He suspected that there would be a change in the bureaucracy, and wanted to make sure that, when WADA representatives visited, they would be talking to the right people at the agency, so that visit was likely to be scheduled for September or October that year.

WADA was pleased with the progress made in Jamaica as a result of WADA visits and recommendations to the minister. All of the suggestions had been implemented. There was a new board, no longer any conflict of interest in relation to people on that board, new staff, and WADA had partnered with the CCES so that it could assist with the training of the people in Jamaica at the national agency. The programme, which had been running well in 2011 and early 2012, was back on track, and WADA would keep in touch to ensure that that continued.

There was an issue in Nigeria, and WADA had spoken through the Vice-President to Nigeria and would work with Nigeria to ensure that the promises made to WADA regarding the national programme would in fact be delivered. Nigeria currently had a law but no agency, so WADA needed to ensure that there was progress in that very important country in Africa.

There were some advances in Egypt and Egypt needed to continue to advance in order to sustain sufficient sample collection to warrant the laboratory in that country. The members would recall that they had approved the status of the laboratory in Cairo to one that WADA would put on its list of prospective future laboratories. To sustain that progress, Egypt needed a full national anti-doping programme and WADA was working with the relevant authorities in that regard.

In terms of NADOs, he mentioned Kenya. The report that WADA had recommended many months previously had been completed, and it had been delivered to the minister but not yet published. On Friday, WADA had written to the minister and asked for a copy of the report, as media reports of some of the recommendations, which seemed sensible and pragmatic, had been seen, and he thought that Kenya would need some assistance from WADA to implement those recommendations. He hoped to be able to advise the members as to progress made as a result of that report the next time they met.

Briefly, in relation to ADAMS, WADA was currently seeking a request for proposals regarding the ADAMS and investigations platforms. WADA needed to enhance ADAMS and an investigations platform was needed to be able to collect, gather and share information in relation to inquiries and information received. WADA was seeking interest. He hoped that, in the coming weeks, good interest would be received and it would be possible to talk about costs with the Finance and Administration Committee when it met in July.

As far as management was concerned, that was the last meeting that Mr Andersen would be attending as Director of Standards and Harmonisation. He had been at WADA for 12 years and would be returning to Norway to take up a position with the Norwegian NOC and Anti-Doping Norway at the end of May. WADA certainly wished him well and would miss him, and the management team thanked him for his great service to WADA. At the same time, WADA would be welcoming back to Montreal Mr Niggli, who would be returning from his law firm in Lausanne to take up the position of General Counsel and Acting Chief Operating Officer. His expertise would obviously be invaluable to WADA in Montreal.

More generally in terms of management, WADA was reforming and restructuring to deal with the new tasks expected of it, and the members would see next to his report a list of issues that had to be addressed as a result of revisions to the Code and standards. WADA was addressing them, and would obviously need to address them even further as 2015 came around, and WADA would be looking at the way in which that was structured resource-wise, and he was talking mostly about money, when the management put together its suggestions for the draft budget for 2015. It was obvious that the prioritisation of activities was heading towards a vital stage of considering whether WADA should continue activities, or whether WADA would have to drop them altogether. He said that bearing in mind the new increased mandate from the Code review and the recommendations before the members from the Working Group on Compliance. There were more requests being made of the management team, and less money to carry out those requests.

The two big events in Sochi, the Olympic Winter Games and the Paralympic Games, had been very successful from WADA's point of view. The members would have seen or had access to the Independent Observer reports for both events, which had been very successfully run, and he had had a chance to thank all the members of those teams personally. Also, the Outreach events that had taken place in Sochi had been most successful and, again, he thanked the participants who had travelled from all parts of the world to partake in those activities for WADA.

The matter of food contamination in Mexico and, on occasions, in China remained an issue. WADA was involved in a project in Mexico with the government, and that research project would hopefully lead to a situation whereby, when clenbuterol was found in samples collected from athletes in Mexico, it would be possible to distinguish between clenbuterol that came from contaminated meat and clenbuterol that had been ingested in other ways. That was the hope and expectation, and researchers were working hard towards that objective.

The Hgh situation as a result of the CAS decision regarding Veerpalu had been addressed. Two research parties had completed their reports, which had been married successfully in an article that had been sent to a publisher for publication as requested by the panel, and he thought that the article would be published in the coming weeks, whereupon testing for Hgh could continue and the samples that had been stored could be analysed properly. The decision limits that had come from the research projects differed little from the decision limits used previously and criticised in the Veerpalu case. There had also been another CAS decision, that of Sinkewitz, in which the panel had decided that the WADA technical document was satisfactory for the purposes of Hgh analysis, and that particular athlete had not succeeded in his appeal.

As for the other cases that he had mentioned in his report, he had mentioned them to make points. The first related to the Jamaican sprinter, Campbell Brown. WADA saw a strong tendency by the CAS to impose more or less strict liability on the ADOs in the same way in which strict liability was imposed on athletes. The case had involved a partial sample, which had been collected but left unsealed in the sample container, with the athlete unchaperoned for a period of time. The court had said that that was not satisfactory because the sample could have been susceptible to what it had described as 'environmental contamination'. It was again a very big wake-up call for ADOs. This was the first case for a long time in which sample collection had been the cause of an appeal, so he alerted all organisations to make sure that their sample-collection process was correct.

The second case had involved the Korean Badminton Association, which had taken on responsibility for the whereabouts of its national elite players. Two players had been sanctioned for failing to give their whereabouts information and, upon investigation by the international body, it had been found that the players had not even known that they had the responsibility of providing their whereabouts, so the sanctions had been set aside, the national body had been fined and the players had been allowed to continue participating in the sport. It told WADA that, at national level, there were things going on that were beyond WADA's control and the control of the NADOs, and WADA needed the assistance of the IFs to ensure that their national members behaved according to the Code.

The final case related to a Colombian swimmer. There had been an appeal regarding a national decision, and WADA had not even known about the appeal. WADA was trying to ensure that the CAS, when it got anti-doping matters, referred them to WADA in case WADA could be of assistance to the panel. The evidence provided in the situation had been shambolic, and the panel had mentioned that. The data received from the laboratory had not been of a proper standard. Essentially, the national swimming association in Colombia had not conducted the appeal very well at all. WADA therefore needed to be in a position whereby, if such situations arose, the tribunals at least had the ability to hear from WADA perhaps as an amicus curiae to the panel, and WADA would take that up in due course.

Finally, something that was not in his report was the 2013 statistics. There was a draft report that would be circulated among all the ADOs in the coming week. It indicated a number of things. First, the significant need for all to use ADAMS, because the information WADA received from ADAMS was important to show trends and issues that were occurring. From 2013, there had been 292,000 samples analysed at the accredited laboratories; that was a slight increase compared to those collected in 2012, and there had also been a slight increase in adverse analytical findings. The interesting point was that the samples delivered to the laboratories had come from 642 testing authorities. Most around the table would think that the major people who collected samples were the IFs and the NADOs and perhaps, of course, the RADOs as well but, no, many others were collecting samples and sending them to the laboratories. WADA would analyse that to see that the additional testing authorities were compliant with the Code and the international standard.

That concluded his report. He also had the task of reporting to the Foundation Board on the decisions taken the previous day by the Executive Committee. Three decisions had been made. The first was that there would be an amendment to the 2014 Prohibited List: the addition to the list of xenon and argon gases as activators. That would involve a process whereby, with UNESCO and states parties, WADA would have to send the list to UNESCO, which would distribute it among all of the governments, and that process would take at least 90 days. That would come into being by the end of August that year.

There were six new versions of technical documents for laboratories in relation to analysis, all of which had been approved the previous day, and two social science research grants had been approved, one amounting to 25,000 dollars, the other amounting to 50,000 dollars. In addition, there were a number of recommendations that the Executive Committee would make to the Foundation Board during the course of that day.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members had any questions or observations with regard to the Director General's report.

MR POUND said that he had a couple of observations, one of which related to the situation in Jamaica. He thought that the world at large had fumbled that ball pretty badly given the outcome of the athletes' performances, and the situation called for resolute and regular follow-up, not mere reliance on a programme that had been said to be put in place.

On Kenya, he had been reading the report, which stated that WADA hoped to get a copy of the report. He hoped that WADA was in a position to do more than simply hope, as there was clearly an issue to be addressed there.

The third point was that, where WADA knew that, in the case of an appeal, there would be a challenge to the science and experts produced by both sides, he suggested that WADA do its best to encourage the CAS to appoint its own expert to help guide the panel in assessing that evidence, as he was frankly not convinced that a bunch of lawyers sitting on a panel really understood the science that they were hearing, the result being that WADA risked getting anomalous decisions.

His fourth point was that WADA was aware of private, non-accredited laboratories analysing samples that were collected at the request of IFs, and those IFs got the results from the laboratories. His question was whether WADA was involved in examining the result management by those IFs or whether there was a private parallel system in play, which was not a good idea.

Finally, he added to the congratulations on the part of the management for all that Mr Andersen had contributed to WADA and its development and the fight against doping in sport right from the very beginning. He had been a tower of strength and experience, and WADA had been very lucky to have him

MR SCHNEIDER apologised for being unable to attend the meeting in Johannesburg; following the elections in his country, he had been confirmed by his prime minister as minister of sports. On behalf of the European representatives, he wished to talk about the draft impact reports on the Code and the international standards, and he reiterated, as requested at meetings in 2013, the urgent need for a financial assessment of the cost to WADA of implementing the new World Anti-Doping Code and for the assessment to be provided sufficiently in advance of the next Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings.

Secondly, with regard to the cost of the Code, he reminded the members that standard-setting and monitoring should be key activities for WADA and most of the costs would be related to compliance. WADA was not a development agency and could not invest in everything, but it was clear to him that monitoring was a priority to be taken by WADA.

MR BUDGETT thanked the Director General for the report and summary of the statistics of testing. Adverse analytical findings were obviously important, but he thought that anti-doping rule violations were even more important, and he asked whether WADA would work towards including anti-doping rule violations in the reporting and also encouraging the use of ADAMS by all ADOs.

PROFESSOR DVORAK seconded what Mr Budgett had said regarding anti-doping rule violations. There had been another 10% increase in doping sampling procedures in 2013, and the aim should be to find out how many anti-doping rule violations there had been since 2005, when there had been exact statistics from the world anti-doping laboratories. This was important to decide on future strategy and cost-effective programmes.

The second item he wished to discuss was clenbuterol. Unfortunately, the issue was not limited only to Mexico. There had been reports of another Latin American country in which meat was contaminated by clenbuterol. Research had begun on urine and hair samples in that country, not only from football players but also the general public. He thought that WADA had to take it seriously and maybe initiate investigations in other Latin American countries. A few weeks before the Football World Cup, another player playing in Mexico had tested positive for clenbuterol, and that could cause a serious issue, as the player in question was a national prominent player from another Latin American country. He thought that WADA should not leave it only up to the Mexican Government to carry out research and should really force it. He faced positive cases or adverse analytical findings for clenbuterol every month from Mexico and currently also other Latin American countries.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded to the comments. He told Mr Pound that WADA was following up regularly and resolutely on the Jamaican issue. It was not going off its agenda of things to do. WADA currently had the assistance of a partner in the CCES, which would be very useful in terms of the information it could provide following its work in Jamaica.

WADA had requested a copy of the report in Kenya. It had been written for the minister and not for WADA, but WADA knew that the minister would give it to WADA if WADA asked in a very strong fashion, which was what WADA had done, and he expected to receive it shortly.

The issue Mr Pound had raised regarding the CAS encouraging its own experts was a matter that WADA had raised many times with the CAS and he hoped that the CAS would look at that, particularly in cases of the sort he had described earlier.

WADA was aware of some non-accredited laboratories operating. It was not aware of the IFs using them in such a way that they were getting results and then either not using result management processes or discarding them. WADA could take that up because it was aware of where some of the laboratories were, and it was an issue that needed to be addressed, so he would refer that to the legal and science teams accordingly.

He told Mr Schneider that WADA was very aware of the need for analysis in relation to the cost; that was why he had continuously raised the impact of the changes on the way in which WADA operated. It had currently come down to the nitty-gritty. WADA would do that analysis in the coming weeks to be able to report to the Finance and Administration Committee in July, and therefore in September and November, there would be a full analysis from WADA. He accepted what was being said in relation to the extra cost that might be necessary for compliance.

Regarding anti-doping rule violations, WADA wanted to be able to publish them but, to be able to do that, it needed all those carrying out result management to forward WADA the outcomes. WADA had a list dating back as far as 2010 whereby result management had not been carried out by the signatories. WADA was going through each signatory on the list to say that WADA could not carry out its task or report unless the process was followed at the right level. It was an issue and a matter that WADA was addressing, and WADA would report on it when it got the data it required. It was expanding the legal database to assess all those matters and would be in a position the following year to provide the data that everybody required.

Regarding the issue of food contamination, he would welcome the assistance of FIFA in the research that WADA was conducting. He had spoken on several occasions as to how that could be expanded and looked forward to talking to Professor Dvorak again so as to make further progress.

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that, just after the Director General's report, there was a paper with WADA management and activities necessary from the Code, so the rules of engagement had been identified. WADA currently needed to put the figures on those rules of engagement, and he was certain that the management would be over that and the Finance and Administration Committee would have to deal with it in London in July.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

4. Operations/management

- 4.1 Endorsement of Foundation Board composition for Swiss authorities

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that this was the normal request that the Foundation Board approve the composition of the board so as to be able to report to the Swiss authorities. He sought the members' approval.

DECISION

Foundation Board composition for Swiss authorities endorsed.

- 4.2 Constitutional amendments

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that two changes to WADA's constitution had been put before the members to ensure that the Foundation Board could operate better between

meetings. A change was sought to allow for electronic votes from time to time if required. The second amendment was one sought in relation to the chairs of the working groups. The original article in the constitution said that a chair had to have been or was a member of the Foundation Board; it was currently known that one could be a member of the Executive Committee without being a Foundation Board member (that had been changed a number of years previously), so he asked for that clause to be changed as well so that, in the future, a chair of a working group could be a member or former member of either the Executive Committee or the Foundation Board.

Those were the matters he wanted to put on the table for approval.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that this did involve constitutional change. Was everybody happy with that or were there observations?

MR PENGILLY referred to the first point about being able to make decisions electronically or via fax. It would be important to have a specific time limit for Foundation Board members to make a decision. Ten days would seem an appropriate time limit. Also, given that it was a significant change in the decision-making process, rather than a policy position, that should be a statutory change as well and specific within that.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded that it was a policy decision rather than a constitutional issue. WADA used electronic votes for the Executive Committee and had ten working days as the time for a turnaround and he expected that, once the constitutional amendment was made, the Executive Committee would look at an appropriate policy for instituting the time required for electronic votes for the Foundation Board. He would certainly, on behalf of the management, suggest ten working days.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members were happy to approve the changes.

DECISION

Proposed constitutional amendments approved.

– 4.3 World Conference on Doping in Sport conclusions

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL stated that the paper spoke for itself. From everybody's perspective, it had been a hugely successful conference. WADA thanked the South African Government for hosting the World Conference on Doping in Sport, and all the participants. The commitment that came from the Johannesburg declaration was very compelling and the wrap-up of all the other operational issues had been successful; so, from the management's point of view, the conference was something it was very proud about and he looked forward to the next one.

THE CHAIRMAN said that there had been a comment from the sport movement side, which had been delighted with the World Conference on Doping in Sport and, in particular, the arguments put forward in the main by the members of the Athlete Committee in relation to the Code. They had made it quite clear, speaking on behalf of the athletes of the world, that they wished to support and protect clean athletes, and had made very compelling introductions and comments, and that had added considerably to the quality of the debate. The declaration was in the files. WADA had ended up with a brand new Code that moved WADA forward, and forward it would go.

DECISION

World Conference on Doping in Sport conclusions noted.

– 4.4 Operational Performance Indicators

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he had no comments on the paper. The matters were reported on regularly to the members.

DECISION

Operational Performance Indicators noted.

5. Legal

– 5.1 Legal report

MR NIGGLI said that the members had the two reports in their files and he did not intend to go through them in detail. He wished to provide an update as to what had happened since the writing of the report.

On data protection at the European level, there was no progress to be reported. Europe was currently involved in an election period, and WADA would have to wait until the new European Commission was in place to see how the matter developed. Switzerland was not part of Europe, so he hoped that the Swiss would make their own decision and recognise Quebec as providing adequate protection, and hopefully that would happen in the near future, making the life of a number of IFs based in Switzerland a lot easier.

On case number 1, Operación Puerto, the members would remember that it was a very old case. Following a decision from the court in Spain, WADA had appealed and, unfortunately, one year since WADA's appeal, WADA had received no news whatsoever from the court, and did not know if a hearing would take place or what the next step in the process would be. In the meantime, the blood bags were still frozen in the laboratory and WADA could gain no access to the bags as had been requested throughout the proceedings. That was unfortunate, but he saw no developments in Spain.

Case number 4 had been finished. It had actually been withdrawn by WADA. It also related to Spain at a time when Spanish legislation had allowed for athletes to gain a lot of time by filing before the administrative courts in Spain. Since then, the law in Spain had changed, so that should not happen again, which was good news. By the time WADA had got back to the CAS and the CAS had been ready to proceed, the science had changed and, for that particular test, a new procedure had been implemented and, given that the sample of the particular athlete no longer existed and had been destroyed long ago, WADA had been unable to perform the new test on the sample; so, in fairness, WADA had withdrawn the case.

Case number 7 had also been concluded, and the athlete had been suspended for 15 months instead of the initial three, so WADA's appeal had been upheld.

He drew the members' attention to case number 14 to point out that, following Mr Howman's remarks on Hgh, there had been an unfortunate decision on the Veerpalu case. There had been a better decision to uphold the test relating to Sinkewitz, and there was now a pending case again on Hgh, and hopefully that case would confirm the case law and put WADA on the right track as far as Hgh was concerned. He also awaited publication of the revised statistics. It all appeared to be falling into place and he hoped that that would be a good step forward. He said no more about the legal report.

MR KOLOBKOV thanked WADA's Legal Department for its assistance to ADOs regarding the application and implementation of the World Anti-Doping Code. He urged WADA to continue its activities throughout the year and beyond.

MS SCOTT asked a question about the high number of methylhexanamine positive cases. What percentage of those were inadvertent as opposed to deliberate?

In relation to Operación Puerto, MR POUND asked whether or not it would be appropriate for WADA to express its disappointment in the outcome to date and the pace at which a very serious matter was proceeding through the Spanish system.

MR PENGILLY spoke about data protection and Swiss law. Perhaps somebody might provide an update on the EU accepting that data protection in Quebec was of an adequate standard and perhaps there was a timeline as to when that might be sorted out.

MR NIGGLI thanked the Russian delegate for his remark. Certainly, WADA was there to help and would continue to do so. He would be happy to do that.

It was hard to answer Ms Scott's question. He did not think that the cases were inadvertent cases; otherwise, WADA would not have appealed them. Methylhexanamine was such a well-known problem that it was hard to believe that it was inadvertent. The supplements came up again and again and it took half a second on the Internet to find out that they did contain methylhexanamine. He was very sceptical about the positive cases being inadvertent, although there were always exceptions. In general terms, it was well known that there was a risk in certain products and they kept coming back.

He told Mr Pound that it was up to the Foundation Board to decide what it wanted to say to Spain, but certainly he was very disappointed about what was happening in that country.

He could not personally give Mr Pengilly an update, as there was nothing new on that front, but perhaps the European representatives knew about what was going on in Brussels.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that, the first time he had seen a quote for the data programme, he had immediately sent it back to Mr Howman and said that he did not think so. The figures had been very high, so he was very well aware of the cost implications of putting together the database required for investigations.

In response to Mr Pound's question, he thought he was correct in saying that the Spanish decision to destroy the blood bags in the laboratory had been appealed by a number of people, including WADA. He thought it was entirely appropriate that WADA express its concerns about the delay in dealing with the issue. It was not good news for WADA, it was not good news for the anti-doping movement and, above all, it was not good news for Spain, so he thought it entirely appropriate to accept Mr Pound's suggestion, and WADA would carefully express those concerns and hope that it got the result it sought.

MR POUND thanked the Chairman; he just wanted WADA to know that it had the full support of the Foundation Board in so doing, assuming that it did.

As somebody from Canada, he had discussed the issue of data protection with the Canadian privacy commissioner, and he had been assured by her that Canada's laws were at least as stringent as those that applied in Europe, and in fact that the work done in Europe on that issue had been based upon work done in Canada and Quebec, and so they were somewhere between very puzzled and very offended that there was a suggestion that Canada's laws were not sufficiently advanced to meet any concerns by governments or government officials. WADA needed the European governments to say that they were satisfied. There might be some bureaucratic study groups out there that were playing with it, but there was no contravention of any European legislation. All of that was in the context of being able to conduct a worldwide anti-doping programme, without which WADA could not protect clean athletes, and that had been the realignment of what the anti-doping efforts were all about, as confirmed by the Johannesburg declaration. WADA really needed the governments to step in and say that they were satisfied. There would always be people who wanted to study, and that was fine, but WADA could not let somebody who was studying an issue dictate an outcome that was not compliant with the law as it currently existed.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the Foundation Board would be comfortable with such a statement.

DECISION

Legal report noted. Statement to be issued with regard to Spain.

– 5.2 Investigations report

MR NIGGLI said that the investigations report gave an overview of the investigations strategy. Mr Robertson was sitting beside him. He would be happy to take any questions the members might have on investigations.

MS VERMEERSCH passed on Mr Muyters' apologies for not being able to attend the meeting of the Foundation Board. Mr Muyters very much regretted not being able to attend, but there were European elections and also in Belgium there were regional and federal elections. He hoped to be able to join the members at the next meeting.

On item 5.2, she complimented WADA on the progress achieved but stressed that, before WADA embarked on potentially expensive IT solutions, it should set out a clear strategy in the area and seek a clear legal basis on which to collect and use intelligence, and she confirmed that Europe was very willing to assist WADA in determining the legal basis.

THE CHAIRMAN asked Ms Vermeersch to pass on WADA's best wishes to Mr Muyters. WADA awaited the results with great interest.

MR NIGGLI reassured Ms Vermeersch that, before entering any IT system, WADA would seek an RSP, it would look at the options and it would not engage or commit to any expenditure until it knew that it was the right system. WADA would have to make sure that, legally, it made sense and allowed WADA to perform what it wanted to do. He was fully aware of the constraints in data protection in terms of exchanging information. That was one of the challenges, as the goal was to make sure that organisations did not work in an isolated manner and could share information, but they had to be compliant with the legislation, and he was fully aware of that.

DECISION

Investigations report noted.

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that WADA had a very important guest from Major League Baseball. Those members who had been following the public debate over the past few months would know that the anti-doping movement in baseball had changed direction considerably, and Mr Rob Manfred was present from MLB that morning. He asked Mr Manfred if he would speak to the members, who would listen with great interest to what he had to say and would learn from it.

MR MANFRED thanked WADA for the invitation to attend the Foundation Board meeting. He had to say that there had been points in time in his history when he would have betted against the possibility that somebody from MLB would be invited to speak at a WADA meeting. In fact, some of the members might recall an era whereby communications with WADA had been largely by means of unfriendly press releases. Fortunately, both of the organisations had changed and evolved, and his had changed dramatically. He had to thank Mr Howman in particular for opening up a positive line of communication between WADA and MLB. Its ability to work with WADA and with Mr Travis Tygart at USADA had made the programmes dramatically better.

In professional sports, particularly North American professional sports, the fight against doping could sometimes be a lonely fight and it was very helpful to have allies and relationships that shared not only knowledge, technical support and information, but also provided a level of collegiality that was extremely helpful to the effort.

He had started at MLB in-house in 1998 and, since that time, the league had literally been transformed on anti-doping issues. When he had begun, MLB had done less than 50 drug tests per year, none of which had been for performance-enhancing drugs. The union had been philosophically opposed to random urine testing and would not even discuss the possibility of blood testing. MLB had had some of the most contentious collective bargaining sessions ever in the history of the sport over the topic. In contrast, in 2014, with the major and minor league programmes, MLB would conduct more than 21,000 urine tests that year and collect in excess of 2,500 blood samples for Hgh testing. Every player in the major league bargaining unit had at least one sample a year subjected to random IRMS analysis and the league made the most extensive use of IRMS of any programme in the world. MLB had a significant longitudinal profiling programme in place and believed it was the best in professional sports, and he thought that most people had recognised that MLB had the first and most sophisticated department of investigations designed to deal solely with performance-enhancing drugs.

MLB was proud of its programme and considered itself a leader among the North American professional sports with respect to the issue of anti-doping. When he looked back at the history, a seminal moment had been Commissioner Selig's decision to commission the Mitchell report. He had personalised the decision to engage Senator Mitchell because Commissioner Selig had not had the support of everybody in baseball for that decision. Many had believed that, by 2008, MLB was making progress in anti-doping and that it should continue to proceed quietly to improve its programmes. The commissioner had been of a different view and, in a business as public as MLB, it took true courage to shine a light on what was a nasty and corrosive problem. Commissioner Selig had had the courage to do that and his legacy on the topic would forever be enhanced as a result of that difficult decision. Senator Mitchell's report had not only disclosed important information about the use of performance-enhancing drugs in MLB but, more importantly, he had made important recommendations for reform.

He spoke about two of those recommendations because he believed that the adoption of those had been crucial to the transformation at MLB. One feature that distinguished the major North American professional sports from other athletics was that the athletes were unionised. He knew, because people had said it to him, that some people thought that professional sports used the obligation to bargain collectively as an excuse for elective progress on the issue of performance-enhancing drugs. Sometimes, that might be true. He had, however, spent his entire career involved in labour relations, and there were two legitimate problems created by collective bargaining that were worth thinking about. The first was substantive. As he had said before, the union had opposed all of the efforts to create an effective drug-testing programme early in the history, and MLB had simply had to negotiate and leverage its way past that opposition. His experience with professional athletes was that, if one could draw out the silent majority of athletes who wanted to play clean, one could force change in a collective bargaining union by energising that large group of individuals. Sometimes, it took time, but he did believe that the education process and the process of engaging athletes who wanted to play on a clean even playing field would always be effective on the substance.

The second problem was really a process problem and it related to the inherently cyclical nature of collective bargaining under US laws. In baseball, players bargained once every five years. That was when their contract was open. The laws of the USA actually protected the right of both bargaining parties to refuse to bargain on any issue during the term of an agreement in order to help produce industrial stability (an absence of labour disputes, strikes, lock-outs and the like). Unfortunately, that process was particularly ill suited to the constant adjustment necessary for an effective drug policy. That was where Senator Mitchell's recommendations came in. A key recommendation had been that the collective bargaining parties in baseball adopt an annual review process that would allow for adjustments to be made to the programme during the term of a collective bargaining agreement. Prior to the Mitchell report, the union had refused to engage in any mid-term negotiation or to reopen an agreement on any topic for its entire history – it had never taken place, and the truly amazing step, a step for which the MLBPA deserved great credit, was that it had embraced the annual review process recommended by Senator Mitchell in a way that had enabled MLB to make important changes to its programme each and every year. Since 2008, there had been just one round of collective bargaining, in 2012.

He gave a few examples of the changes that had been made in Senator Mitchell's recommended annual review process, even though the collective bargaining agreement had not been reopened. In 2007, at the major league level only, MLB had done 3,200 tests; by 2011, as a result of annual changes, that number had increased to 3,900. In 2012, the contract had been reopened and 5,300 tests had been carried out. That year, again mid-term, 7,500 tests had been carried out. During the 2012 round of bargaining, MLB had begun blood collection, but only during the off-season. In-season collections of blood samples had started in 2013 and, in 2014, MLB had increased Hgh testing from 1,200 to 1,600 a year at the major league level. Since 2008, MLB had added 50 prohibited substances to the list in the annual review process. That past winter, the penalty structure had been increased from 50 games, 100 games and a lifetime ban to 81 games, half a season, 162 games, a whole year and a lifetime ban and, in 2013, MLB

had instituted longitudinal profiling and random IRMS testing mid-term of a collective bargaining agreement. The adoption of Senator Mitchell's recommendation had allowed baseball to be more nimble and responsive in the drug area despite operating in what he continued to believe was a difficult unionised environment.

A second important recommendation in the Mitchell report had been the establishment of the department of investigations. MLB's investigative capacity had been the key to its success in the recent Biogenesis case. He shared some thoughts on investigative activity, both good and bad. The positives were that, over the long haul, he believed that investigative capacity had a tremendous prophylactic effect. Athletes now understood that, even if they thought they could beat a drug test, there was still the possibility that they would be exposed as a result of investigative efforts. Second, an effective investigation could be a tremendous learning opportunity. In the Biogenesis investigation, MLB had been able to secure as a witness the cooperation of the individual who had actually run the clinic. The interaction with the individual involved, Tony Bosch, had been fascinating and educational. MLB had learned that the people engaged in anti-doping were extremely sophisticated in terms of their knowledge of MLB programmes; they analysed the programmes for weaknesses and it was a mistake to think they lacked scientific knowledge, as it was simply not true. Secondly, they were organisations, not individuals out on a street corner like drug of abuse dealers. They actually had marketing plans. Biogenesis had had two distinct forms of marketing: targeting fringe players on the way up with a sales pitch that one could be got to the riches associated with MLB and, with established players, mostly players who already had a history of use of performance enhancement drugs, they had marketed themselves on the basis that they could provide a healthier and safer form of doping. Last, it was a mistake to assume that clinics such as the Biogenesis clinic and individuals such as Tony Bosch operated independently. There was in fact a network of individuals who were deeply involved in doping and who shared information and were in contact with one another all the time. The information that MLB had received during the Biogenesis investigation had led to very significant changes in the programme on everything from longitudinal testing to the unpredictability of collections and the timing of those collections. MLB had completely revamped its processes in response to what it had learned during the investigation.

On the downside, an effective investigative effort could involve a tremendous commitment of financial resources. MLB had suspended 15 players in connection with the Biogenesis investigation, but that investigation had had an eight-figure price tag attached to it. As long as Commissioner Selig was at the helm, MLB could afford to and would make that financial commitment, but he understood that not every sports organisation could.

It was necessary to develop a model for effective investigation across sports that shared resources and was more effective and efficient. Later that spring, MLB would be hosting a meeting with Mr Howman and WADA representatives in New York to discuss that very topic, as he truly believed it was the next wave on the investigative front. Second, it was important to appreciate that, as one of his colleagues said, investigations of that type were not for the faint-hearted. He would tell the members one anecdote that he thought made the point. He had received a direct call at a point in the Biogenesis investigation from an individual who had wanted to be an informant. As the COO of MLB, he did not view day-to-day investigations as part of his role, so he had tried to get the individual in touch with one of the investigators. The individual had refused to take that meeting, and therefore, after evaluating the information on the individual, it had been decided that he should meet the individual personally. That meeting had been arranged at a hotel room in Los Angeles. There had been a security person in the lobby who had called him to tell him that the individual was on his way up to meet him. Right after he had hung up the phone, somebody from his office had called him to tell him that, after carrying out additional background checks on the individual, it had been discovered that the individual had actually been dismissed from college for making terrorist-like threats. It had been a little unnerving. It was indicative of the element with which one was dealing in such investigations and it was necessary to be sophisticated enough to understand how to deal with such people.

A concept that got a lot of play in the investigative area was cooperation with law enforcement. That was crucial, but it was also important to understand that it was inherently limited. Law enforcement, particularly in the USA, had a job to do and was not interested in compromising efforts to help catch players who were engaged in anti-doping rule violations. So, in each and every investigation, one always came up against the limit whereby they would not give additional useful information because of concerns that their own efforts would be compromised and it was necessary to appreciate that and structure cooperation with law enforcement appropriately.

Finally, some of the members might have read that MLB was undertaking an overhaul of its investigative capacity in the wake of Biogenesis. It was doing so as it had learnt things that caused it to believe that it needed to be more effective and efficient in that area so as to always have the very best investigative unit possible. One of the things that MLB had come to learn in Biogenesis and that was relevant to the overhaul was that there was institutional risk in the investigative efforts. When one had, as in the Biogenesis case, 40 or 50 investigators on the street, following leads, dealing with people, some of whom did actually have criminal backgrounds, things could happen that reflected badly on one's organisation, and it was a topic about which MLB had been thinking long and hard to make sure that the investigations that it conducted could withstand the type of public scrutiny that always accompanied what it did.

In closing, he wished to tell the members one last little story, as he thought that it was relevant to the issue of constantly re-evaluating programmes and trying to be better. In 2002, there had been a Sports Illustrated story in which Ken Caminiti, who had been the national league's most valuable player a couple of years previously, had disclosed that he had been a user of performance-enhancing drugs. That story had rocked MLB and the then president of MLB had convened a meeting and the better part of two days had been spent talking about how to put the issue of performance-enhancing drugs behind MLB. Some of those who had been in that meeting had laughed about the premise of that meeting, as they currently understood that the fight against performance-enhancing drugs was a fight that sport would always face. He did not think that MLB was perfect and he knew that MLB had to continue to improve, and it tried to be vigilant about making its programmes better every single day. He thanked the President and Mr Howman for inviting MLB to be present. It really was an honour and he thanked everybody very much.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that Mr Manfred's presentation had been fascinating. The sports model was slightly different to the unionised model in the USA, but WADA had followed the progress of what MLB had been doing with great interest, and he thought that MLB had begun to change public perception about performance-enhancing drugs in the USA and that could only be a very good thing. Were there any questions, as it was a unique presentation in his experience at Foundation Board meetings?

MR POUND said, as somebody who had been involved in the early exchanges of four-letter words as the dialogue had begun, that he was personally delighted with the evolution that had occurred to the point whereby WADA had been able to envision having Mr Manfred present to explain a very positive advance in America's national sport. He congratulated Mr Manfred on what he had done.

MR MANFRED said that he had purposely talked about those exchanges and thought that he would be remiss if he did not point out that, as much as MLB had not liked them at the time that they had gone on, from the perspective of WADA, it was important to realise what a great motivating effect they had had on MLB.

MS SCOTT thanked Mr Manfred for a great presentation. Earlier on, Mr Manfred had spoken about the process undertaken to draw out the silent majority of athletes who were clean but not speaking out. What tactics or steps had been taken to do that and effectively accomplish it? It sounded like a big part of the picture.

MR MANFRED responded that the key to educational efforts in terms of motivating players had been making clear to players what an advantage the drugs provided. It sounded a little backward until one pointed out to a group of very competitive men, in MLB's case all men, that, if one athlete was using a particular substance, he was placing

those players who were playing clean at a tremendous disadvantage on the field and in terms of relative economics. Once people had appreciated that (because there had been a myth in baseball that performance-enhancing drugs did not help that much) and realised that there were numbers that demonstrated that users had dramatically changed their performance, that was when the silent people had started to say that what the athlete was doing was affecting their career and their economic opportunity. To get to the point of realising that that was the pitch they had had to make had taken a while, but it was a very effective argument.

MR RICCI BITTI thanked Mr Manfred for the interesting presentation. Tennis was half-unionised, so it had been very interesting to hear about the model. In the beginning, the unionised sports had had hurdles to jump over but, to give credit to the athletes of the sport, when one jumped over the first hurdle, perhaps it was better to have a unionised sport, because the perceptions became collective, and he believed that MLB had taken advantage of that. He congratulated Mr Manfred, because MLB was the first league to have got the message from the people who tried to defend the integrity of sport. He thanked Mr Manfred for his presentation and for MLB's achievement.

MR MANFRED said that he totally agreed with the idea that a union could be positive and clearly the union had changed. In that year's annual review process, the union had come to the table, and the first five proposals had been accepted immediately by MLB. Some had been more than MLB had thought it would be able to get in the bargaining process; that was how forthcoming the players' association had become on such topics, and the leadership of that organisation deserved a tremendous amount of credit.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Manfred for a most interesting presentation and he congratulated him and MLB on everything they had achieved. He also thanked the Director General for arranging the presentation.

6. Finance

– 6.1 Government/IOC contributions

MR RICCI BITTI said that he would go through the papers that the members had received and provide some comments on them.

The latest contributions update was before the members, and there had been a significant amount of collection: 82.92% of the public authorities' contributions had already been received, which was excellent, however still slightly below the level at the same time the previous year, the year with the lowest collection rate since 2009. He thanked Russia and Japan for their additional and badly needed contributions.

DECISION

Contributions update noted.

– 6.2 2013 year-end accounts

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members that 2013 had been the year with the lowest collection rate from public authorities in comparison with previous years; however, the year-end result was better than budgeted. The revised budget had been 235,000 dollars, and the actual loss was 151,433 dollars, so that was an improvement. It could be attributed to additional contributions received, the favourable exchange rate between US and Canadian dollars, and also the fact that 98.88% of contributions had been received from the public authorities compared to the prudent budgeted figure of 98%. One negative had been capital expenditure, at 3.2 million instead of 3 million as budgeted, so 200,000 dollars had had to be taken from the reserve.

The overall position of the agency was stable; however, as cash reserves were depleting because WADA was at a loss, it had become imperative to increase funding and seek solutions to decrease expenditure without reducing activities, and the WADA mission did not allow it to reduce activities, as it was at the minimum possible. The 2014 budget had addressed the issue with a slight increase in contribution of 1% and the decision to charge travel costs to stakeholders. That decision had put WADA in a better

condition for 2014 but, going back to the general situation, WADA was decreasing available reserves, and that was not a good situation.

The auditor's report had been once again more than favourable: no shortcomings had been found in accounting controls or any suggestions for improvements to be made. He thanked the Finance Department for its great job. A mis-statement had been recorded but it had been considered immaterial.

He asked the Chairman to seek formal approval of the accounts. The Executive Committee had approved the 2013 accounts as presented. He asked the Chairman to introduce the auditors before moving to the formal approval of the 2013 accounts.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that it was entirely correct that the Foundation Board hear from PricewaterhouseCoopers before formally approving the accounts and invited Ms Beauparlant to present her report. Thereafter, he would put the accounts to the members for approval.

MS BEAUPARLANT informed the members that she was an associate at the Montreal PricewaterhouseCoopers office and worked hand-in-hand with her colleague from Lausanne, who was responsible for signing off the accounts. She would give an update on activities, mention certain items tied to the financial statements and highlight certain additional operational points.

PricewaterhouseCoopers had undertaken the 2013 audit of the World Anti-Doping Agency accounts and was in a position to conclude that the financial statements for the year ending 31 December 2013 faithfully reflected the financial situation, the results of operational activities and the movement of funds in compliance with the IFRS, and complied with Swiss law and the foundation's deed. She also confirmed that there were proper internal controls in place when it came to establishing and presenting the financial statements in accordance with the Foundation Board's directions. There were no shortcomings in terms of internal controls to be reported to the Foundation Board. Consequently, PricewaterhouseCoopers was ready to finalise its opinion on the statements subject to approval by the Foundation Board.

The draft financial statements had been provided in US dollars and Swiss francs. In accordance with Swiss law, they had to be submitted in Swiss francs; however, accounting was done in US dollars, the operational currency. The balance sheet was stable, as already mentioned, although the members would see a reduction in liquidity of 2 million US dollars and an increase in intangible assets and capital expenditures as mentioned. In terms of activities, there had been an excess of expenditure over income for 2013 compared to 2012, which actually meant an improvement of 620,000 dollars. The reduction in loss came from increased revenue due largely to higher voluntary contributions combined with a reduction in operational expenditure. That favourable variation in the operational result in 2013 compared to 2012 was, nevertheless, offset by a variation in the exchange rates, mainly on investments. The variation in operational expenditure was a result of an increase in staff salaries and other staff expenses, and a reduction in the funding of research projects and IT activity.

She thanked the management and staff at WADA for their support, especially Mr Howman, Ms Pisani and Ms Vizioli.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Beauparlant. Were there any questions? He submitted the accounts for the year ended 31 December 2013 for approval.

DECISION

2013 year-end accounts approved.

- 6.3 2014 quarterly accounts (quarter 1)

MR RICCI BITTI said that, as of 30 March, 52% of the total budgeted income had been received. Usually, the major portion of contributions was received in the first part of the year, so he would not jump for joy about the 7.5 million-dollar profit, which was obviously seasonal. On a positive note, the major events item, which was the major item of expenditure, was under budget. The activities carried out by WADA in Sochi in the

form of the Independent Observer and Outreach programmes, and also the ADO symposium, another major activity, were on budget.

The July meeting would concentrate more on variations, and the information at the beginning of the year was just factual.

DECISION

Quarterly accounts noted.

– 6.4 2015 draft budget – preliminary planning

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members that, obviously, the development of the budget would be completed later in the year and he had only some considerations to make about the 2014 budget. As soon as the 2014 budget was cleared, the detailed budget would be prepared and submitted to the Executive Committee and subsequently the Foundation Board for approval in November. The total contributions received in 2013 had been 98.88% of what had been budgeted, and that was the lowest amount collected since 2009, raising some concern about the ability to collect 100% in the year to come. After two years of zero growth on income, WADA had been granted a 1% contribution increase the previous year for the 2014 budget and there had been a decision to reduce travel costs, totalling around 500,000 dollars. In spite of the two decisions, very important for the survival and running of the activities, the 2014 budget had posted a deficit of 884,000 dollars. It was clear that, with the depletion of the cash reserve to compensate for the budget deficit, an increase in contributions was needed. He mentioned very important expenditure that was vital for 2015 and stemmed from the implementation of the new WADA Code, and he mentioned only two: the review or upgrade of ADAMS, a key element and tool for WADA's activities, and secondly, the integration of the investigation platform in ADAMS. Those two alone would require a lot of capital investment and it was necessary to state clearly that the message from the Finance and Administration Committee was that at least a 3% increase in the 2015 budget was needed. If they were not able to achieve that, the members would have to understand that the reserve would continue to go down and would be very close to zero. All the sports bodies had a reserve policy to have one or two years of operations, depending on how wealthy they were, but his opinion was that WADA could not live without some reserves. WADA was going to be a company or a group without reserves, and that was surely not what the original aim had been, so all of the stakeholders needed to think about the future. The message would be more articulated after the July Finance and Administration Committee meeting, but it had been his duty to send the message out to everybody.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI thanked all those who had been working on issues related to the financial dimension of WADA and reassured the Chairman and the people dealing with the financial situation that, as far as the European countries were concerned (and this could be seen on the revised table or the previous one on who had paid or not yet paid), the number of European countries had diminished. There were currently eight European countries that had not yet paid their contributions, but she had wanted to reassure the Foundation Board that the situation was under control and there had been clear indications from the countries concerned that they were going to pay, so nobody should be afraid about negative surprises there. She had wanted to share that information, as it was important to have an idea of where WADA was going in terms of the following month.

She could certainly absolutely share the view that more resources were needed for WADA in the future, in particular in relation to questions related to the implementation of the new Code and also some other activities that had been mentioned in the previous points on the agenda which would require significant investment, so her question was, to what extent did WADA envisage having an investment plan separated from what she would call the ordinary budget? That might help the public authorities understand how they would cope with WADA's future requirements.

MR SCHNEIDER spoke about the draft budget for 2015. He also welcomed the cost saving initiatives introduced in the 2014 budget and urged WADA to continue to identify

further possible savings and reallocation of funds. He also recognised that new requirements for 2015 would be met for WADA because of the Code. WADA needed new money and finance to do that. The majority of the signatories and governments were not experiencing a budget increase, and the situation in Europe was known. He reiterated requests for financial assessment of the costs to WADA of implementing the World Anti-Doping Code. He requested that reserves not be used to cover operational costs and that they be used only in exceptional cases. Therefore, he thought that the draft 2015 budget had to contain the mandatory requirements for WADA of the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code and international standards, and an enhanced compliance monitoring activity as recommended by the WADA Working Group on Compliance, and any proposed plans for structural changes to the committees and professional staff. European countries were also in a very difficult position at that time and budgets for 2015 were not so easy; therefore, Europe was tabling a 0% budget with possible voluntary contributions, which were undoubtedly needed to deal with the new problems and new activities for WADA.

MR RICCI BITTI commented on what Ms Battaini-Dragoni had said. He was confident about the first point, and was sure that even those who had not paid would pay, but that would not be enough for the future, as he had said. His position on investment was that, in accounting terms, one could consider only capital budget. If she was referring to the funding of the investment, that was another option and WADA could surely look into more creative ways of getting money; but, in accounting terms, he did not think that WADA had any choice other than to consider capital budget for all the investments necessary and special investments for its activities.

To Mr Schneider, he said that he recognised that Europe was in a difficult position, but the money involved for WADA was not that much and, if WADA really wanted to progress, its members would have to think about what they wanted. Mr Schneider had said exactly what he had said: it was not healthy to drain the reserves every year. He agreed with Mr Schneider about the situation in Europe. The Finance and Administration Committee would surely make some recommendations in July, but it was his duty to inform the members of the situation.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was actually another financial exercise under way that had not been put on the agenda. The IOC had made available a fund of ten million US dollars for innovative research into doping, although the WADA Science Director had reminded him yesterday that all research was innovative. WADA had asked the government representatives on the Executive Committee to see with their constituent members if there was a possibility, as requested by the IOC, that governments would match that IOC funding, and that process was under way. He had been asked to give the floor to his colleague from China who wanted to speak to the members in that regard, and he was happy to give Mr Jiang the floor.

MR JIANG thanked the Chairman for giving him the floor. It was traditional for China to support the work of WADA and China believed it was very important to increase investment by the anti-doping community in the field of research and to improve the effectiveness of anti-doping. Therefore, the Chinese Government would support the proposal of the new research fund and would make a donation and contribution to the fund.

THE CHAIRMAN remarked that that could only be described as very good news. He also thanked Mr Jiang for the invitation to visit him in Beijing and to visit the Chinese doping authority, which he would be happy to do during the Nanjing Youth Olympic Games.

DECISION

2015 draft budget noted.

7. World Anti-Doping Code

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that item 7.1 was an issue for decision and item 7.2 was the consideration of the report from the Working Group on Compliance. The Executive Committee had reversed the two items the previous day and he thought that

the Foundation Board should do the same again to deal first with the report on compliance and take a decision after having considered it.

– 7.1 Implementation of the World Anti-Doping Code 2015 and International Standards

Having heard the debate under item 7.2, MR NIGGLI said that he did not think he needed to add anything. The proposal was that the Foundation Board approve the idea that, on 1 January 2015, WADA would publish the list of those who had not adopted the rules, following which there would be a more formal discussion at the next meeting of the Foundation Board.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if all the members were happy with the proposal.

MR RICCI BITTI said that there had been an alternative idea, which was to publish who had adopted the rules.

MR BUDGETT asked that it be made very clear that not adopting the rules was not the same as not being Code-compliant, because obviously that would follow later.

MR NIGGLI agreed with what Mr Budgett had said. The compliance decision was one to be taken by the Foundation Board.

MR POUND said that, without arguing too much about how many angels fitted on the head of the pin, the members would see on page 2 of the document that there was a provision within the Code itself that everybody had adopted, which was that one was not considered in compliance with the Code until one had accepted and implemented. WADA would be looking to see if the Code had been accepted by the stakeholders on 1 January. If they had not done that, they could not be considered in compliance. One of the things WADA had to do was identify those countries that had not done that; not applaud those that had done what they were supposed to have done.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that that was the legal situation with which WADA was faced, and an attempt had been made to encompass that in the document.

MR NIGGLI replied that it was clear: on 1 January, WADA would publish a list to provide the picture of those with rules in place. Compliance with the Code was a decision to be taken a few months later by the Foundation Board if things had not changed.

DECISION

Proposal on the implementation of the
World Anti-Doping Code 2015 and
International Standards approved.

– 7.2 Report of the Working Group on Compliance Reporting

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that the report had come after a number of physical and telephone meetings. A number of the members of the working group were in the room. He formally asked the chairman of the group, Mr Pound, if he would like to highlight any particular issues on the initial working group report.

MR POUND stated that he would report briefly, as he thought that the written report more or less spoke for itself. It had been constructed on the premise that the parties had negotiated changes to the former World Anti-Doping Code to produce the 2015 Code, that they wanted the Code to be enforced as and from 1 January the following year, that everybody involved in the World Conference on Doping in Sport in Johannesburg had subscribed to and supported the Johannesburg declaration and in particular with the change in emphasis of orientation to that of protecting clean athletes.

The group had looked at what was involved in becoming Code-compliant and focused on what could be done in a positive sense to ensure that all signatories were Code-compliant as of 1 January, recognising that, human nature being what it was, there would be some signatories that probably would not be; but, in combining the motivational forces of the carrot and the stick, it had been the group's view that as much as possible should be done to help people become compliant but, if they were not as of 1 January (and he recognised that the signatories might not have done everything that was

required but, if they did not have their rules into a position whereby they could do all that), then they had really failed to live up to what everybody had wanted to do.

One of the recommendations would be that, as of 1 January, those signatories that did not have in place rules that complied with the Code be identified, recognising that any formal action could be done only at the Foundation Board, so the full consequences of non-compliance would not kick in until May 2015 but, in the interim, there would be a variety of incentives made to comply and a series of relatively short delays within which all that could occur. The group had tried not to reinvent the wheel; he knew that there were working groups dealing with the assessment of risk in various sports and countries, so the group had not touched that. The group had endorsed the concept that had been discussed at the Foundation Board meeting and at the Executive Committee meeting of a hierarchical structure whereby there were circumstances that required higher levels of compliance activity than others; the group thought that that was an important aspect of Code-compliance generally.

Finally, because it was hard to act quickly with a group the size of the Foundation Board, the recommendation, and he thought the Executive Committee had considered that, would be for the Foundation Board to contemplate and appoint an expert group that could deal with the various elements of Code compliance and make some kind of an assessment that could then be given to the Foundation Board for it to act upon. The group had wanted to make sure that the constitutional authority remained with the Foundation Board; it was not a delegation to an expert group, unless of course that was what the Foundation Board wanted to do, but that would be a separate decision, and he believed that that was important because a smaller expert group could more easily assemble the facts, reach a conclusion and make a recommendation that could be understood by a group as large and disparate as the Foundation Board. Apart from that, he thought that the group had tried to have a limited number of recommendations and not to get too much into operational detail, which would depend upon the WADA staff and some of the other working groups that were out there focusing on separate issues as part of Code compliance. He would be happy to try and answer questions, and there were at least two members of the working group present to correct any errors he might make.

THE CHAIRMAN confirmed that what Mr Pound had said was precisely what the Executive Committee had decided the previous day: the question of rules by 1 January 2015; secondly, the issue of an expert group; and, thirdly, a scale of compliance going forward. Were there any questions?

MR MACADAM said that, earlier that morning at the government partners' meeting, the concept of tiering had been introduced and there had been an explanation provided. He thought it might be useful if the Foundation Board were given clarification as to what the notion of tiering might look like.

MR RICCI BITTI commented on what Mr Pound had presented. His problem was that he had made many interventions that year and he did not wish to repeat what he had said. There was a lot of difference between adoption and compliance. Compliance meant implementing the Code and adopting was something different. A lot of time was wasted, and this was a concern on the part of the sport side, talking about signing or underwriting the UNESCO convention. The UNESCO convention did not mean that much from a practical point of view. It was a tool to make laws in a country, install a NADO and implement an anti-doping system that could match the sport system at an IF level. They were two different matters.

Again, there was another qualification problem of wording: adopting the Code and implementing the Code were two different things. People had to judge the situation, especially from the government side, and it could be a small group, it could be WADA and, in his opinion, it should be the WADA staff supported by all those they wanted, but the political decision should remain, as Mr Pound had initially mentioned, with the Foundation Board, as WADA was a body of two parts, and the political decision to issue sanctions or communications about compliance should remain with the Foundation Board, but there were many steps in between. That was what was never talked about. Signing

or adopting was very easy, but then if nothing happened, that was not compliance. Compliance meant going much further. All the steps had to be clarified, along with what WADA wanted and the eventual sanctions that could be put in place.

MR VARADKAR stated that the European public authorities wished to thank the working group for the work done on the matter; they were very satisfied with the recommendations on coordination and compliance activities, and wanted to reiterate their commitment to work in close cooperation with WADA on compliance monitoring, specifically with respect to the monitoring of the Council of Europe's anti-doping convention. He proposed that future compliance reports include explanations as to why a signatory had been declared non-compliant, and stressed that, while everybody was committed to ensuring that full compliance was achieved, it was very important that those bodies able to apply consequences for non-compliance be able to agree on what those consequences might be and then apply them.

On behalf of the athletes, MR ESTANGUET encouraged all the anti-doping organisations to be compliant by 1 January 2015 following their commitment through the Johannesburg declaration. The athletes thought that using the same new Code worldwide as soon as possible would be the best way of protecting clean athletes. Equality for all the athletes meant that it was necessary to keep up the pressure and find a way to send a strong signal to all those organisations that had not made all necessary efforts. He understood that the situation was not easy and there were probably many steps that had to be taken, but he recalled the importance for the equality of all the athletes of implementing the new Code as soon as possible.

MR SERETSE sought clarification on the issue of programmes. WADA continued to assist signatories in developing their anti-doping programmes in order to begin the new Code implementation in 2015. In that case, which were those countries to be supported? Were they developed or developing nations? What sort of countries were to be supported? He sought further clarification on the matter.

MR POUND responded that the concept of tiering was of course going to be a work in progress, and it would depend on what was found out there but, by and large, most of the people around the table would understand that some sports carried with them a greater likelihood of doping, some countries might have a greater risk of doping, others less and, therefore, compliance monitoring would be designed to take into account those aspects of risk and past conduct as part of the way in which WADA allocated its very slim resource budget to compliance monitoring. To give the actual components of that would be beyond the mandate of his group and it had deliberately stayed away from trying to design that system. He thought that a working group could probably do that if requested, but that had been beyond the mandate.

He told Mr Ricci Bitti that there was clearly a difference between the adoption of the necessary constitutional structure to enable compliance with the new Code to be undertaken but, as a very minimum, on that date, 1 January, the signatories should have adopted the necessary constitutional framework and they should be in a position to start acting in compliance with the Code as of that date. He certainly agreed with the suggestion that any compliance report, particularly where there was a potential declaration of non-compliance, ought to give the explanation for the non-compliance so that the party would have an opportunity to correct it. In addition, a series of escalating responses had been suggested in the report; much of that would probably be dealt with before somebody sought a formal declaration of non-compliance. For example, an organisation would be told that there was a weakness in its programme and asked to address it. He thought that the Foundation Board, before it pulled the trigger on a non-compliant signatory, would like to know why, and that would be the responsibility of the expert group, assuming the Foundation Board decided to accept the recommendation that there be an expert group, and it would certainly be one of the questions the Foundation Board ought to be asking.

He thought that everybody shared the hope of the athletes that everybody would be up and running on 1 January 2015. The answer to that was that it was the signatories' Code and Johannesburg declaration; they had made all the decisions, not WADA and, if

they had thought that there would be a problem being ready for 1 January 2015, the time to say that had been in Johannesburg, and everybody operated on the assumption that they had meant what they had said and that the timing had been regarded as reasonable.

As to the countries to be supported, they fell into two groups: any country that asked for help, and there were guides and suggestions on how to adopt the Code out there already, so that would be WADA responding to a request. WADA would also have an independent opinion on who needed some help, in which case there could be a proactive offer of assistance. There had already been several meetings with stakeholders and signatories to say what was coming, and that there were model guidelines, and what compliance would consist of. When the members went back to their particular regions, if they knew of countries in their regions that might need some help, they should let WADA know and WADA would do what it could. The countries should not be afraid to ask; WADA had all sorts of model guidelines to be used for compliance purposes and would be anxious to share them with the signatories.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that Ms Battaini-Dragoni had wanted to take the floor.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI said that she really wanted to pay tribute to the working group for what it had done and the paper submitted, which was interesting, inspiring and clear. All the work was very relevant for WADA and very timely. When monitoring, obviously it could be looked at from the point of view of finding out what did not work and how to help, but WADA could also do monitoring in order to issue appropriate sanctions if something was not working as it should. That was why she liked the approach in the document, because WADA would deal with both dimensions of a proper monitoring system so that WADA would be able to help but, if nothing happened, it would have inevitably to sanction because impunity could not be accepted. That was very clear; it was the fundamental approach, and she did appreciate that. That was why she believed that the debate that day was so fundamental to WADA, because WADA was indeed a standard-setting organisation and would increasingly become a monitoring organisation. That was why she was looking forward to the costing of the exercise. WADA needed to be credible and really needed to make sure that the monitoring was done properly.

She also shared the views of those who believed that not everything would be perfect on 1 January, but it had been clearly explained that, unless a date were fixed, WADA would never start and it would be impossible for athletes to compete if they came from different countries and there was asymmetry between the countries.

She understood that the first year would be very important in terms of establishing good dialogue to create, in those situations where improvements had to be made, the necessary support, etc. Sanctions would come only if nothing was done. However, there was one technical aspect that was important to the governments. They (at least the European governments) were going to enter into a system whereby there would be the monitoring mechanism linked to the European anti-doping convention covering 48 countries; then, the following year, the monitoring mechanism of the UNESCO convention would come into force, and then the WADA compliance mechanism would presumably enter into force. She was thus far extremely satisfied that proper coordination was being looked into in order to avoid useless replication and make sure that it would be possible to go as far as possible and not encroach on other territory, leading to useless work and results. That issue of coordination had possibly not been sufficiently mentioned in the debate, although it was mentioned in the document, and the working group had immediately raised the issue of how to better coordinate in the future. The tier system was a good one inasmuch as it was flexible to combine monitoring for improvement and monitoring for sanctions.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Battaini-Dragoni for her observation.

MR PENGILLY added to the comments made by Mr Pound about the tiering issue. It was unreasonable to expect a small country and/or a poorly performing country with an incredibly low budget to submit to the same anti-doping standards as a large country, the only other option therefore being similar to the current system whereby the standard

to achieve Code-compliance was relatively low, particularly for those nations that required a very high standard to ensure that the clean athletes were properly protected.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, at that meeting one year previously, the Foundation Board had begun to look at tiering. For sports, tier one would be all the Olympic sports and recognised sports, and then there was a group that said 'others', and therein lay the debate. Looking at countries, tier one would be the top 50 countries winning medals at the Olympic Games. That had been discussed and minuted, and people had seemed quite happy with that but, clearly, more work was to be done with regard to the issue. He thanked Mr Pound for a splendid debate.

DECISION

Report of the Working Group on Compliance
Reporting accepted and all recommendations
in it approved.

– 7.3 Technical Document on Sport Specific Analysis progress report

THE CHAIRMAN observed that the technical document was a fascinating piece of work. Mr Pound had rather referred to it when talking about other working groups whose work might have an effect on compliance in the future. It was led by Mr Ricketts, to whom he gave the floor.

MR RICKETTS said that, in addition to the update paper that the members had in their files, he felt it important to give them a brief presentation on the new technical document due to the change that it would bring to many anti-doping programmes. The technical document was one of the many enhancements in the fight against doping in sport that was contained in the revised Code and that supported more effective anti-doping systems.

In essence, the technical document would outline the minimum levels of analysis for sports and disciplines determined to be at risk with regard to those specific prohibited substances that were not included in the analysis of a standard urine sample. It was important to note that that was one part in the development of an effective and intelligent test distribution plan. The substances that had been categorised to be in the technical document were the three that the members could see on the screen: erythropoiesis-stimulating agents, known as ESAs, and that included EPO and the variations of that; Hgh and growth hormone releasing factors; and the group of insulins.

That meant that every ADO, IF, NADO or major event organiser testing those sports deemed at risk with regard to such substances would have to meet a minimum level of analysis. The minimum levels were just that: minimum levels. ADOs could certainly test at a greater level, and that was encouraged.

In terms of why it was needed, the majority of samples collected were urine and they received the standard urine analysis for an in-competition or out-of-competition test. The additional analysis for EPOs and growth hormones was an extra cost on top of the minimum urine analysis price, and it was also currently at the discretion of the ADOs as to whether or not to test for those and, if so, at what level. There had been limited monitoring of that aspect in the past, and that would obviously change under the new programme, and the statistics showed that, in some sports, some ADOs were doing a high level of analysis and others were not, so it was about raising the bar to bring those that were not up to a minimum level.

In terms of what the technical document aimed to achieve, it would close the current loopholes in analysis by setting the minimum levels that needed to be achieved. ADOs would be held more accountable and there would be an increase in the quality of the programmes that they were conducting, as well as an increase in the capacity and proficiency of the laboratories, along with new tools and guidance to further assist the development of the ADOs. There would be an increased level of deterrence and also hopefully detection. One of the big things to come out of it was greater protection of the clean athletes on the basis that they knew that there was a minimum level of analysis for their sport globally.

In terms of the drafting group that had been put together to draw up the technical document, there was a very distinguished group of members from individual and team sports, IOC and IPC representation, laboratories, NADOs, and also an exercise physiologist, a professor at a Canadian university. The group had been put together the previous December and had been given seven months to pull it all together. The work undertaken had been excellent and the members of the group should be commended on the work that they had delivered to date.

In terms of the basis for the development of the technical document, it was based primarily on the physiological risk against the performance enhancement benefits of those prohibited substances shown in the earlier slide. The group had undertaken a consultation process with all the IFs (Olympic, IOC-recognised and non-recognised) and asked them to provide physiological and non-physiological information in respect of their sports. There had been a great response and that had helped the group to look at over 100 sports and disciplines. To make the whole thing a little easier, the group had categorised the various sports and disciplines into similar physiological categories, so the team sports had been put together, as had the power and strength sports, the cardiovascular endurance sports, the aiming sports, gymnastics sports and combat sports. The group had also looked at the performance benefits of the prohibited substances and the current laboratory capacity for the analysis of substances around the world.

In terms of the outcomes, the table on the screen outlined the groups of substances, the sport and discipline, as well as the percentage level. That was what the minimum level would be represented as. The higher the risk, the higher the percentage would be and vice versa. The document was currently out with the IFs and he was expecting comments back on it in the coming weeks. It would then be forwarded to the NADOs for their comments and also the major event organisers. The working group was considering a possible reduction in the ESA percentage based on the implementation of an effective Athlete Biological Passport programme for blood.

In terms of the level of athlete to which it should be applied, for IFs, it should be aimed at the international-level athletes and, for NADOs, the national-level athletes. Both organisations were welcome to conduct testing outside of that but, for the purpose of measuring adherence to the minimum levels, those were the two groups of athletes it should be focused on in order to utilise resources more effectively. Looking at the flexibility that ADOs would have, it would be up to them to determine which athletes should receive such specific analysis. They would be able to determine when to conduct the testing, in-competition or out-of-competition, selecting the athletes and the timing of the tests. All the decisions should be based on a thorough risk assessment and risk factors, and also the intelligence to which they had access. The aim was to test the right athletes for the right substances at the right time.

Regarding the impact of the technical document on ADOs, for those ADOs at or above the minimum percentage levels, there should be no change and obviously for those sports that were not required to do any analysis, as there was no risk, there would be no change either. ADOs below the minimum analysis levels would have to look how to increase their analyses and change their test plans to accommodate that. Obviously, increasing would have a financial impact and that would need to be considered and, as a result, WADA might see a decrease in test numbers, but the flip side would be an increase in quality. WADA would be monitoring the level of analysis on each sport and discipline through ADAMS, and there were changes currently under way to represent the statistics in a more defined manner where in the past that had not been reported.

There would be some changes in development requirements to assist with the implementation. He had mentioned the statistics. WADA was developing a new testing guideline to assist ADOs in the development and implementation of their testing plans. There would hopefully be greater use of the Athlete Biological Passport programme, in particular for those sports deemed at risk with regard to ESAs that currently did not have one and should. Laboratory prices would be published from 1 January along with the various analytical methods of the laboratories available, and he had mentioned the capacity of the laboratories increasing. Also very important would be building the

partnerships between the ADOs, IFs and NADOs so that information could be shared along with intelligence.

In terms of the next steps of the process, the group was currently in consultation with the IFs to finalise the physiological scores that the group had provided and to look at those draft minimum levels of analysis. The Olympic IFs were due to report back the following Friday, and the recognised and non-recognised IFs the Friday after. The document would then be circulated among the other ADOs.

The experts in the drafting group would be meeting in mid-June in Montreal to review any submissions from the IFs or the NADOs regarding the draft levels, then the final draft technical document would be published at the end of July, tabled at the WADA Executive Committee meeting for approval in September, published in October and effective as of 1 January 2015.

In closing, the technical document would ensure that a minimum level of analysis was applied to those sports at risk by all ADOs globally. It would enhance the quality of the testing programmes and also identify areas of development. WADA would continue to work with the IFs and the NADOs and other ADOs, not just in the development but also in the implementation of the technical document. The implementation would be monitored by WADA and reviewed annually.

It was a starting point for a very good step forward. It was not set in stone; there would be reviews, and he looked forward to the members' support with the implementation of it.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Ricketts. This arose from article 5.4 of the Code, which everybody had signed up to in Johannesburg. It had been an outstanding piece of work to date and he thought that cooperation with the IFs had been an excellent part of it. For the members' records, as it was quite powerful stuff, copies of that presentation and several of the other presentations that they would hear that day were on the members' tables and they should feel free to take them away with them. He thanked Mr Ricketts, along with Dr Pascual. It was a big task and, if the anti-doping movement pulled it off, it would certainly make things much better.

DECISION

Technical Document on Sport Specific
Analysis progress report noted.

8. Athlete Biological Passport

Dealt with under item 10.2.

9. Anti-Doping Administration Management System

MR ZAIER said that he would provide an overview of ADAMS usage, ADAMS achievements over the past 12 months, the ADAMS roadmap for 2014 and future enhancements in ADAMS. Thanks to the 98 IFs and 94 anti-doping organisations and agencies using ADAMS, the database included 255 athlete profiles, more than 14,000 TUEs and around 730,000 athlete results reported by 35 approved laboratories. Numerous major event organisers had used ADAMS during events in 2013 and 2014, including the 2014 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in Sochi. As of May 2014, ADAMS had been available in 17 different languages. The team had recently added Polish and would add Hungarian in the next release. In 2013, a series of enhancements had been added to the whereabouts module, and the changes introduced early in 2013 had been made to facilitate the new mobile application release. The steroid module had also been integrated in September 2013. Finally, numerous enhancements had also been added in December 2013 to ADAMS to improve the efficiency of the system for the IOC and IPC at the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in Sochi. The new applications for the iPhone and Android platforms had been revisited in December 2013 and February 2014. Some of the enhancements had been planned for the first quarter of 2014 but, based on the feedback received, WADA had advanced the release in December 2013. However, despite the significant demand for the application and good feedback received

to date (an average score of 4/5 in the Apple Store and Google Play), downloads had been modest, around 5,350 for the iPhone version and 1,200 for the Android version. He encouraged all members to promote the tool among athletes. ADAMS 3.6 had been released on 1 May and had been mainly dedicated to functionality enhancements based on user feedback, including TUEs and laboratory function.

For the 2014 roadmap, various improvements would be made to the haematological and steroidal module in ADAMS. Such changes were the result of continuous feedback from stakeholders and had been designed to improve the efficiency of the Athlete Biological Passport. The new enhanced legal and result management system would be released to address the limitations of the current system. Finally, the ADAMS 3.8 release would focus mainly on test plan functionality enhancements in preparation for the new mobile eDCF system. The paperless project would serve as the foundation for the new interface between ADAMS and other systems and would allow anti-doping organisations to administer mission orders and the doping control procedure electronically and automatically capture doping control information in ADAMS from any other systems. Earlier that year, planning had started for changes in ADAMS to reflect the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code and international standards. The specifications for the changes had been completed and would be developed in time for release that year prior to January 2015. Following the release of the new whereabouts mobile application, a future phase of the application was envisioned to extend functionality to team managers and athlete agents.

He concluded the presentation with an overview of the future ADAMS projects. He mentioned primarily the universal interface and intelligence platform. It should be noted that, prior to 2013, there had been an average of two ADAMS releases per year. In 2013, that had been increased to four releases and, in 2014, there would be eight releases. The increase in productivity with higher-quality deliverables within the same budget was essentially due to the new approach that had been implemented, also to address the earlier comment about the previous slow release rate. Finally, he mentioned that ADAMS was ten years old, and adding functionalities and maintaining the system was a real challenge.

THE CHAIRMAN remarked that the word 'challenge' had been used in that room for some time. He had not appreciated that ADAMS had been around for ten years. The developments that had taken place were impressive.

DR PASCUAL said that he had some questions that had come from the Director General's report and the new requirements for WADA to deliver other IT-related services to the community because of the new Code. One related to how that would help WADA monitor those possible athlete support personnel who might be sanctioned in accordance with the new anti-doping rule violation on prohibited engagement with somebody who had been sanctioned, and how to help ADOs know who had been sanctioned. Would there be something in ADAMS, with the names of the people that every ADO could access?

The second question related to the fact that, in article 14.5, ADOs could use any other systems if they were approved by WADA. What did that mean? Did it have to do with the universal interface, so, if they had implemented a connection with ADAMS through the universal interface, they would be allowed to use their systems because ADAMS would get the information from their systems?

Regarding the paperless system, was that something WADA would take on board and then offer to stakeholders? Could the software simply be downloaded, or was it something that had to be contracted with a developer? How would that be implemented?

MR POUND thanked the management for arranging the very interesting presentation. He asked for forgiveness if he sounded like a lawyer, but he noticed that there was an application that would allow managers and coaches to provide whereabouts information. What would happen if a manager said that he would be in Montreal on a certain date and was actually in Toronto and missed a test? Maybe that had been thought about but, if it had not, there had to be some kind of default responsibility that went back to the

athlete, that, if the athlete had authorised their manager or coach to fill in their whereabouts, they would be stuck with what had been put in.

MR BUDGETT mentioned how grateful the Olympic Movement was for the enhanced functionality that had been used very effectively in Sochi. His question was about storage and reanalysis of samples and, as more and more organisations stored samples, they considered the challenges of reanalysis. The first issue was continued access, which was a technical issue, and the second issue was the availability of relevant athlete data for that intelligent selection of samples for reanalysis when athletes changed jurisdiction, which was both technical and legal, and he would be grateful for any efforts to tackle both those issues.

MR VARADKAR noted that a particular aspect of importance was the development of the interface to allow data to be exchanged between ADAMS and other systems, particularly SIMON. Could any more information be given on that and how it was progressing?

THE CHAIRMAN said that he hoped that the quality of the questions was in direct proportion to the quality of the presentation.

MR ZAIER responded that the issue of the universal interface was the most important. It would be a protocol put in place for any system that would communicate with ADAMS. It would be bidirectional or unidirectional, depending on the further analysis that had to be carried out and the legal assessment of the system. Basically, he would take as proof of concept the paperless project itself, as that was being considered as the first step for the universal interface. The interface for the paperless project would be open to any other system that could connect to ADAMS and provide the information. That was the most important thing. WADA was not working for a single organisation; it was working for a global system that could include any system in the future.

Going back to the legal system, there would be a new version of the legal system but, at the same time, there would be an improvement to retrieve the data from the legal system and integrate it in ADAMS, especially related to the decisions that would be made in the future.

Finally, regarding the location of the managers, that was not being taken into consideration, although perhaps Mr Robertson would provide more information. The location of the athletes when they provided their whereabouts would be taken into consideration. That was one of the enhancements that would be made in the future with the new intelligent system.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that he was one of the few people blessed with copies of the presentations. If anybody wanted a copy, that could be arranged.

DECISION

ADAMS update noted.

10. Department reports

– 10.1 Science

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed Dr Steinacker, who was a member of the Health, Medical and Research Committee and was representing Professor Ljungqvist, who was recovering well from a hip operation in Stockholm.

10.1.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee Chair report

DR STEINACKER conveyed Professor Ljungqvist's greetings to the Foundation Board. Regarding the report on the Athlete Biological Passport, the haematological module was running well and was an important instrument to monitor suspicious changes. It had been implemented by 36 ADOs but only 15 IFs, mainly the most important IFs, but that had to be worked on. The steroidal module had been introduced and included all athletes who had been subjected to urine samples, and about 11,000 doping control forms were also included. Only those doping control forms that were entered in ADAMS could be

used, so that was a problem, but it was a good initiative and the committee welcomed the introduction.

Decisions had been reached the previous day, particularly on the inclusion in the Prohibited List of the noble gases xenon and argon. The use of the substances had become evident during the Olympic Games in Sochi, and it was a new doping mechanism that involved erythropoietin and blood formation, so the committee really welcomed the rapid inclusion of the two gases in the Prohibited List.

The draft of the 2015 Prohibited List was in the consultation phase. As every year, that phase would end on 8 July, after which the List Expert Group would present the draft at the end of August to the Health, Medical and Research Committee to be decided on by the Executive Committee at its September meeting.

Research projects also had to be dealt with. Dr Rabin's department had received a record number of 116 projects, representing a 64% increase compared to two years previously, and the Science Department had announced that it would propose modifications to the assessment phase, because such huge numbers would have an impact and WADA wanted to maintain high quality and a cost-efficient way of reviewing them. Most resources in the Science Department went towards anti-doping laboratories and the technical documents that came out of the Code. All that had to be implemented. The laboratories had to be visited and guided, and new laboratories required a nurturing process, which entailed visits to look at what they were doing and improve them. A conference for pharmaceutical companies would be held in January in Japan, and that was also very important.

Moving to the Medical Department and TUEs, he highlighted the improvement of the ISTUE, the implementation process, the monitoring of the TUEs and the fact that there would be a TUE chair symposium in Paris on 23 and 24 October that year hosted by the French NOC. He also wished to thank the Japanese authorities for agreeing to host the pharmaceutical meeting.

DECISION

Health, Medical and Research Committee
Chair report noted.

10.1.2 Science update

Covered under item 10.1.1.

DECISION

Science update noted.

10.1.3 Draft 2015 Prohibited List update

Covered under item 10.1.1.

DECISION

Draft 2015 Prohibited List update noted.

– 10.2 Medical

10.2.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee Chair report

Covered under item 10.1.1.

DECISION

Health, Medical and Research

Committee Chair report noted.

10.2.2 Medical update

DR VERNEC said that the members had four pages of medical documents in their files and highlighted the TUE symposium on 23 and 24 October in Paris. The previous symposia had been held in 2005 and 2009. The symposium was for TUE chairs, and the

agenda would be going up the following week. He thought that the programme was excellent.

He would be giving the members a short update on the Athlete Biological Passport, with a focus on the new steroidal module. As many of the members already knew, the passport was a way of indirectly detecting doping by looking for biomarkers without actually looking specifically for prohibited substances. It could be used for targeting or it could directly lead to an anti-doping rule violation. The haematological module had been operating since 2009, and there were 44 ADOs running the programme. Approximately half of those were NADOs and half were IFs and, clearly, the emphasis was on endurance sports (athletics, cycling, skiing and so on). From 2008-2013, there had been 340 positive blood doping cases, which was about double the rate in the years before the passport. Most of those included positives from finding ESAs. Of those 340, and certainly increasing over the past few years, 53 had been positive Athlete Biological Passport cases alone.

Looking at the steroidal module, which had been operational since the start of that year, the basic processes and principles were the same as those for the haematological module. There were approximately 20,000 matched urine samples in ADAMS for the first four months of that year. All urine samples had to have a doping control form entered into ADAMS which made it possible to put a name to an athlete (it remained anonymous as a BPID number), to automatically generate a steroidal profile. All of the athletes getting regular urine tests were part of the steroidal passport. The calculations were all done automatically in ADAMS, and the individual reference values of the athletes were used rather than population values. That meant that there were fewer unnecessary IRMS tests and fewer athletes would fly under the radar. The blue line in the middle of the slide was the actual T/E ratio for the athlete. Almost every result except for one was over 4:1. This was an athlete who, before 2014, should have an IRMS test on almost every sample. If that did not happen, there had to be negotiations between the ADOs and the laboratories. Other athletes flew under the radar and, looking at the blue line again on the screen, the normal T/E ratio for the athlete was about 0.16, and that athlete had been used as a test case and given oral testosterone, as could be seen with the arrow, at which point there had been a tenfold increase in the level of testosterone, which had been easily picked up by the adaptive or steroidal module but, if using the 4:1 ratio, would have been completely missed. The final example showed an actual screenshot from the passport as it stood. The athletes remained anonymous, and had an Athlete Biological Passport ID number. What was unusual about that particular case was that there were a lot of numbers, because the athlete had been successful at the Olympic Games and had been tested before and after the podium. Again, he had put the 4:1 line because, if the athlete had only a 30% increase, that would immediately trigger an atypical passport finding, which was far below the 4:1 with which WADA had been operating for so many years. The reality was that, for most athletes around the world, there might be one or at best two actual values, so there would not be a lot of statistics being generated at that early stage.

The revised version of the technical document had been approved the previous day and it was an integral part of the work being done for the Athlete Biological Passport.

He did mention that the system was set up in a single database system, which was ADAMS. There was one athlete, one passport, and shared data; therefore, multiple organisations were putting information in, everything was calculated automatically, and there was very little administrative work other than putting the doping control form into ADAMS. That resulted in cost savings and decreased administrative burden for the ADOs and the laboratories and, of course, by having it in ADAMS, there was the ability for WADA to look at trends and fulfil its monitoring role.

If an ADO did not use ADAMS, it created some difficulty, but there was a process in place for that. He did not want to talk too much about that except to say that there were certain criteria. It meant a lot more work for the laboratories and the ADOs if the doping control forms were not being put into ADAMS. In terms of disadvantages, one was unable to use test results for multiple ADOs if one was not using ADAMS, one was not using the adaptive model and therefore had a less efficient application of the IRMS. Very few ADOs

actually had their own versions for calculation of longitudinal profiles and analysis, but those numbers were very low. Again, there was an increased administrative burden and costs for the ADOs and the laboratories.

In the event of an atypical passport finding, two things would happen. The first was automatic notification: it went to the laboratory, the laboratory did an IRMS, if the IRMS was positive for an exogenous steroid, that would be essentially an adverse analytical finding and it would move along to sanctions. If the atypical passport finding was done but the IRMS was negative or inconclusive, further expert evaluation and/or testing would be needed. WADA had advised the ADOs to associate with WADA laboratory-associated athlete passport management units, or APMUs. More so than the haematological module, the expertise was really at the level of the laboratory experts for the steroidal module. The APMUs would recommend effective and strategic testing, would manage the passports and go all the way to compiling documentation packages and issuing adverse passport findings to the ADOs and WADA.

He was very pleased that the steroidal module was operational. There were not that many statistics at that stage, but early indications were that it was doing what WADA had hoped. There were fewer IRMS tests being done, but WADA was still getting the same number of IRMS positives, so there appeared to be a certain degree of cost-effectiveness at that point. There were challenges and still some work to be done; he had already discussed a number of times with stakeholders and was trying to make some adjustments in ADAMS, some of which were already due in September, and more adjustments would be made, and also WADA had to engage with the ADOs, which had certain responsibilities, including trying to get the doping control forms into ADAMS so that the steroidal module could be effective. Some IFs did not use ADAMS yet but were entering doping control forms specifically for the passport. If one did not put data in, one did not get data out.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that Professor Dvorak wanted to speak on the subject.

MR GENDALL said that, on behalf of the New Zealand minister and NADO, he had been asked to raise two points regarding access to the Athlete Biological Passport profile information. The Athlete Biological Passport could be successful only if all ADOs had automatic access to all profile information about their athletes, and he understood that was not currently the case. The ADAMS operational concept of custodianship of profiles inhibited access of NADOs to profiles of their own athletes and some IFs were not willing to share. He understood that paragraph 1.4 referred to the suggestion and proposal of reciprocal agreements, but that was a cumbersome device and, if they did not share, that would not work and that discouraged NADOs from more complete Athlete Biological Passport programmes and prevented NADOs from exercising their result management authority as established by the Code. The Athlete Biological Passport/ADAMS currently gave athletes too much access and too immediate access to their own profile information, and that was anti-doping information, and access could be abused by some people who managed their own profiles in order to avoid detection. It was like those under suspicion having access to the very information that enabled them to manage non-detection. Those were the two issues he had been asked to raise, and he left it to those responsible in WADA to consider whether there were some adjustments to the Athlete Biological Passport and ADAMS that might be made to correct the problem.

DR VERNEC responded that the business of passport custodianship and access was something that had been put in for a number of reasons. There had to be a passport custodian or somebody responsible. It was very different to a doping test. If one performed a doping test and that was positive, the testing authority had full responsibility all the way to result management. Longitudinal profile was like a child. Somebody had to be raising it and keeping an eye on it, and there had to be some sort of coordination. If one wanted to have respect for the athletes, one did not want a number of organisations jumping on the athletes and testing them without some sort of coordination. Some issues had been raised by stakeholders and they were valid ones, and there would be some changes in version 3.7 addressing the read access. If one was not the passport custodian but was granted read access by the IF (which should happen pretty much in every case and, if not, one should go to WADA), one would have access

to everything, including the files, the profiles and expert reports. He did not think that was quite realised. The IF was currently the default and that would change so that, if there was no established profile already and the NADO was the first group to test, the NADO would become the passport custodian. There were some changes and there might be more in the coming year, so he appreciated all the comments.

To address the second question, the business of too much access for athletes to their own profiles, there had been a heated discussion about it in 2009, and there had been varied opinions, with some people saying that the athletes had no business looking at doping tests and others saying that they would give absolute full access to the passports right from day one. To some degree, it was a legal issue: to hold any more than the slightest delay would simply not work, as it was the athletes' own biological information and they had a right to that information. He did not think it was as worrisome as had initially been thought because, at the end of the day, WADA was monitoring and watching what people were doing, and the ultra-sophisticated cheats could probably develop their own parallel system; so, for purely anti-doping purposes, a slight delay would have been ideal but, at the end of the day, it had been necessary to work within the legal confines and the ability for athletes to see their own information.

PROFESSOR DVORAK thanked Dr Verneec for the excellent presentation, which was very clear, although he wished to point out that it was not as simple as it had been presented. It was quite a complicated issue and it was not totally black and white, which was why it had been thought necessary to bring the doctors, scientists, those responsible for the ADOs and the laboratory experts to the table, and the result was the special issue of the British Journal of Sport Medicine, which contained the current body of knowledge about the interpretation and how the Athlete Biological Passport could be implemented. There were 11 papers and he strongly recommended that all the members read them. His neighbour had raised very important questions on coordination, custodianship and access to data. He could tell the members that FIFA had no experience at all as to how it worked and nobody really had experience of how the Athlete Biological Passport should and would work in the long run and in the lifespan of an athlete, but he had indications that it could be a very powerful deterrent, even if the athletes had access to the longitudinal data. Of course, the highly sophisticated would always find a way, but the majority would not.

Currently in the database, there were approximately 2,000 football players from the Champions League, from Euro 2012, from the different FIFA competitions, the top players and the male population, and also FIFA was doing out-of-competition testing for all players participating at the FIFA World Cup in a few weeks' time, and would compare data in a longitudinal manner with the methodology presented by Dr Verneec to see what new information was being obtained. It was a very elaborate process. Of course, one could say that all of the urine samples were included and they were automatically processed, but it was necessary to gain more experience from the laboratory experts and the scientists for those comparisons. It was necessary to wait. He was happy to be able to work closely with WADA and the laboratory experts. There had been a fantastic event in the autumn of the previous year. Currently, he asked the members not to expect immediate results, as it would take some time to establish a baseline for individual athletes. In the long run, the whole system might be made much cheaper with the use of the regular examination of athletes and putting the related data into the system as well. He was responsible for football, or overseeing the action, and he needed access to the data to understand the background and, even though he had complete confidence in the WADA Science Department, he still needed to understand what was happening in his sport. It would be very important to find a way to communicate and also have a clear idea about the confidentiality of the system and not abuse it.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was grateful for the intervention from an expert's point of view, which was very useful.

DR STEINACKER said that it was known that the cheats had the information already; but, through the model, it would be possible to find out about the integral changes among athletes, and this had been done for years in rowing. The blood passport gave much more information on what was happening and the IFs and ADOs had a picture of

what was happening within the population. That information was necessary and needed to be displayed with caution, and the module gave much more responsibility and opportunity to deal with the process and was therefore a very important step forward.

DR VERNEC said that he appreciated the comments and certainly there were complexities that had not been addressed. He thanked Professor Dvorak and FIFA for organising the December meeting and a special edition of the BJSM; that was something that enhanced the programme. The Athlete Biological Passport had integrated to some degree with the new vision of intelligence and gathering other information, and the definition of a passport was the longitudinal profiles and all other information. Initially, the process was anonymous to protect the athletes but, once there was an atypical passport finding and a number of experts were ruling that there was something that needed further evaluation, at some point the athlete could be contacted to try and explain why there were some abnormalities, and then all sorts of other information became part of the game in trying to understand exactly what had happened.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if he could be associated with WADA's thanks to FIFA for its efforts in the field. He wished Professor Dvorak well in Brazil the following month.

DECISION

Medical update noted.

– 10.3 Education

10.3.1 Education Committee Chair report

MR MOSES stated that he was very pleased to be present at his first Foundation Board meeting. He had made a similar presentation the previous day at the Executive Committee meeting. First, he wished to give his condolences to the family of Mr Jurith, who had passed away the previous year. That was the only reason he was present. He had had a good relationship with Mr Jurith and had had the opportunity to meet him a couple of times in the USA.

The Education Committee had met on 3 and 4 April in Montreal, and it had been his first ever meeting with WADA. He had spent a couple of days with Mr Koehler and the staff some weeks prior to the meeting to get up to speed and to talk to the people at the office about education and what WADA had done and how it might move forward. The interaction with the Education Committee had been outstanding, and a wide range of subjects had been discussed. The Education Committee had welcomed Mr Ben Sandford from the WADA Athlete Committee, and it had been very good to hear the perspective of the athletes and Mr Sandford's take on things. One of the benefits of having athletes at the committee meeting was that people who were not from the world of athletics really appreciated hearing a different, real perspective in terms of what the athletes' perceptions of doping were. Mr Sandford had said that an athlete and Olympian had to think about drug testing every day, use whereabouts and declare where one was, as one never knew when the testers were coming. Mr Sandford had given a very good explanation of what it meant to be an athlete and how important the Education Committee was and how important it was to educate and be at the forefront to provide athletes with the information that they needed.

One of the outcomes of the meeting had been to ensure that the Athlete Committee and the Education Committee would share the agendas of their respective meetings. It had been agreed that such engagement would continue, as the athletes were really where the rubber met the road in the whole scope of what WADA did. He had also spoken to Ms Scott and Ms Bokel, and would always be in touch as to what was best for the athletes.

There was a report in the members' files that went into detail as to what the Education Committee had been doing. He would just give a short overview of some of the activities.

The Education Committee wanted to ensure that education initiatives were both interesting and fun, and WADA should explore how to engage world-class athletes to

highlight the activities specifically for athletes. It had been recommended that WADA develop some basic principles to assist and guide ADOs on what type of activities athletes could be involved in. The committee had looked at the use of videos, the insertion of formatting on websites, and promoting all aspects of drug testing, not only among peers competing at the same world-class level but also among junior levels, bringing in top-class athletes to events to become role models and spokespersons and begin to talk about anti-doping. The committee realised that, on many occasions at some of the youth competitions, athletes at the junior level had perhaps not heard about doping other than news reports in the papers about athletes testing positive; they never heard about responsibilities, things that they could do, things they should perhaps avoid and some of the pitfalls, so the Education Committee was very conscious about using Olympians, gold-medallists, national champions and heroes to work with younger children.

The Education Committee wished to continue to develop the survey and evaluation tools to assist the stakeholders in measuring the effectiveness of the education programmes.

The Education Committee thanked the Education Partnership, which involved WADA, UNESCO, the IOC, the IPC, the International Fair Play Committee and the International Council for Sport Science and Physical Education for their commitment to work together to develop one resource kit for teachers. The Education Committee wanted to make sure that major games signatories were aware that they also had a responsibility to promote education and make sure that the younger athletes were educated.

The Education Committee had reviewed all the educational tools being developed by WADA such as Coach True, ALPHA, the ADO resource and the online sports physician tool kit. The Education Committee encouraged the department to continue to promote the tools and to continually look for ways of improving and updating them.

The Education Committee had reviewed the educational model guidelines and had developed some comments and received comments and feedback from all the members of the committee, and had put that together to be circulated for more comment.

The Education Committee recommended for 2015 three social science research projects to focus on three different areas: developing effective intervention programmes based on the knowledge base of research obtained to date. The department had looked at almost every piece of research out there and had tried to find gaps in the research to fill in the blanks. A lot of the research currently focused on the detection of drugs and deterrence models, and WADA was trying to find ways to prevent athletes from using drugs through values-oriented approaches, the possibility of being tested, the use of role models and other values systems. The Education Committee would look at the effects that the legitimacy of anti-doping rules had among athletes; in other words, whether the athletes really believed that the rules meant something, and the Education Committee wanted to find out the athletes' perception as to what those rules actually meant and how they would be enforced, how they manipulated their attitudes, and what their attitudes were. The third area was to understand the deterrence measures for the entourage to either reject or perhaps seduce athletes. Some of the research said that there was a continuum, which might start with an athlete getting fluids, then vitamins, then anti-inflammatories, then amino acids, and then perhaps an IV drip if nobody was watching, followed by anabolic steroids, growth factors and EPO. It was known that there was a continuum that athletes had to deal with. The Education Committee had asked for research on that, as there was not a lot out there in that particular area.

Two other social science research projects had been recommended for funding and had been discussed that morning.

In essence, the Education Committee was trying to be proactive and look at areas that needed to be researched (not the typical knowledge), trying to find out why and trying to put in front of the athletes a 'why not'.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Moses.

DECISION

Education Committee Chair report noted.

10.3.2 Education update

MR KOEHLER referred to the partnership that had been formulated with the International University Sports Federation and the Guangzhou 2015 Universiad organising committee, which had wanted to build a legacy from the games. Part of the legacy was that WADA had partnered with the committee to develop a university e-textbook. The entire amount of funding from that (25,000 dollars) had been provided by the organising committee. It was being piloted throughout the world in five continents with seven universities, so he awaited feedback from the professors to improve the textbook, but it was available online for those wishing to look at it. WADA planned to utilise some of the work that UCAT had done with its university credit scheme and see how the two might be married once the pilot phase of the project was completed.

The new Athlete Learning Programme about Health and Anti-doping (ALPHA) was an e-learning programme for elite athletes and was currently available online. It contained information about roles and responsibilities of athletes, dealt with ethical information and also looked at the values-based approach in learning and did some social science research within the programme itself to measure values from the beginning to the end of the curriculum. It was not a quick education resource; the athletes were actually expected to invest the time, and it did take a while to complete, but he hoped that the interactive approach made it interesting for them.

WADA had taken the sport physicians toolkit that it had and placed it online on an e-learning platform, and it would be ready in June/July 2014 and WADA would, of course, inform the members when it was officially online.

Finally, WADA was planning to revamp the Coach True programme in 2015 so that it could be used on platforms such as iPad and Android systems, as it was not at that moment.

DECISION

Education update noted.

– 10.4 Programme Development

MR KOEHLER said that the full report was in the members' files, but he wanted to highlight a few things within the report. One was that the RADOs had made significant progress. More testing was occurring within the RADOs, there was more education training and technical training as WADA moved towards the implementation of the 2015 Code. It was not just WADA doing the work; it was important to point out that there were several partners, including in particular the Olympic Council of Asia, which had hosted the third RADO conference, which Sir Reddie had attended, and it had looked at developing further resources to ensure that the RADOs would succeed and increase their capacity. The OCA had also developed a DCO exchange programme and an administrator programme to ensure that RADOs were exposed to different events throughout Asia. WADA had been working with and confirmed commitment from the Association of NOCs, and was currently engaging the European Olympic Committees and the African Olympic Committees and would move forward to engage PASO in the coming months.

Another area of WADA support in Asia was the Japanese Government, which had provided an additional 132,000 dollars that year for the RADOs and, since 2008, had provided over a million dollars to help develop Asian RADOs. The Australian Government had also committed 252,000 dollars over the past few years to the Oceania RADO to cover staff and education initiatives within the region, and the New Zealand Government had provided a testing grant to help out within Oceania through Drug Free Sport New Zealand. WADA had also engaged Anti-Doping Norway and CHINADA, which were helping with the African Zone V RADO in Kenya, and the Norwegian Government had pledged money to assist with the staffing of an additional person in that office. When it came to NADOs, WADA sought assistance from over ten well-established NADOs to help with the

RADO programme. For example, some years previously, Saudi Arabia had provided 25,000 dollars to help with education in the region. One of the NADOs that had committed the most internal resources was UK Anti-Doping, which had helped with over five RADOs and had pledged its commitment again in 2014 to help out with all the RADOs requiring assistance. The South African ADO continued to assist with the African RADOs, mainly the English-speaking ones, and the AFLD had continued to help with the French-speaking African countries. Also much appreciated was the assistance provided by Canada to Jamaica and African countries. On behalf of the 15 RADOs, which comprised 123 countries, he thanked all those helping with their development.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he had gone to the RADO conference, and it had been stimulating in every way. Huge amounts of great work were being done and there was a great degree of cooperation, not just monetary, so it was very encouraging.

MR PENGILLY mentioned a point that was perhaps indirectly related to education but certainly related to social science research, so he might be directing the question to the wrong people. It related to doping prevalence and the fact that the members had been told at certain Foundation Board meetings that there was some research into this going on and he asked for an update on the situation and how that was moving forward.

MR KOEHLER responded that there had been a project and WADA was still talking to the IAAF about the results of the project and was waiting to hear back from the IAAF.

DECISION

Programme development update noted.

– 10.5 Governments

DR AL KONBAZ informed the members that, on 30 April 2014, there had been a bureau meeting seven months after the fourth conference of parties at the UNESCO headquarters. The main purpose of the ad hoc meeting of the bureau had been to discuss the forthcoming conference of parties in 2015. After discussion, the bureau had recommended maintaining the conference of parties in 2015 at the UNESCO headquarters and would propose at the fifth session that the members consider holding the conference of parties in 2017 outside Paris. There had also been discussion of compliance challenges based on gaps and weaknesses and the fulfilment by the public authorities of key obligations under the convention. The compliance report showed that there were gaps in the implementation and application of the convention responsibilities. The absence of binding obligations made compliance with the anti-doping programme difficult, especially with regard to articles 8 and 10 of the convention which had been identified as being particularly relevant. The debate had focused on how best to address compliance improvement. Hence, the secretariat had invited three experts to make presentations. The first presentation had mainly focused on the difficulties regarding the use of supplements by athletes as an established part of sport practice and compliance and understanding the Prohibited List. Supplement use was problematic because it was estimated that 10-15% of supplements available in France contained banned substances. The Prohibited List was fluid, complex and difficult to use as a prevention tool and it was possible that athletes could feel trapped by the rule of the double standard applied to supplement use. The outcome of the discussion had been a recommendation that the Prohibited List be made more accessible and easy for athletes to understand. For supplements, standards on labelling were essential to provide a consistent message. Work done to date had resulted in the identification of numerous supplements as risk supplements in France where doping was concerned. A proposal had been made to create a worldwide database to be used by states parties to help eradicate involuntary doping. States parties would contribute to the database from their own experience, and access would be via a mobile application that states parties could make available to their athletes. There had been no direct contact as yet with WADA about the proposed project, but there was a feeling that it was essential and it was known that countries such as the UK, Switzerland and Australia had similar databases, but for medication and not for supplements. The idea would be to have some sort of integration to enable as much information as possible to be made available to the athletes. The secretariat had commented that the project was of interest. As the chairperson, he had commented that

the proposal was excellent and would make a big difference to the athletes; however, there were some setbacks. Some companies added prohibited substances to their products to use as a marketing tool. The bureau had expressed the feeling that the issue needed to be explored and that there should be a review of the implementation data.

Another speaker, an expert in social science and doping at Paris Ouest University in France, had proposed examining the compliance of five countries in 2014 with a further 25 states in 2015 and 2016, funded by the UNESCO voluntary fund. He would leave that part to Mr Schischlik, who would provide more detail, but the bureau had suggested that social research was a core component in prevention strategy and could be discussed at the WADA Foundation Board meeting in May.

The third presentation had been on a logic system. An expert in the field had presented to the bureau the current logic system record and current and historical compliance. Mr Schischlik would also give more details on the proposal. After discussion, the bureau had acknowledged the important proposal and the necessary adjustment. In conclusion, he thanked everybody involved.

On behalf of UNESCO, MR SCHISCHLIK congratulated Sir Reddie and Dr Stofile on their election as President and Vice-President of WADA. It was crucial that he intervene on behalf of UNESCO in order to provide a context as to how the anti-doping convention had been developed within the organisation. The members had to understand that UNESCO had experienced a tremendous financial crisis, which the members might have seen in the press, and the total funding of UNESCO had been reduced by about 30% subsequent to the admission of Palestine as a member state. In spite of the very critical situation regarding the budget and staffing of the organisation, the director general had ensured that the same regular budget would be allotted to the secretariat of the anti-doping convention, together with the appropriate staffing, which was an enormous achievement.

He commented on some important points in the context of what Dr Al Konbaz had just reported. Effectively, the only task UNESCO had was to ensure that the monitoring of the international convention on doping in sport was efficient and, even more so, that the results reported back were credible, and the meeting of the bureau that had taken place some weeks previously in Paris had been to see how far the 28 questions that were reported back in the web-based application, without having any further visits to states parties, were credible and how deeply the states parties really went when reporting back. One needed peer learning and peer mentoring and things that WADA was doing through the NADOs, and which he would like to see being done with governments, and that was what was being developed in the consultations being held with the different stakeholders to improve that.

One of the projects presented on Friday 23 May to the approval committee of the international fund against doping in sport was precisely about reviewing national policies and legislation and different rules that existed in order to improve the status of the fight against doping in sport through peer learning and peer mentoring. Dr Al Konbaz had mentioned two articles in the convention on trafficking and nutritional supplements, and they were the most difficult to monitor for UNESCO because the two areas were not within the reach of the ministries of sport, which were the focal point for UNESCO, but in the ministries of health, justice and others, and that was the big issue being faced, and it was why the international convention was so different to the World Anti-Doping Code, because the international convention against doping in sport created a governmental obligation to look into the issues outside sport and it had to be used in a much better way, and it was very complex to do that, and the few examples mentioned by Dr Konbaz showed how difficult it was to get hold of even the formula of the nutritional supplements.

He reiterated what had been mentioned about the efforts that the Council of Europe wished to undertake to revisit how member states of the Council of Europe reported back to the Council of Europe on the convention and not duplicate efforts regarding the monitoring of the UNESCO convention, and debates were currently ongoing between the two organisations.

On the social science research project mentioned by Dr Konbaz, in order to interpret the information provided by the states parties in the system, UNESCO wanted to go into greater depth to actually understand how that was done, because the reporting was a little too loose and too light to understand exactly how the different actors of a country cooperated and made progress, so the narrative data currently being collected was not sufficient, and it was necessary to adapt, after eight years of the convention, how UNESCO asked the questions and got answers to the modern era. One of the special items discussed that morning in that context was how states parties would be able to respond to article 22 of the new World Anti-Doping Code, because it was not sure, and that had also been discussed with the bureau, that states parties, which had ratified the convention in its 2005 format, with the latest developments proposed by the Johannesburg conference, would be able to adjust their policies and legal obligations within the country to the Code. That was an ongoing discussion, but it was very important to address it at the next conference of parties in 2015.

He reiterated how important it was to be involved in the education project mentioned by Mr Koehler. It was not about creating new tools, but more about introducing anti-doping and sport values education in school curricula. It was not having some convinced teachers doing it now and again; it had to be systematically introduced in school curricula and UNESCO was particularly well placed, as it had an education mandate and worked with the education authorities of the countries.

Everything he had been saying was part of the revision of the memorandum of understanding with WADA which he hoped to progress shortly so as to be able to go deeper with a memorandum of understanding with WADA.

Regarding item 11 on the agenda on the next dates of the Foundation Board meetings, it might be necessary to discuss dates when planning the November meeting of the Foundation Board, to somehow combine that with the meeting of the conference of parties so as to be sure that it did not jeopardise the Foundation Board meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he really accepted the difficulties on issues of trafficking and supplements. They were issues WADA confronted as well and he did understand the complexities. He thanked Mr Schischlik.

DR AL KONBAZ stated that, after the implementation of the new Code in 2015, he thought that there were some legal differences or conflicts between the UNESCO convention and the new Code and, of course, he was not a legal expert, but he thought that a solution had to be found, and perhaps WADA and UNESCO had to work together to at least review the convention and compliance with the new Code or if there were some differences.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI said that she appreciated the report on UNESCO and in particular could confirm absolutely that the Council of Europe was working with UNESCO with a view to facilitating the question of monitoring. She wished to use the opportunity under the item on the agenda to say a few words on an important initiative not directly linked to anti-doping per se but nonetheless at the heart of the objective of protecting the integrity of sport, and she referred to the Council of Europe's forthcoming convention on match-fixing and illegal betting. The Council of Europe had been working on the preparation of a legal instrument in the field very intensively over the past few years in close cooperation with a number of partners, including the IOC, which had supported the Council of Europe from the beginning, for which it was very grateful. Other organisations such as Interpol, the EU and others had also been cooperating. She mentioned in particular the close interest and involvement of many countries outside the 47 member states of the Council of Europe, including the USA, Mexico, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, Belarus and Morocco. The Council of Europe was at the very final stages and the expectation was that, at the ministerial meeting of ministers of sport in Switzerland in September, the convention would be open for signatures. She therefore warmly invited those around the table who might be interested in learning more about the convention to go and see her during the break.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the members. He was well aware of the interest and support from the IOC as far as the convention on match-fixing was concerned and noted that it

was necessary to work together closely as often as possible to ensure that the services and policies that best suited the athletes of the world were delivered.

Were there any questions on the paper on statistics?

DECISION

Governments update noted.

– 10.6 International Federations

10.6.1 International Federations update

MR DONZÉ said that he would combine his reports on IFs and the European regional office. Based in Lausanne, Switzerland, the regional office was in an ideal location to act as a liaison with IFs and also IF umbrella organisations, such as ASOIF, AWOIF, ARISF, SportAccord and also other bodies based in Europe such as the European Olympic Committees and the Eastern European RADO.

The office had had quite a busy beginning of the year with the adoption of the World Anti-Doping Code and the international standards 2015 at the World Conference on Doping in Sport in Johannesburg the previous November. The office had spent quite a significant amount of time and energy and would continue to do so that year in collaboration with a number of departments at WADA, including the Legal Department, but also with SportAccord, which had been very helpful in that regard. The office had spent quite a bit of time supporting and encouraging IFs to start work as soon as possible on the revision of their anti-doping rules and the implementation of the 2015 Code. The objective was really to ensure that all IFs had revised anti-doping rules in place by 31 December that year to ensure that they were in line with the World Anti-Doping Code. The office had also been active in reaching out to IF presidents and would continue to do so and organise meetings with the WADA President to further enhance relations between WADA and the IFs, and the office had continued to be constantly involved in the development of a number of WADA programmes and activities with a direct impact on the IFs, and he was thinking in particular about the Athlete Biological Passport, the development of a number of education tools including the new ALPHA tool, but also projects such as the development of the technical document on sport specific analysis, an issue on which the office had worked closely with Messrs Andersen and Ricketts.

DR AJÁN stated that, in his federation, if any continental or world championships were organised, a special education symposium was organised to provide coaches and competitors with more information on anti-doping. He wished to thank WADA for its activities since its creation, which had fundamentally changed the picture and scenario of the anti-doping fight, and he mentioned his appreciation to the former presidents of WADA, Mr Pound and Mr Fahey, and Sir Craig Reedie as a former IF president and chairman of the BOA and vice-president of the IOC would completely understand the problem. He had asked for the floor to give information on three points that were not exactly acceptable in his IF's view. The implementation of the World Anti-Doping Code 2015 made it possible to be stricter and better organised and change the situation. He acknowledged the fact that there were certain sports that were more doping-sensitive and others that were less doping-sensitive. At the same time, there were huge and disproportionate differences between the quantity and quality of doping controls carried out by the various IFs. Without wishing to single out any sport, it was ridiculous that a sport labelled as doping-sensitive carried out several hundreds or even thousands of doping controls a year whilst another considered 200 or even less as too much. Mathematically, it was obvious that more tests would produce more positive cases; the problem was that the international media focused only on doping violations. He asked WADA to work towards a rational and objective harmonisation of annual testing numbers between the different sports. In that circle, it was not necessary to deny that there were differences between the quality levels and the rate of efficiency of the various WADA-accredited laboratories. The IWF had specific and proven experience that any analysis of the same sample could produce different results in two different laboratories. The IWF was one of the few IFs to have tested all its athletes prior to the games and had been

among the first IFs to implement out-of-competition testing. The IWF wanted to be sure that the structures would be in place in advance and totally reliable. He trusted that WADA would be able to provide reassurance on that point.

Another important fact in connection with that was the shift the emphasis on sport-specific analysis. Both issues previously outlined had a great impact on the support of the IF leadership. The member federations would understandably prefer to choose the easy way regarding the number of controls and the choice of laboratories.

His next remark concerned the NADOs. The IWF was working with 187 member countries. Unfortunately, there were significant differences between the activities, reliability and dedication and involvement of the NADOs in the various countries. He wanted to be sure that all the different stakeholders, the NOCs, NFs, IFs and NADOs, shared the same responsibilities when it came to doping affairs and that WADA would consider all its signatories equally, including the governments. Equal treatment of all stakeholders would be a key step in the harmonisation process. The same shared responsibility should be reflected in the media's approach to doping, and he was sure that WADA, with its professional means and worldwide respect, could contribute to achieving a desirable change.

Regarding the implementation of the 2015 WADA Code, he thought it would lead to greater fairness and all stakeholders would have the same responsibilities when it came to contributing to good and fair doping controls.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he did not think anybody would question Dr Aján's last remark. That was what everybody was there for. If there were differences in quality, one of the objects of the exercise with the technical document was to try to deal with that situation. He did of course accept absolutely the comment that the media tended to be interested only in violations; good news did not sell newspapers while bad news did, and most of the people round the table would have been subjected to exactly that kind of interest.

He was not entirely sure that he understood or accepted the comment on the laboratories, and asked Dr Rabin to deal with that, because the accreditation and testing system operated by WADA was designed to make sure that the quality of the testing was universal across all laboratories, and there were differences in 187 countries and enormous IFs like the IWF. Again, it was the intention of the Code, as he understood it, to try to bring everybody up to the highest possible level rather than allow people to slip down below the standards. The WADA Foundation Board had started to look at the question of different tiers of compliance and he gave Dr Aján an undertaking that WADA would take his comments into account as it developed that philosophy.

DR RABIN stated that the situation to which Dr Aján was referring dated back a few years if he remembered well and, since then, the technical document for the MRPL had been adjusted. What WADA had to acknowledge, and that was something he had said previously to the Foundation Board, was that the objective was to harmonise the laboratories as much as possible, and WADA was probably conducting one of the most advanced EQAS programmes in the world, but WADA did not want to freeze the analytical methods in the laboratories, as that would go against the innovation and integration of new techniques in the laboratories, so WADA was constantly aligning the laboratories on the best methods, and that was why WADA adjusted the technical documents regularly. He could assure Dr Aján that the laboratories were reaching levels of sensitivity that were raising questions about the exposure of people to certain drugs, so WADA was really reaching some of the finest limits that could be achieved in analytical science.

THE CHAIRMAN concluded that he heard what Dr Aján was saying, and was grateful for the comments.

DR AJÁN thanked the Chairman for the information. His IF had a very special anti-doping commission and in the future hoped to have close cooperation with the various WADA departments and the Athlete Committee, which could provide a lot of good proposals.

DECISION

International Federations update noted.

10.6.2 Anti-Doping Organisation Symposium report

MR DONZÉ highlighted a few points regarding the WADA ADO symposium held on 25 and 26 March 2014 in Lausanne. What had started as a small gathering of IFs had become the biggest annual gathering for the anti-doping community, bringing together all types of ADOs as defined by the World Anti-Doping Code, namely IFs, national and regional ADOs and major event organisations. That year, once again, there had been a record number of participants: there had been 350 at the Palais de Beaulieu in Lausanne, representing more than 170 different ADOs. He believed that it would be possible to continue to expand on the value of the symposium.

That year, two main themes had been covered, one on current issues, including the implementation of the 2015 Code and international standards, and another on the new and evolving strategies and tools to enhance the effectiveness of the fight against doping in sport. A number of current strategies had been discussed, including the Athlete Biological Passport, education, intelligence and investigation tools, new tools and strategies. WADA had been very pleased to have the active participation of the WADA Athlete Committee, and that had been welcomed by the participants and, in formal and informal feedback, there had been a call to repeat the experience and perhaps further involve the WADA Athlete Committee and athletes in general, so that was something that he would certainly bear in mind for the future.

More than the agenda, which was of course very important for participants to enhance their knowledge and expertise, as the majority of the participants were anti-doping practitioners, the symposium was a great opportunity for all participants to improve the sharing of experience and ultimately to enhance the trust and collaboration between ADOs, NADOs, IFs and other types of ADO for the benefit of clean athletes. As every year, a survey had been sent to all the participants, and overwhelmingly positive feedback had been received, formally and informally, and that certainly confirmed the value of the symposium, but WADA could not rest on its laurels and needed to look ahead and see how to capitalise on the success of the symposium, and how to further expand it whilst keeping it manageable. It was a symposium that to date had been managed essentially in-house by the European regional office. There would be an internal debriefing in the coming weeks in Montreal with all those involved in the organisation of the symposium to look at ways and means of managing the symposium to offer great value to the participants whilst keeping it manageable. Provisionally, 24 and 25 March 2015 had been blocked for the symposium at the Palais de Beaulieu in Lausanne. The members would certainly hear more in the coming days and weeks about the future of the symposium.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he could certainly confirm the scope and interest of the symposium. Were there any questions for Mr Donzé?

DECISION

Anti-Doping Organisation Symposium
report noted.

– 10.7 Regional Offices

10.7.1 Lausanne

Report given under item 10.6.1.

10.7.2 Cape Town

MR SWIGELAAR informed the members that there was a detailed report in the files, so he would highlight only one particular matter. In April, the Africa Zone V RADO had successfully hosted a regional workshop for governments and NOCs, primarily to discuss and deliberate the development of the RADO. It had been the first of its kind in Africa. Through the UNESCO voluntary fund, the RADO had received just under 50,000 US

dollars for the event. The RADO office, with the support of the member states and WADA, had developed the concept and proposal for the workshop. Following the UNESCO voluntary fund administrative procedures, Burundi as a state party had submitted and received the funds on behalf of the RADO. Following internal discussions, the RADO office based in Kenya had approached the Egyptian Government to host the event. All the RADO member countries had attended and it had been very encouraging to witness the enthusiastic deliberations and debate as the stakeholders sought to find the best solutions to the many challenges individual countries and the region in general faced in their attempt to contribute meaningfully to the RADO and anti-doping. The primary objective of the workshop had been to get all the players together to take stock of the development of the RADO and also to do introspection insofar as support to the RADO was concerned. The forum had also provided ministers and NOC leaders and the RADO office and board members with an opportunity to reflect on what needed to be done to ensure the continued development of the RADO and the role that potential partners and future partnerships could play in strengthening the role of the RADO. The workshop had been very successful, with key recommendations focusing on the most realistic and relevant needs of the RADO in the region. Besides recommitting and reaffirming their support to the RADO, NOCs and governments had committed to work together and to explore possibilities in order to find common ground on how to share responsibilities. It had also been very heartening to receive from the IAAF, which had been invited to attend and present on the action plans, huge endorsement of the RADO for the work and potential future role in the deliverance of the IAAF's anti-doping programme in one of its most important regions. UNESCO should receive a report on the project and he was confident that many other RADOs would benefit from arranging similar events.

It was only through the creation of opportunities for stakeholders to engage that the RADOs would continue to develop and serve the regions, especially considering the importance of the structures foreseen in the 2015 revised Code. Finally, the forum had expressed thanks to WADA for its continued support, advice and guidance, without which many of the countries would not have been able to achieve compliance status.

10.7.3 Tokyo

MR HAYASHI said that the Tokyo office highlighted its strategic partners in the region. Partner number one was the RADOs. There were six RADOs in the region and, through the RADO framework, national anti-doping control programmes were strongly promoted. The key partners were the RADO office and its host country, the chairman and board members representing each country, endorsed by the NOCs and governments. Programme supporters included continental and Olympic associations and sports event organisers to host regional games. Strategic partners, including the Olympic Council of Asia and the Oceania NOC, were also very vital to the regional office's activities. Without their cooperation and support, the regional office would not have been able to achieve any of its goals. They provided regional stakeholders with various forms of contribution, such as DCO exchange programmes, youth camps, outreach and other sports events, especially in support of RADO programmes and development. They also coordinated with other sport movements, the IOC and major games organising committees for anti-doping programme development.

The role of the government was also important for the regional office, not only in terms of finance but also in terms of anti-doping policy development, including the UNESCO convention, to support the NADOs and RADOs in the region.

The Asian Foundation Board members' meeting and annual intergovernmental meeting on anti-doping functioned well to promote the policies, especially contributions to WADA and support of RADO activities.

The establishment of the Asian Anti-Doping Foundation and active funding of the UNESCO fund were proof of government initiatives in the region. Active cooperation for the new research fund by governments in the region was also expected to respond positively to the recent IOC initiative. The slide showed the recent additional contributions from governments in the region. As his colleague had also mentioned,

support to regional anti-doping programmes was supplemented by the additional contributions.

In the Asian region, as well as in the African region, UNESCO was an indispensable supporter of anti-doping activities, especially educational programmes. Also, the regional office encouraged the governments to ratify the UNESCO convention and also requested that all states parties in the region apply for the UNESCO fund. He appreciated Dr Al Konbaz's leadership in terms of WADA-UNESCO cooperation, especially in the Asian region.

The slide on the screen showed the situation regarding ratification. 30 countries had already ratified the convention in Asia and 14 countries out of 17 countries had ratified in Oceania. Almost half of the countries in the region were already funded by UNESCO funds.

Finally, he referred to the fact that strong support from developed NADOs was essential. The Japanese, Korean and Chinese anti-doping agencies and the Australian sports anti-doping agency were role models as well as major supporters of regional development, providing programmes at bilateral, regional and international levels.

10.7.4 Montevideo

MS PESCE informed the members that, after the World Conference on Doping in Sport in Johannesburg, the main objective of the regional office activities had been to make stakeholders aware of the Code and standard changes so as to start planning how to implement the changes and improve their anti-doping programmes. The third South American anti-doping legal seminar had been co-organised by WADA and the sport ministry of Uruguay, which had hosted the event in Montevideo, consisting of an overview of WADA's work in Latin America and presentations on how to best implement anti-doping rules in compliance with the Code. A series of breakout sessions and presentations from the region had provided the countries with an opportunity to share experience and expertise. A significant outcome of the seminar had been the establishment of a forum of dialogue among participants, which should continue to exist in the future to ensure that better practice in terms of Code implementation was widespread throughout the region.

The regional office had attended the Americas governmental meetings of sport ministers held in Santiago, Chile, in the first week of March. Presentations had been delivered by CADE, CONSUDE and CID. The message of the need to improve capacity-building in anti-doping structures to be able to meet the new Code requirements had been included in the CADE declaration as an aspect for the continuation of work.

Finally, anti-doping education was still a high priority on the agenda of governments and sport movements in the region. Participants at the WADA Latin American Anti-Doping Symposium held in 2013 had declared 10 April Play True Day, with the objective of carrying out different activities related to anti-doping education with much cultural diversity but unified in one simple message. The Anti-Doping Commission of Puerto Rico had organised the first Play True Day with the support of the UNESCO fund against doping in sport and under the auspices of the NOC and the sport ministry. It had included a Play True theatre contest with plays of doping-related examples and situations. Theatre had proven to be an innovative way of reaching a young audience. A group of athletes had raised the Play True flag that they had created, and also read and committed to the Play True pledge on behalf of Puerto Rico's athletes.

The entry into force of the new Code and standards represented a challenge for everybody. If anti-doping programmes were developed in cooperation with the various countries and WADA, it would be possible to ensure a structured and continuous development towards compliance.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that the members would see the interplay between the regional offices, the RADOs, UNESCO and the governments, which played a very important role in the work of the agency.

MR ORTA RODRÍGUEZ informed the members of the Foundation Board that the regional office, which helped CONCECADE, which comprised 14 countries in Central America and the Caribbean, had played a key role in what Ms Pesce had just presented. He had become president only a few months previously, and the regional office had helped to convey the message. It prepared the ground for the development and application of the standards and rules of WADA.

MR IRURUETA also underlined the importance of the education seminars. For some time, it had been stated that one of the main ways to fight against doping in sport was to start with young people by reinforcing values, and sport provided a way of doing that. That interest should be combined with the interests of WADA to introduce anti-doping education and values in the educational system. He thought that it was necessary to continue working in that field. He underscored the importance of the meetings in which the various experiences of different countries and opinions could be exchanged. Those who were not yet applying adequate rules might avail themselves of the experience of other countries. He was grateful for the work of the regional office and, as the countries united, they became stronger in the fight against doping in sport.

DECISION

Regional office updates noted.

– 10.8 Communications

10.8.1 Athlete Committee Chair report

MS SCOTT informed the members that there had been a meeting of the Athlete Committee in Lausanne at the end of March in conjunction with the WADA anti-doping organisation symposium held there as well. That had been done deliberately to allow the Athlete Committee members to learn from and take part in many of the presentations there and meet and interact more with the anti-doping community. It had been a very valuable experience.

Several new members had been welcomed to the committee that year. The committee was very engaged and interested and lively. The group was very diverse and dynamic, with varied representation in terms of sport and countries, and that was very inspirational for her as the chairperson.

One of the main objectives during the meeting had been to take a look at the athlete reference guide to the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code. It had not been made available for distribution as yet, as there were a few more changes that needed to be made. It had been spearheaded by the committee with the objective of helping athletes understand the Code and the world of anti-doping in general. Often, athletes were some of the least informed out there, so this was an opportunity to bring them a more broken-down version of the Code to help them understand it. It would be made available online as well as in hard copy to be distributed at various locations and venues. The Athlete Committee was very pleased with the outcome and thought that it would be very well received by the athlete community. The tone of the document and the information was well and clearly established and she thought that all the members were very pleased with the outcome and the finished product.

There had been a lot of discussion about education, and the Athlete Committee had been liaising with Mr Moses and the Education Committee at WADA. That was a very productive partnership and she looked forward to continued collaboration and communication between the two groups.

That more or less summed up the WADA Athlete Committee meeting at the end of March. The next meeting would be in Korea in conjunction with the Asian Games and she looked forward to meeting there.

MR IRURUETA thanked Ms Scott for her presentation. Would it be possible to send the document with the simplified Code so as to make it available to the athletes? As had been done in Uruguay with some of the standards, he offered to have the document translated into Spanish, as it would be very useful to have the guide available in his

region. It was important, not only for the athletes. On several occasions, managers and coaches were not aware of the rules according to which they would be judged, and all efforts to ensure in-depth knowledge of the Code and the rules would be welcome. If the document could be made available, he offered to have it translated into Spanish.

MS SCOTT said that the intent was to make it widely available to everybody interested in obtaining a copy and she would undertake the process of getting it translated into as many other languages as necessary. She agreed that it would be of great value to coaches as well. She would ensure that it got into the hands of those who needed it.

10.8.2 Communications update

MS MASSE said that she would briefly highlight three points in the report that the members had in their files. It was a very busy year for the Outreach programme: WADA would be participating in seven events. The members had heard earlier about the successful delivery of the Sochi events, and at that date there were four more Outreach events to deliver: the African Youth Games in Botswana, the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow, the Youth Olympic Games in Nanjing and the Asian Games in Incheon. She highlighted the fact that 30 representatives from ADOs had been recruited to participate in the Outreach programme in 2014, in line with WADA's strategy to help build capacity within the anti-doping community. One often heard the following year or months after such representatives returned about the uptake of the Outreach model or requests for support or assistance in better defining their programmes, so activity did take place following such participation.

The Play True quiz had been redesigned in the past few months and optimised and was currently hosting the newly developed youth quiz, which was on trial and would be fully launched at the Youth Olympic Games.

The WADA website had been undergoing a complete revamp primarily to enhance user experience and help everybody find their documents, and that would be launched sometime towards the end of June.

DECISION

Communications updates noted.

– 10.9 Standards and harmonisation

MR ANDERSEN said that he had one issue related to statistics and that had been raised that morning in terms of the result management by Mr Budgett and Professor Dvorak. The question was what happened with all the results, because the statistics from ADAMS gave results on analytical findings and atypical findings. There were around 3,000-4,000 of those. What happened to those results? WADA had started collecting information for every adverse and atypical finding in a system whereby it would be possible to provide systematic information on who the test had been conducted on, the country, the testing authority, when the test had been taken, whether the test had been a targeted, random, in-competition or out-of-competition test, and whether the atypical result had been based on the whereabouts information, which might be of use to everybody. WADA was collecting all the information and asking the ADOs to submit it to WADA. WADA had only about 30% to date, so he asked the ADOs to submit the information so as to enable WADA to take advantage of it and provide some trends in terms of results.

Since this was his last official meeting as a WADA director, he thanked WADA for having given him the opportunity to be part of an amazing and extremely competent team over the past 12 years. It was and had been a tremendous privilege to work for an organisation with such a noble objective, the most important being to protect clean athletes and work towards a level playing field. Unlike some people who constantly expressed scepticism and undue concerns, he was very confident that WADA was on the right track. During his 12 years at WADA, he had been through the development and enhancement of three different versions of the Code, the last being the one he clearly believed was the most advanced in terms of the ability to catch cheats and protect clean

athletes. When the implementation and compliance strategy came into play in 2015, WADA would have all the tools it needed to take the fight to new heights. The biggest hurdle and challenge of all was to ensure that the struggle to protect clean athletes came from the soul and the heart of each sporting and governmental anti-doping organisation, and not because they were being told to do so. He had met a lot of good people while at WADA and would cherish the memories, friendship and shared commitment to protect clean athletes. While he was leaving WADA, he was not leaving sport and was certainly not leaving anti-doping. He looked forward to working with everybody from his new base in Norway. He thanked WADA, all of the staff and colleagues, his dedicated assistant Marilyn, Mr Pound, Mr Fahey, Sir Craig Reddie, Mr Syvasalmi and not least Mr Howman, who had led the staff in an extremely dedicated and professional manner. He would always cherish the fine time he had spent at WADA and thanked everybody again.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Andersen, who would gather from the applause how grateful WADA was to him for all his efforts. WADA had had one of the world's leading experts working with it for 12 years. He was very grateful to Norway for letting Mr Andersen work at WADA and hoped that Norway would welcome Mr Andersen back with open arms. If Mr Andersen had any spare time and was offered even a part-time appointment with the Oslo bid committee, he begged Mr Andersen to accept it.

DECISION

Standards and harmonisation update noted.

11. Any other business/future meetings

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, on the question of dates, any number of the members had approached him to ask whether there was any way the meetings might be held in the middle of the week as opposed to at the weekend. WADA would of course discuss with Dr Al Konbaz a date for November the following year so as not to clash with the conference of parties. He was wise enough as a chairman not to get involved in an argument about dates, but the issue was whether people were happy to meet mid-week as opposed to at weekends. He would set a date of 15 June for anybody who had really strong feelings against meeting mid-week instead of at weekends to respond because, as everybody got busier, it seemed to him that weekends became ever more precious. He asked the members to take a note and by 15 June to get in touch with the office with their thoughts. WADA would try to move the meetings to mid-week unless there was a huge move against it.

He thanked everybody for their attendance, including the interpreters, the people who had provided all the excellent visual presentations, which added greatly to the success of the meeting, and Mr Howman and all the WADA staff as always for the way in which they welcomed the members, presented the papers and allowed the members to conduct the meetings. Finally he thanked all the members. As they would see, WADA was definitely making progress. There was willingness in that room and accord on which to move forward and make progress. He was very grateful to everybody. He wished the members a very safe journey home.

DECISION

Executive Committee – 20 September 2014, Lausanne, Switzerland;
Executive Committee – 15 November 2014, Paris, France;
Foundation Board – 16 November 2014, Paris, France;
Executive Committee – 23 May 2015, location to be confirmed;
Foundation Board – 24 May 2015, location to be confirmed;
Executive Committee – 19 September 2015, location to be confirmed;

Executive Committee – 21 November 2015,
location to be confirmed;
Foundation Board – 22 November 2015,
location to be confirmed.

The meeting adjourned at 2.15 pm.

FOR APPROVAL

SIR CRAIG REEDIE
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA