

**Minutes of the WADA Foundation Board Meeting
12 May 2016, 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 at a new venue in Montreal, if anything an even bigger room than the members were used to, so he apologised if his tired eyes could not see who was at the other end of the table.

The meeting was open by tradition, and there were a number of representatives of the media present. He reminded the members of that at the outset, so that they could carefully consider what they said, as it would be very accurately recorded.

He briefly welcomed one or two new faces: Mr Lalovic, the President of United World Wrestling, who was joining the WADA Foundation Board for the first time, and Mr Patel, from the UK, who had to stand in for his minister, Tracey Crouch, who was currently on maternity leave. The member from Namibia was missing, but there was a new deputy, Ms Tjongarero, and Mr Kimura from Japan was a new deputy for Mr Tomioka.

The format was the same as normal, although slightly different at the top table, as he had asked Mr Niggli, who would be taking over from Mr Howman as director general of WADA at the beginning of July to join him and Mr Howman.

As far as he could see in terms of roll call, there was a very full attendance. WADA was missing the Vice-President, Dr Stofile, Mr Luembe from Gabon, Mr Infante from CONCECADE, Ms Riffo from Chile, and one European seat, which had yet to be filled. Everybody else was very welcome.

The following members attended the meeting: Sir Craig Reedie, President and Chairman of WADA; Mr Toni Pascual, Chairman, IPC Anti-Doping Committee; Mr Nenad Lalovic, Member of the IOC, President, United World Wrestling; Mr Patrick Baumann, Member of the IOC, Secretary General, FIBA; Dr Budgett, representing Dr Robin Mitchell, Member of the IOC, President, Oceania National Olympic Committees; Mr Richard Pound, IOC Member; Ms Rania Elwani, ANOC Representative; Mr Fabio Pigozzi, President, International Federation of Sports Medicine; Professor Eduardo Henrique de Rose, President, PASO Medical Commission; Mr Andrey Kryukov, Executive Board Member, Kazakhstan National Olympic Committee; 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, Chairman of ASOIF; Mr Gian Franco Kasper, Member of the IOC, President of FIS; Mr Anders Besseberg, President of the IBU; Ms Claudia Bokel, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Adam Pengilly, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Nicholson, representing Ms Kirsty Coventry, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Tony Estanguet, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Patel, representing Ms Tracey Crouch, Minister for Sport, United Kingdom; Mr Chris Agius, Hon. Parliamentary Secretary for Research, Innovation, Youth and Sport, Republic of Malta; Mr Philippe Muyters, Flemish Minister for Finance, Budget, Work, Town and Country Planning and Sport; Ms Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Deputy Secretary General, Council of Europe; Mr Redwan Hussien, Minister of Youth and Sport, Ethiopia; Ms Tjongarero, representing Mr Jerry Ekandjo, Minister of Sport, Youth and National Service, Namibia; Mr Moses, representing Mr Michael K. Gottlieb, National Program Director, White House Drug Policy Office, Executive Office

of the President, USA; Ms Carla Qualtrough, Minister of Sport and Persons with Disabilities, Canada; Mr Kimura, representing Mr Tsutomu Tomioka, State Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan; Mr Jeong, representing Mr Chong Kim, Vice Minister, Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Republic of Korea; Mr Mohammed Saleh Al Konbaz, President, Saudi Arabian Anti-Doping Committee, Saudi Arabia; Mr Yingchuan Li, Assistant Minister, General Administration of Sport, China; Mr Godkin, representing Ms Sussan Ley, Minister for Sport, Australia; Mr Gendall, representing Dr Jonathan Coleman, Minister for Sport and Recreation, New Zealand; Mr David Howman, WADA Director General; Mr Olivier Niggli, Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel, WADA; Mr Tim Ricketts, Standards and Harmonisation Director, WADA; Mr Rob Koehler, Deputy Director General, WADA; Ms Catherine MacLean, Communications Director, WADA; Dr Alan Vernec, Medical Director, WADA; Dr Olivier Rabin, Science Director, WADA; Mr Kazuhiro Hayashi, Asia/Oceania Regional Office Director; Ms Maria José Pesce, Latin America Regional Office Director; Mr Frédéric Donzé, Director of the European Regional Office and IF Relations, WADA; and Mr Rodney Swigelaar, Africa Regional Office Director.

The following observers signed the roll call: Thorhild Widvey (WADA Executive Committee member); Valérie Fourneyron (WADA Chair, Health Medical and Research Committee); Beckie Scott (WADA Chair, Athlete Committee); Rune Andersen; Eva Bruusgaard; Philip Bunt; Taera Choi; Kenny Lee; Zhixue Jiang; Yahuan Hu; Sergey Khrychikov; Rafal Piechota; An Vermeersch; Shin Asakawa; Ayako Ito; Jugo Imaizumi; Tatsuya Sugai; Keiko Uchitani; Koichi Yamamura; Christian Thill; Walter Palmer; Andréanne Morin; Valérie Amant; Kristina Molloy; Joe Van Ryn; Jeremy Luke; Paul Melia; Lucienne Attard; Marcellin Dally; Kari Tollikko; Olivier Fontaine; Victoria Katukula; René Bouchard; Joseph de Pencier; Erik Johannesson; Louise Barton; Simon Cléroux-Campeau; Roxanne Malo-Lauzon; and Linda Beauparlant.

– 1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members if they had a conflict of interest on any item to be discussed on the agenda. In the absence of any conflicts of interest, he proceeded.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 18 November 2015 in Colorado Springs

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the minutes of the previous Foundation Board meeting, held in Colorado Springs on 18 November 2015. The very full minutes had been circulated to the members; there had been no observations on them. Were they a true record of what had happened at that meeting? If so, he would sign them as a correct record of the meeting.

DECISION

Minutes of the meeting of the Foundation Board on 18 November 2015 approved and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE CHAIRMAN stated that the Executive Committee had dealt the previous day with a particular item. A number of the Foundation Board members would have received correspondence over the past five or six months from Hein Verbruggen, a former Foundation Board member and an honorary member of the IOC. The Executive Committee had met the previous day at an in camera session and had taken a unanimous decision to answer the five questions asked by Mr Verbruggen (which had been done, and the answers would be sent to him at the end of the meeting), and that no further steps would be taken, as the matter was already in the hands of the lawyers of WADA, in the hope that Mr Verbruggen would cease and desist from any further allegations. He had to report that formally to the Foundation Board.

MR POUND said that he thought the time had come (in fact it had come a long time previously) whereby the conduct of defaming WADA, defaming its Director General and defaming

members of the Foundation Board ought to be brought formally to the attention of the IOC ethics commission, and he urged the Chairman of WADA to do just that.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that Mr Verbruggen had made the complaint to the IOC ethics commission; under the revised rules of the IOC ethics commission, it did not have jurisdiction over WADA, so would not deal with it. The point raised by Mr Pound would apply only to members of the IOC. He noted carefully what Mr Pound had said.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that he would add to the written report that they had in their files by making a few observations on some of the issues listed therein.

The first item was UNESCO, and he had attached to his report the memorandum of understanding that WADA had signed with UNESCO and which had led to a number of practical activities with UNESCO that had been most helpful to both organisations. For example, WADA had an open invitation to attend the bureau meeting that UNESCO held on a twice-yearly basis. WADA was, of course, an observer to the voluntary fund committee and was liaising regularly with UNESCO in relation to matters of compliance. Regarding the UNESCO convention, the director general of UNESCO had sent letters of non-compliance to states parties that had not responded appropriately to the questionnaire, and they had been given until the end of February 2017 to remedy such issues. The other matter in relation to UNESCO that he wished to raise was that there were two further countries in the pipeline with their ratifications: Sierra Leone and Laos. WADA had seen the soft copies of those ratifications but, of course, the hard copies had to be sent to Paris and be dealt with legally in that city.

The relationship with Interpol had continued in a healthy fashion. The President and Mr Niggli had met with high-ranking officials at Interpol the previous month, and that would only help further the relationship that WADA had with Interpol.

In relation to the World Customs Organization (WCO), WADA at last had a secondment to the head office in Brussels, and he thanked France very much for seconding one of its officers accordingly. He looked forward to the practicalities that would come from such an appointment.

He had raised two countries in his report. That was the last time they would be contained in a director general's report. Going forward, matters would be raised either by the Compliance Review Committee or by Mr Koehler in his report on NADOs and RADOs. He mentioned the two for a specific reason, because there had been a lot of attention on them. The first was Brazil. Brazil had been removed from the watch list of those not compliant, as a presidential decree had been passed in March by the president of Brazil. There was another step still to be taken by the parliament, which had to ratify the decree by passing appropriate legislation, so there was still work to be done in the country, none of which would affect the operation of a doping control system at the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

Kenya was the other country he had mentioned, and the members would hear more about that when the Compliance Review Committee reported. He suggested that they not ask him for comments on Kenya until they heard that report.

He made a strong statement in his report about the management and the amount of work created by decisions of non-compliance for WADA. The management had spent a lot of time and resources, including financial resources, in relation to the assistance that WADA gave to signatories deemed to be non-compliant. That had inevitably meant that other activities conducted by WADA had been put on the back-burner, and had also meant that WADA had had to divert finance from other activities to that. In the corporate world, some things were run in relation to compliance programmes. The first was that, in some countries, those being investigated knew in advance that they would be meeting the costs of such investigation. That led to some incentive to cooperate with the investigators, simply to ensure that they reduced the costs of such investigation. He put that on the table as something he thought would be worthy of consideration by the Foundation Board. He also mentioned the possibility of imposing monetary penalties or costs on those who were not compliant. He urged the members to give appropriate consideration to that suggestion.

Turning to the Special Research Fund, WADA had been told that the IOC would match every dollar that WADA received by 31 March that year. WADA had received from governments 5,839,255 dollars and the IOC was matching that with a final payment to be made on 20 May of 285,810 dollars. In addition, WADA had been working with the Partnership for Clean Competition, which was a group comprising the major leagues in the USA, the USOC and USADA, and there were 4.5 million dollars being spent by them on anti-doping research in the same innovative fashion. WADA had an observer seat on the allocation committee to ensure that there was no duplication of projects. Finally, of the 10 million dollars that the IOC president had pledged for anti-doping research, 5.8 million had been spent, and the rest, 4.2 million dollars, would be spent on innovative research. As a result of that initiative, there were more than 20 million dollars presently available for innovative research.

In Colorado, the President had asked the governments to consider contributing to a special investigation fund, and he was pleased to announce that WADA had received contributions from Canada, New Zealand, Romania, Denmark and Japan. A couple more had pledged to consider their contributions at an appropriate time, and he would be having discussions with those countries in the coming months. WADA had received a total of 443,314 dollars to date. The President had advised him that he would raise that with the IOC with a view to obtaining matching funds.

In relation to raw materials, for some time, WADA had been working very hard with the Government of China in an attempt to see that the raw material business could be shut down as much as possible in that country. The government had agreed to pursue effective laws. There had been two meetings with multi-departmental groups in China to ensure that WADA could work with them on that. WADA had also involved Interpol through its memorandum of understanding so that information could be exchanged appropriately by authorities at their level. He was very grateful to the Government of China for working with WADA on that initiative and certainly looked forward to results in due course.

The final matter he wished to highlight concerned food contamination. There had been problems with clenbuterol being fed to cattle in Mexico and China. WADA knew that the problem had spread from Mexico to some other Central American countries, including Guatemala. A total of 106 clenbuterol cases had not been pursued in Mexico in recent months because of the high likelihood of food contamination. WADA was still working on a research project in Mexico, hopefully to get to a situation whereby clenbuterol taken through food could be distinguished from clenbuterol taken in other ways. That was a project in progress. It definitely needed to be resolved, and clean athletes definitely needed to know about it.

He referred to the decisions made the previous day by the Executive Committee. The first was that three Special Research Fund projects had been approved, and they related to autologous blood transfusion. The total amount committed was 739,217 dollars. Approval had been given to the technical document TD2016-19NA in relation to the reporting of nandrolone. A change had been made to article 4.4 of the ISL which in effect meant that, if a signatory country was deemed to be non-compliant through its NADO, the laboratory in that country would not automatically lose its accreditation. It would not lose its accreditation if 60% of its samples were received from outside the NADO. That would alleviate an issue raised by many members. The fourth decision was that the anti-doping centre in Moscow had been granted approval to conduct blood sample analysis pursuant to the Athlete Biological Passport. He emphasised that that was not a reaccreditation of the laboratory; it was an approval to conduct blood analysis only for the purpose of the Athlete Biological Passport. Changes had been made to the technical document in relation to the Athlete Biological Passport and, as a result, also a modification had been made to the ISTI, particularly the annexes to that document, to come into effect from 1 January 2017. After some discussion in relation to an issue put on the table by European countries, the process for allowing new signatories to the Code would remain as it was. That completed his report and the decisions from the previous day.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any questions.

MR POUND expressed curiosity about the Moscow laboratory. The reasons for its suspension and the ongoing process in relation to revocation of accreditation had not been so much related to its technical capacity as to its overall reliability, and he wondered what assurances had been put in place to make sure that it would be reliable for the purposes of blood testing and the Athlete Biological Passport.

MS BOKEL referred to the fact that Brazil and Kenya had been mentioned in the report, and stressed that it was important to look not only at compliance (although it would be good if they became compliant); WADA needed them to become effective as well. With the Olympic Games coming up, WADA needed effective ADOs.

MS SCOTT had a question about the funds available for special research as opposed to investigations. It seemed that there were millions of dollars for research and only 400,000 dollars for investigations. Was that funding restricted? There had been a significant philosophical shift some years previously, with a move towards investigations versus testing. Looking at recent events in Russia, there had been many more athletes exposed through investigations than through testing. She wondered whether WADA might work to increase the amount available for investigations or divert the funding from research to investigation.

MR RICCI BITTI echoed what Ms Bokel and Ms Scott had said. The philosophy of the Olympic Movement was to switch to investigations as a permanent activity of a compliance body, which was what WADA was. Recent events suggested that WADA should be equipped with a permanent investigation capacity. That would undoubtedly have an effect on the budget and finance. He gave the members the policy line, which was that investigations should be a permanent activity of the agency, rather than appointing a special commission, with all due respect for the outcomes, which had been very useful. The Olympic Movement believed that that should be the way forward in the future.

MR KIMURA thanked the Director General for the report and, on behalf of the Japanese Government, wished to touch upon three issues from the report. As mentioned in the report, Japan had taken a sports pharmacy system initiative, launched in 2009 by JADA, to certify qualified pharmacists who were trained to have accurate anti-doping knowledge and could provide appropriate advice to athletes on medicine and the effects of drugs on health. Japan was ready to share its experience and knowledge on the education and training of pharmacists to enable them to better deal with the Prohibited List.

In responding to the request of the President for contributions to the special investigation fund, Japan had expressed its intention to make a contribution of 20 million Japanese yen, equalling around 180,000 US dollars. Japan was highly interested in international cooperation, in particular with a view to the Tokyo Olympic Games in 2020, which should be clean and doping-free.

Lastly, regarding partnerships in the cooperation project, Japan would be hosting an international anti-doping seminar in December. The next WADA Athlete Committee meeting would be held in conjunction with the seminar as well. Efforts would be continued to build up a platform based on good practices and regional partnerships, in particular with the Asian countries, in order to mobilise anti-doping activity worldwide.

MR PATEL thanked the Chairman for the warm welcome, as it was his first meeting representing the European representatives on behalf of Ms Crouch. Ms Crouch was on maternity leave but looked forward to attending the next meeting in Glasgow. On independent investigations, speaking on behalf of the European representatives, he had found that investigations had effectively assisted the fight against doping in sport and could therefore be viewed as a beneficial additional working method. Looking ahead, and where possible, Europe would welcome further information on future anticipated costs, number of investigations and how that way of working would sit alongside WADA's regular programme of activities and, to that end, it might be useful to have a further debate about current and new working practices.

MR KONBAZ noted that the UNESCO bureau had met in Bucharest in March and was working closely with Japan on the pharmacy programme mentioned and would take more action at the

next bureau meeting, to be held in Korea. It would be a very good idea to include the pharmaceutical companies in WADA's anti-doping activity.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI shared some information in relation to the way in which the Council of Europe had cooperated with WADA in the process from the very beginning in relation to the Russian situation and in particular in order to ensure the independence and transparency of the RUSADA operations. For that purpose, a representative of the Council of Europe had been appointed as an international expert on the newly established supervisory board of RUSADA. In parallel with WADA's activities in relation to RUSADA and to complement them, the Russian authorities had started to review their national anti-doping policies and, in order to support such action, the Council of Europe had proposed and submitted to the ministry of sport of the Russian Federation a concrete plan of action, which drew upon the recommendations of the evaluation visit of the monitoring group to the Council of Europe anti-doping convention to Russia held in December 2013. The overall objective of the action plan was to improve the application of the Council of Europe anti-doping convention at national level, including the appropriate enhancement of the integrity of doping control and disciplinary procedures, as well as ensuring the protection of the rights of clean athletes to compete in a doping-free environment. Thus, the action plan would aim to encourage the development of the national anti-doping programme in compliance with all the relevant Council of Europe standards, principles and values, and it was expected that it would be implemented over a two-year period. It was very clear that the implementation of the action plan would be carried out in close coordination with WADA actions in relation to RUSADA and that an integrated, holistic approach to the complex issues of the fight against doping in sport should help ensure that the Russian Federation would quickly eliminate the issue that had led to the declaration of non-compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code and would become compliant again within a reasonably short period of time. That was the statement shared with the committee of ministers of the Council of Europe and she believed it was important to bring the information to the Foundation Board.

On the other issue mentioned, she said strongly how interested and supportive the Council of Europe was of the idea of reinforcing the investigation dimension of the work of WADA, so was very much looking forward to the information shared in relation to the possibility of WADA having a fully-fledged investigations program in a structured manner within its own administration.

MR NICHOLSON congratulated Mr Howman and his team on the issue of the WCO. He knew that creating that link and finding a secondee to go to the WCO had been a lot of work, and hopefully a lot of information would be shared. That was great work.

MR AGIUS asked, following the publication of part two of the Independent Commission report, whether any decision or action had been taken or implemented in relation to the IAAF?

MR PENGILLY made a comment from the athletes in relation to the question at the previous Executive Committee meeting to the Foundation Board about continued investigations. The athletes understood that WADA was putting in place its own internal investigations body and were pleased that that was happening, and would strongly encourage that that happen swiftly and that all appropriate information be acted on in a very timely fashion.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded to Mr Pound that the answer was yes. He did not think that he needed to elaborate on that. If any elaboration were required, it could come from Dr Rabin. The process in relation to approval of that particular laboratory to conduct blood analysis had been conducted pursuant to the standards and the recommendations made by the Independent Commission.

He thanked Ms Bokel for her comment on how important it was for athletes to have effective NADOs. WADA certainly agreed and was certainly doing everything it could to ensure that the quality of provision of work done at that level was of the highest standard.

He told Ms Scott that, on the issue in relation to the special investigation fund, he would talk a little more about how WADA was developing its investigation in-house unit, but it was for special investigations for which WADA needed to pay outside people, and the challenge that the President had raised to governments the previous November had been responded to thus far in

the fashion he had reported. It would be necessary to wait to see how many other countries would contribute to that, but that would be a special fund used only for special occasions. To elaborate on that, coming back to the investigation plan, and that had been worked on for some months, WADA was hiring a new chief investigative officer. Once that person was in place, the project or programme would be developed with his or her input. That was really important. WADA could not start doing that itself without the input of that person. He envisaged, and that related to the comment made by Mr Ricci Bitti as well, that other members of staff would be involved in the investigative unit. There was Matthieu Holz, of course, in Lausanne. WADA would need an analyst to read the material received through the passport or other material received in general, so that investigations could be undertaken or enquiries of a certain level. Finally, the Compliance Review Committee was looking at issues in relation to non-compliance of various signatories. That might require some inquiry and investigative work, and WADA would of course have an in-house team to do that. He was hopeful that there would be two results. The first result was that the fund would be increased. WADA should get over 1 million dollars at least in matching funds from the IOC, and he was hoping that discussions with other countries might increase that. The second result related to the programme that WADA was putting in place for the in-house process of investigations, and he thought that Mr Niggli would be able to report in a more detailed manner on that in September.

He thanked his friend from Japan for his support in relation to the pharmacy project. It was something the UNESCO bureau was looking at. WADA had certainly encouraged it. He had mentioned it in his report and the outcome was to provide models for other states parties to follow the lead that Japan had shown in that area. He thought that that would be most helpful. He also thanked Japan for its contribution to the special fund.

He thanked Mr Patel for his comment in relation to the investigation fund. He hoped that WADA would be able to continue the dialogue in a more positive fashion, but certainly understood the precarious position of some governments facing austerity issues in Europe in particular.

He thanked Mr Konbaz for his leadership of the UNESCO bureau; it was most helpful for WADA to liaise with Mr Konbaz. WADA appreciated that and looked forward to it being developed further, and he certainly hoped that WADA would be present in Korea for the next meeting.

He told Ms Battaini-Dragoni that there would be a thorough report on Russia later on, so he did not want to make any comment about what she had said, but he thanked her for the Council of Europe report. It had been received the previous day. WADA would study it and would work closely with the Council of Europe in the way in which WADA progressed what it had to do with RUSADA. He thought he had answered her second question in relation to the structure WADA was trying to achieve with investigations.

He thanked Mr Nicholson for his personal help in relation to customs. WADA saw that as a project that would be very fruitful, in the same way as WADA had developed its work with Interpol. Customs authorities were often the first point of receipt of banned substances. They could pass on that information to WADA to be used, particularly if it was related to coaches, trainers, athletes, and so on, so WADA was looking forward to gathering information and intelligence in that fashion.

He told Mr Agius that he would be given a report in more detail on the IAAF; in fact, one of the next items on the agenda related to the response of the IAAF to the recommendations of the commission.

He thought he had responded to Mr Pengilly's question in relation to investigations and thanked him for his continued interest.

The issue of meldonium was a topic that required specific attention, particularly relating to the memorandum that WADA had circulated to ADOs in early April. He would not go through the document again, but was raising the issue since he knew that it was of interest and all members needed to be fully aware of the steps taken by WADA. It would also give him an opportunity to

introduce Ms Fourneyron, who would give the position of the Health, Medical and Research Committee in relation to that particular substance.

Meldonium was a non-specified substance that had been placed on the monitoring list for 2015. That had been a decision of the Executive Committee taken in September 2014. Subsequently, the List Committee had determined that it ought to be on the Prohibited List for 2016, and that decision had been approved by the Health, Medical and Research Committee and the Executive Committee the previous year in September. There had been a long process of consideration of the substance by the List Committee; in fact, it had started in 2011, so the issue was not new to the scientists. As a result of the huge number of cases that had occurred in early 2016, WADA had sought urgent research on excretion, so the excretion of the substance from the body was something WADA needed to determine because, if an athlete had it or had taken it prior to 1 January, there was a possibility of the athlete getting a decision of no fault. WADA wanted to be fair, so relied on the studies to help categorise the particular cases that could be finalised in a simpler fashion. He did not wish to go into more detail as to the content of the notice. The members all had a copy of it. It looked at ensuring that the athletes who might have innocently had returns of positive cases because they had ingested the substance prior to 1 January had a way in which they could show the tribunal that they had and WADA would not oppose a decision of a finding of no fault or negligence. In the meantime, the studies continued, and he asked Ms Fourneyron to make a statement from the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

MS FOURNEYRON said that the Director General had summarised the discussion that had taken place the previous day about meldonium at the Executive Committee meeting. She insisted on a couple of things, which could have consequences for the Health, Medical and Research Committee. It was important for WADA to remain unbiased in areas in which medical practice was controversial, whilst at the same time ensuring that its own actions were guided by robust clinical and scientific evidence. The meldonium case had shown that WADA's revisions to the Prohibited List could lead to considerable and sometimes unexpected consequences and attention. As public scrutiny of the decisions intensified, WADA remained most credible when its anti-doping efforts were balanced and firm and responsive to the most significant threats to clean sport. That was exactly what had been done in the meldonium case. In 2015, meldonium had been put on the monitoring list for good reason. The performance-enhancing factor had been duly documented, as had the fact that the product was used for reasons that violated the spirit of sport and ethics. The monitoring programme had provided further evidence that the product was widely used by some athletes with no medical reason with the intention of enhancing performance. The process to put meldonium on the Prohibited List had been neat, sound and clean. There had been and was still no doubt whatsoever about the fact that meldonium had to be on the Prohibited List. However, afterwards, after certain highly visible cases, it had appeared that WADA had insufficient knowledge about the product elimination period; in other words, it was not possible to say at that stage how long the product stayed in the body and could be detected by anti-doping tests. WADA lacked robust excretion studies about meldonium. That had been recognised by the List Committee at its latest meeting. Such studies were under way and should be made available over the coming weeks, and they would be communicated to NADOs and relevant stakeholders as soon as possible.

WADA's credibility stood only on its absolute scientific rigour and impartiality. From that point of view, WADA had not failed in relation to the meldonium case. She could not say, however, that there were no lessons to be drawn from the situation through which WADA was going. WADA could improve its process on a few points. When placing a product on the monitoring list, WADA needed to anticipate, on the scientific level, all the issues that could arise. WADA needed to ask whether it needed to collect more scientific data before making a decision. Excretion studies formed part of such data. Though excretion should not in any way become the fourth criterion for inclusion on the Prohibited List, WADA needed to be more careful in the future. Excretion studies should not become compulsory criteria for the inclusion of a product on the Prohibited List; otherwise, WADA would diminish the capacity of the whole anti-doping community to react to new substances, which were increasingly difficult to detect. For the most common products,

excretion studies were done by the manufacturers. That had not been the case for meldonium, which was manufactured by a Latvian laboratory with which WADA had not been able to cooperate. For the more exotic substances, therefore, WADA needed to be able to anticipate, and she thought that WADA should launch its own studies as soon as a product was considered for inclusion on the Prohibited List. That could be done through the WADA reactive research programme. The situation also called for continued efforts to strengthen WADA's cooperation with the pharmaceutical industry. She knew that the information-sharing process with the athletes about the changes to the Prohibited List could probably be improved. WADA needed to be able to better explain how a product got on to the Prohibited List, so she suggested increased cooperation with the Athlete Committee and the Communications Department to better anticipate similar issues in the future. Those were her suggestions for improvements, and she thanked all the departments of WADA, who had worked very hard to deal with the issue of meldonium in a very professional manner, and they had gone beyond the call of duty.

MR AGIUS requested more information on the status of athletes suspended for meldonium use during the process of 2016.

DR PASCUAL said that the situation with meldonium had been peculiar and he raised the fact that WADA should take that opportunity to improve information and education about the substances. One important thing, having been at hearings and understanding the situation, was that WADA had to make it clear, in that case in particular, that the substance had been on the monitoring programme, and perhaps WADA did not communicate what was on the monitoring programme sufficiently to the athletes. From an ethical perspective, athletes were expected not to use a substance that had already been announced as going to be on the List and, even if it was legally acceptable, it was not ethically acceptable and had not been since September. If it was necessary to know the secretion profile of a substance, athletes had to be aware of the fact that, ethically, after 1 October, they should not have continued to use the substance.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL replied to the legal issue raised by the European representative. He could talk privately of progress in relation to the numbers of cases. They fell into three categories. The first was those cases that were proceeding because the athlete had admitted or the substance quantity had been at a certain level; the second category was those that had been stayed so that they could benefit from the excretion studies mentioned by Ms Fourneyron; and the third category was those outside both of those areas: cases in progress about which WADA did not talk until they were completed. That was the most effective way in which he could answer the question

The ideas raised by Dr Pascual had been raised by Ms Fourneyron in her presentation and the management team had taken good note of that the previous day at the Executive Committee. The Communications Department had worked on ways and means of ensuring effective communication as early as February that year. The management could only do so much. WADA relied heavily on its signatories to convey the same information to their athletes, and that was where WADA had to insist it continued, as there was only so much that WADA could physically do. Taking heed of the suggestion, the members should bear in mind how much WADA could achieve. He thought that that responded to the two questions.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that there were some lessons to be learnt. The comments and advice were noted.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

– 3.1 Independent Commission – part 2

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that they would have a copy of the responses that WADA had made to the Independent Commission's report and the recommendations contained therein, and they would see the response from the IAAF as to the actions that it had taken. WADA had received that the previous day, and had asked the IAAF to provide it for the very purpose of informing the members. There had been a detailed response,

one by one, to the recommendations, but the members would see that all the recommendations had been addressed, the only difference being that some had been completed and some were in progress. He did not want to say any more than that. He urged the members to read the document. The reason that the management did that was to assure everybody that it had responded to the recommendations made by the commission.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any observations. Mr Agius had asked a specific question about the IAAF. Was the answer there?

The report of the Independent Commission chaired by Mr Pound had made a number of detailed recommendations, and there were six double-sided pages detailing what WADA had done about them, so he asked the members to be assured that action had been taken to deal with the recommendations made by the commission that WADA had set up.

DECISION

Independent Commission report noted.

– **3.2 Single testing authority**

MR NIGGLI started by saying that the topic was about process and not substance. The idea was to agree on the way forward in relation to the study conducted. The matter had been discussed by the WADA Executive Committee the previous day. The recommendation from the Executive Committee was to follow the process in the paper with a few adjustments. In November, the management had been asked to study the possibility of creating the testing authority, the work had started, and the members would see the minutes of the first meeting that had taken place in January. At that meeting, one of the needs clearly identified by the group had been an in-depth financial study to be conducted to understand the ramifications of such a project. The IOC had agreed to fund the study, and it had been given to PricewaterhouseCoopers, since it was already involved with ASOIF and other groups of IFs in conducting surveys and had a head start on doing such work, so it made sense. PricewaterhouseCoopers had already started working. The proposal was to continue the work at the technical level; a lot of discussion still needed to take place at that level and, once PricewaterhouseCoopers had finished its work, the technical group would review the work and would be able to provide some recommendations. In terms of the composition of the group, there were currently two individual sports, ski and tennis, and ski also fulfilled the role of representing the winter sports. There was one team sport, basketball, and a further team sport was to be added. He would wait to hear from ASOIF on that. There was a representative of ASOIF. The proposal was to enlarge the group to include two NADOs. Norway had agreed to be part of the group and there would be another NADO from another region soon to be determined. The IOC and WADA were also represented. That was the technical group, which would carry out its work as soon as WADA had enough information from PricewaterhouseCoopers.

At the same time, a more political group was to be established, as there were numerous questions that needed to be discussed, and the political group was to be made up of five representatives from governments and five from sports, to be appointed by each side. The only difference from what was stated in the paper was that there had been a request for more time to appoint the people, to give governments in particular more time to consult on the matter, and it had been agreed by the Executive Committee that 1 September would be a reasonable date for that to happen. He foresaw no problem in terms of timing. The work should be completed by PricewaterhouseCoopers in July, and then there would be further work by the technical group, so it did not delay the process being put into place. The other request received related to the subjects for discussion or terms of reference for the political group. Those were the result of the discussion in January; however, there had been a proposal to enlarge that. The Executive Committee had said that, if governments wanted to propose other items for discussion, they should send those to WADA in advance and the terms of reference would be finalised in September at the Executive Committee meeting. That was the proposal in terms of process, and he sought the approval of the Foundation Board.

PROFESSOR ERDENER thanked Mr Niggli for his comprehensive explanation of the important project. The Olympic Movement fully supported the project; it would be an important step towards protecting clean athletes. It had been an important recommendation from the Olympic summit and the IOC executive board also fully supported the project. He was only a little confused about the name. Why it was called a single testing authority instead of an independent testing authority under the leadership of WADA?

MR MUYTERS thought it was good that the possibility to enlarge the tasks of the group was being considered and that extra things could be examined. Europe supported the idea behind the proposal for a single testing authority. What was important was that, when such single authority was created, it would not influence WADA's independent role. That was really important. That was something that had to be considered.

MR RICCI BITTI reinforced the IOC and Olympic Movement position. That was a very delicate matter and it was not easy to achieve, especially in a short time. He thanked Mr Niggli, because he had given information about the composition, and that was very delicate, as the body had to represent all the sports, constituents and stakeholders, and there was still debate, so WADA had to work on that. The second matter was that he supported the idea of a steering committee. The concern was the terms of reference, and there was work to be done, and the word 'political', as the Executive Committee was political and he did not want that work to be duplicated. He supported the proposal if there was some further, additional value. It looked to him as if it was a little bit delicate.

MR KIMURA appreciated the proposal based on the detailed and useful discussion held by the working group to date. Japan supported the proposal to further consider a single testing authority in the informal working group and the steering group, since Japan deemed it important to consider the way to ensure the independence, transparency and credibility of anti-doping testing, and was also interested in further discussions on the mandate of the steering group.

DR BUDGETT noted that WADA should consider it not just as an independent testing authority but also an independent testing and result management authority, although that might be rather a long title. The proposed membership of the technical group was very important and was good as outlined, and also, as had been pointed out, the steering group proposal was very similar in structure to that of the Executive Committee, and perhaps many of the items on the terms of reference for the steering group could also be considered by the technical group in advance of 1 September.

With respect to the process, MR POUND wondered if WADA should not consider at some point expanding beyond the people around that table to include other potential stakeholders, and he was referring to sponsors and broadcasters, people who had a different view than the insiders, and maybe they did not have to be part of a working group but, before WADA went public with any discussion, it should at least test that, because there was a huge amount of interest in that. It struck him that the elephant in the room would be cost: how much it would cost and the source of the revenue to do all of that work. Just to respond to the issue of the political aspects, he would prefer to get away from 'political' as part of the vocabulary. WADA was dealing with the creation of a new policy; those were all policy issues: whether WADA should do that, how it should do it, who should be involved and so forth.

MR ESTANGUET made a short comment on that point. Everybody knew that testing was very important and how sensitive the issue was for the athlete community. He believed that the athletes needed to know the exact process in relation to testing, and WADA's role was to inform them of all the steps being taken on the issue. He requested that the WADA Athlete Committee be well informed and asked WADA to make sure that an athlete representative would be part of the steering group.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI believed it was important that whatever steps were taken with regard to the creation of such an independent body did not compromise the capacity, credibility and integrity of WADA, which should remain a unique international organisation responsible for setting standards in the anti-doping field and monitoring compliance with those standards. That

should be taken into account when considering the organisational, institutional and financial expense of the creation of the new agency. As a piece of information that was, however, very important and went along the lines of what Mr Pound had just said, enlarging the scope of those who could participate in the creation of the new strategy and structure, she informed the members that, in November 2016, a conference of European ministers for sport would be held in Budapest and the issues of good governance in sport, the fight against corruption and strengthening the integrity of the fight against doping in sport would be discussed. The issues in relation to the creation of the single testing authority might also be addressed. That was why she believed it very important for the government side that, when the European ministers met, they had a clear idea (coming from the different continents representing the authorities) of the common government position on the setting up of the new structure. The intention was to adopt a resolution at ministerial level that would be in line with the consolidated approach of the public authorities worldwide. That was to signify how important the debate was, how seriously it was taken and how much Europe wanted to contribute to it.

MR BESSEBERG thought that, when it was eventually decided to create the group, it would be very important to have a transition period, to take care of know-how, intelligence and so on built up over the years by the different ADOs, the IFs, the NADOs, etc., so he thought that there had to be cooperation between the two for at least some years, because it was not so easy to put all the expertise of the IFs and NADOs into one big elephant, if he could put it that way.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that he was encouraged by the debate, because the points raised were precisely the reason why WADA had such a comprehensive review policy.

MR NIGGLI responded that he understood that WADA could change the name; he had no issue with that and everybody should agree on the most suitable name. He understood that it should be called a steering committee or policy committee, not a political group. The terms of reference should be discussed in September.

He told Mr Pound that it would be possible to look at how to integrate people, but WADA should do it step by step, as it had not even defined what it was talking about. Moving along, WADA should see when was the right time to involve other people, but it was definitely a good idea.

He did not want to answer any of the comments made by Ms Battaini-Dragoni on substance, as that would be premature.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that the Executive Committee had agreed the previous day to ask Ms Fourneyron to chair the second group, the policy group, and he was pleased to say that Ms Fourneyron had agreed to do that. There was much work to do. It was a very interesting project, enthusiastically supported by the IOC president, and he was sure that the IOC president would be really encouraged by the support for the principles discussed around the table.

MR RICCI BITTI remarked that it was a very delicate matter and had been raised by the Olympic Movement to improve transparency and credibility following agenda 2020, which had been an important exercise. He was pleased to have consultation with sponsors and get the support of the governments, the other side of the coin. He welcomed what Ms Battaini-Dragoni had said. His point was about framing it. It was a very delicate idea to make the system more transparent, feasibility was not easy, and ASOIF, which he represented, had already carried out an in-depth study on the finance and existent activities, and the report would be published before the end of the year and would be available to all the bodies, because it was best to start by looking inwards and analyse what was being done to change that. The idea was to avoid even small conflict of interest perceptions that had been occurring recently in relation to some cases. That was the aim of the Olympic Movement and it was necessary to work on that. He was aware that it was not easy, and everybody needed to support it. Finally, he supported the appointment of Ms Fourneyron to chair the committee.

DECISION

Proposal in relation to the single testing authority approved.

– 3.3 Ethics Panel

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that the Ethics Panel had met for the first time earlier that year and the minutes were in the members' files. WADA was privileged to have a new group, headed by Bartha Knoppers. The panel comprised a very clever group of people who had considered a number of issues at their first two-day meeting. WADA was following up on the questions that they had raised. They would have more meetings through the year, probably by teleconference, and would report on the meetings as they went forward. If necessary, WADA would ask Ms Knoppers to come and present the report and answer questions herself. It was a point for information.

DR AJÁN said that he had been listening to some of his colleagues. He wished to refer to meldonium. The meldonium cases were not helping the position of the ADOs that year. That was not only his opinion. He had consulted with other IFs. It was the ADOs' duty to apply WADA decisions and, due to the inaccurate preparation of the Prohibited List the previous year, the IFs and NADOs faced multiple criticism from the sport world. He did not want to go into details, but it had been a big challenge to find a fair solution for those athletes participating in Olympic qualification events whose samples had returned with low concentrations. Sometimes there had been a very difficult and unfair situation, and decisions to withdraw some athletes from participating in Olympic qualification events. That was not good for the reputation of the IFs.

The other thing concerned the Independent Commission. The IWF had been among the first IFs to confirm its willingness and interest in embracing the IOC initiative in relation to an independent anti-doping authority, but that could be done only with the knowledge and expertise of the sports and IFs; otherwise, it would be only a sham measure for the public without increasing the effectiveness of the fight against doping in sport. That was basically what had been discussed and was nothing new.

A final point he wished to raise concerned the involvement of various experts and staffing. The IFs had to increase staff numbers in order to handle the administrative tasks, and in some IFs the anti-doping departments were almost bigger than all the other departments of the IFs put together. Expert involvement also required funding, time and organisation. It seemed to not only his IF and him but also to some IFs that too much bureaucracy was coming from WADA, and he therefore asked WADA to find a balance in terms of how WADA gave information to the IFs, as they had to employ more and more people in the secretariat and, slowly, as he had mentioned, there were more people in the anti-doping department than the rest of the federation. He thanked the members for their attention.

THE CHAIRMAN assured Dr Aján that WADA had understood the complexities on the meldonium issue. In many ways, the decisions taken had been designed to help the result management process of the IFs, and that had been a major issue behind the steps being taken. There was no doubt that the fight against doping in sport and the protection of clean athletes was a complicated business and, if WADA wanted stronger compliance processes, all the stakeholders

would have to face up to the reality of that. He thanked Dr Aján as always for the open and fair way in which he had expressed his views.

DECISION

Ethics panel update noted.

4. Operations/management

– 4.1 2019 World Conference on Doping in Sport

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that the items included a recommendation from the Executive Committee that WADA hold a World Conference on Doping in Sport in 2019. The management had suggested that it take place not for another revision of the Code and standards, but for the purpose of having good and healthy debate and discussion about the issues confronting the anti-doping community at the time. It would also be an opportunity for the President, who would cease his term at that time, to pass over to the next president, who would come from the government side. That was the recommendation of the Executive Committee from the previous day. WADA needed the approval of the Foundation Board to undertake an immediate search for an appropriate host city.

DECISION

Proposal to hold World Conference on Doping in Sport in 2019 approved.

– 4.2 Endorsement of Foundation Board composition for Swiss authorities

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the members would see before them the composition of the Foundation Board for 2016 and the length of the terms for each member. There was one seat (that previously filled by Russia) that was currently empty, and he was waiting for the European governments to advise WADA who would take that seat.

DECISION

Foundation Board composition noted.

– 4.3 Modification to Swiss Register of Commerce

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that there was an issue related to his departure and Mr Niggli's appointment as director general. He sought the members' approval to have Mr Niggli added to the Swiss Register of Commerce as an appropriate person to sign documents on behalf of WADA.

DECISION

Proposed modification to Swiss Register of Commerce approved.

– 4.4 Operational performance indicators

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the report spoke for itself and he would not make any comment on it.

DECISION

Operational performance indicators update noted.

5. Athletes

– 5.1 Athlete Committee Chair report

THE CHAIRMAN noted that he was happy to pass the floor to Ms Scott.

MS SCOTT informed the members that the Athlete Committee meeting had taken place in March that year over two days in her home town of Canmore in Alberta, and the members had taken part in an outreach activity and had had an opportunity to take in a world cup ski race, get some ski lessons and actually do a race in conjunction with the FIS Snowkidz programme and supported by them. It had been a very enjoyable activity for all involved.

In terms of the outcome of the meeting, in what she would call an extraordinary measure, there had been only one significant outcome, which was an open letter renewing the call to expand the investigation into Russian doping, following the release of the report of the Independent Commission into Russian athletics the previous autumn, and also the Athlete Committee had taken the opportunity to announce the Athlete Committee's public support for the whistleblowers Vitaly and Yuliya Stepanov. That had been posted on the WADA website and could still be found there. The members might recall that the Athlete Committee had originally put out the call in November the previous year, almost immediately following the report, and had been disappointed with what it perceived to be a lack of decisive action and follow-up in the wake of a 300-page report detailing one of the most comprehensive and organised systems of doping and cheating in international sport that had ever been brought to light. It was a report in which the authors described 'a culture of cheating' and stated on several occasions the utter, complete implausibility of the system being in place to service only track and field athletes. That the curtain had been pulled back to reveal such widespread corruption and doping and prolific abuse of the rules and laws of ethical sport and nothing had been done was almost incomprehensible to the athlete community. Indeed, the lack of action and follow-up combined with the growing sentiment among the athlete community that there were leaders in sport who just wanted that to go away had led to a barrage of letters and communications to the Athlete Committee from athletes around the world asking it, as the voice and representatives of clean athletes, to do more, to ask for more and to please stand up for the rights and protection of the clean athletes. WADA had received communications from athletes from all sports from around the world, including the FIS, the IBU, the IBSF, the US NOCAC, the German NOCAC, the Canadian NOCAC, the British NOCAC, as well as swimmers from Zimbabwe and Australia, curling, swimming, etc. She could go on, but would stop there because what she really wanted to do was highlight the fact that nationality and sport did not seem to be as significant a factor in that movement as the emotional and growing call from athletes for leaders of sport to expand and strengthen the investigations and stand up for the protection of clean, legitimate athletes and for sport with integrity.

And so the Athlete Committee persisted. It continued to ask for more to be done, and maintained its position that the protection of clean athletes and fair sport should be at the heart and forefront of all decisions. In that light, the Athlete Committee had four proposals: there had to be sanctions for the very serious infraction of non-compliance. That task should be undertaken by the current Compliance Review Committee and a policy adopted as soon as possible. The Athlete Committee proposed that WADA have the autonomy and authority to impose immediate sanctions in extraordinary circumstances such as the ones from Russia that had come to light. For athletes to have to wait six months or longer to know what was going on as due process unfolded and decisions were made was too long. The Athlete Committee fully acknowledged and understood that WADA did not have jurisdiction over the Olympic Games. WADA did have influence, however, and the clean athletes proposed that WADA use that influence. With respect to Rio and Olympic Games beyond that, athletes strongly felt that, if there could be no guarantee that athletes from Russia would be clean and not involved in doping activity, they should not be there. With respect to whistleblowers, WADA had to develop a method to ensure the safety, confidence and care of whistleblowers. They had to be encouraged and taken care of. That was imperative. The clean athletes of the world demanded that more be done. They demanded that investigations be initiated and carried out, that athletes, organisations, officials and even countries be sanctioned accordingly and in a timely manner. The whole anti-doping system required athlete buy-in. It required athletes to believe that it was working and that winning without doping was possible. If WADA did nothing, did not investigate, did not lead investigations rather than just follow up on television programmes, if WADA did not sanction, it would lose not only the athletes' belief in the system but also the belief that winning clean was possible.

MR ESTANGUET fully supported what had been said. He really believed that WADA needed to be trusted by the athlete community, which requested greater effectiveness and transparency. He agreed that the concerns were on investigation, that there should be a list of strong and rapid sanctions for non-compliance and that WADA should act as urgently as possible, as the athletes wanted to realise their dream by going to the Olympic Games, and that was an Olympic season,

and they could not afford to wait for weeks and months. He relayed that concern. The credibility of the system was at stake.

MR POUND said that it seemed to him that the real currency in activities of that nature was information, and WADA was not very good at either encouraging the provision of information from people who knew or protecting them in the case of disclosure of improper conduct. He would say that, out there in the athlete community, there would be huge reluctance to come forward, as the whistleblowers just got killed, publicly and in other ways. There were lots of smart people sitting around the table who could probably devise a better way of making it possible for people with information to come forward and then enable investigations to be properly informed at the beginning, and he suggested that, in the Executive Committee or the staff, a very high priority be accorded to figuring out how to get information, encourage and transmit it, and how to protect those who had provided it.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI said that she was very pleased that the question of the protection of informants or whistleblowers had been raised. She attached a lot of importance to the possibility of WADA coming come up with a catalogue of good practice that could be used in such situations, in the way in which they were dealt with and, more importantly, protection. The Council of Europe was working on a legal text for the protection of whistleblowers in general. That indicated that the Council of Europe was serious, and shared the urgency of the question. It was necessary to protect whistleblowers properly, and the work WADA would do to develop guidelines for good practice and legal dimensions in terms of the protection of whistleblowers in the field of anti-doping would be extremely useful for the general issue of protection of all kinds of whistleblowers who provided information. It was important from the Council of Europe's perspective and she hoped to have an opportunity for very close cooperation in that area.

MR MOSES said that he did not think Ms Scott could have put it more succinctly by discussing all the elements important to the athletes she represented. In relation to the things being heard from Russia, and the new investigation that was going to happen and whistleblowing, there was a difference between an athlete providing useful information in a typical drug case and somebody who was providing the type of information that indicated the corruption of an entire system. WADA really had to pay close attention to that, because they were two different levels of provision of information. In the second case, for those who might have seen the 60 Minutes programme, and for the Executive Committee members who had heard from Mr Stepanov the previous day, it was a completely different level and the stakes were very high, so WADA had to provide an atmosphere whereby athletes would come forward. The US anti-doping agency had seen an athlete implicating coaches and trainers and had had several successful cases, but that was different, and it would be very important to provide the protection and think about how that would remain an opportunity and an option for athletes around the world. That year was an Olympic year and there were four and a half months to go until the Olympic Games. Around the world, there would be 10,000 or 11,000 athletes at the Olympic Games; there were probably hundreds of thousands of athletes out there training every day who really wanted to know that the level playing field would be available at the Olympic Games. WADA had to make sure that that was the case, and it behove WADA as an organisation to understand what the athletes were going through, that the athletes were engaged 100%, and WADA had to prove to them that the playing field would be level at the Olympic Games or any other competition. That was the only thing the athletes had and they needed to be able to rely on WADA.

MR PENGILLY fully supported what Ms Scott had said and the entire Athlete Committee did as well.

MS BOKEL echoed what Mr Pengilly had said.

MR NICHOLSON echoed the comments made by Ms Scott on behalf of the Paralympic athletes.

MR NIGGLI started by saying that he heard what Ms Scott and all the athletes were saying. WADA would continue to act to do what it took to get sports clean. There was no ambiguity. That was a complex matter and called for not just one answer, but probably a very comprehensive

response to the athletes' call. That was WADA's priority, and it was working on it. He could tell the members what WADA had put into place and was working on and developing. It was interesting to hear that there was clear unanimity about the fact that WADA needed to reinforce its intelligence and investigation team and it was doing that. It was recruiting a chief investigation officer, the call for proposals had concluded. WADA was in the final stages of selecting somebody, and that would happen soon. There would be an entire team of people able to do the kind of work expected by athletes and which was a major priority. WADA was strengthening its compliance programme. Compliance would lead to audits, potentially investigations and ensure that WADA could look in places in the world in which things were not done in the way they should be. WADA was making more use of the Athlete Biological Passport. The starting point was information, as Mr Pound had said. Without the information, it was hard to go and investigate. WADA had a lot of information in the Athlete Biological Passport that it needed to use better, and that would be part of reinforcing the investigation team, having proper analysts who could do that job. Part of the decision that the members were being asked to take that day related to ensuring that WADA got all the information it needed in the system, including doping control forms and TUE information. WADA was liaising with doping control officers who were seeing a lot of things in the field and trying to collect and centralise the intelligence so that WADA could understand from their experience in the field what was happening. That was part of supplementary reports that were not part of the regular process but were reported by doping control officers when on mission. That was a very important thing. Finally, WADA was beefing up and creating a real whistleblower programme. There would be different components to that. WADA had improved its website and ensured the availability of different languages, but WADA wanted to develop a comprehensive programme, and involve the new chief investigation officer. He was pleased to hear what Ms Battaini-Dragoni had said because, clearly, the protection of whistleblowers went beyond what anti-doping organisations could do; if governments were ready to provide some legal framework, that was very important as there was only so much sports and anti-doping could do. WADA would certainly liaise with the Council of Europe to ensure a coordinated approach. He could say that not everything could be put on the table immediately. A lot of work was ongoing and was not public but, after some revelations from swimmers, WADA had been reaching out to the journalists to get information and to FINA through certain members, and FINA had agreed to set up an independent investigation into some of the allegations. WADA would follow up and receive a report. Following the 60 Minutes programme, WADA had requested that all recordings made be transferred to WADA and, if the athletes could encourage that to happen as quickly as possible, that would be great. WADA needed that information to move forward. WADA would continue to collect information and would act whenever necessary. WADA was committed to doing that, and it would be a clear priority. Ms Scott had mentioned that it would be good to have some suggestions and recommendations on the consequences of non-compliance and she would soon hear from the Chairman of the Compliance Review Committee, who he was sure would take that on board to make some proposals at the next meeting of the committee so as to have a comprehensive list of suggestions as to real consequences for situations of non-compliance. He hoped that provided a framework. He heard Ms Scott, he heard the athletes and WADA was there to make things work better.

MR PENGILLY asked for a timeline. There was just one staff member currently working on investigations. When would the director and full team be in place and what might that look like?

MR NIGGLI responded that the chief investigation officer was to be recruited in the next two weeks. As soon as the person was identified, WADA could liaise to start other recruitment. If the Foundation Board approved the mandatory entry of doping control forms in the system, WADA would recruit an analyst immediately. As part of the recruitment of the chief investigation officer, WADA had received a lot of applications for the job and would select one for the top job, but WADA had a lot of CVs in the files to get other investigation officers on board relatively quickly. That was under way and was a priority.

THE CHAIRMAN said that people were talking about confidence in an Olympic year. WADA should separate two things: the build-up and delivery in Brazil, and then there would be a report on Russia later on. The two issues needed to be separated. The members should be aware that

with the IOC there was a task force, WADA had been very regularly over the past few months to Brazil, WADA had put together at the request of the IOC a group of NADOs, which were putting together intelligence-led testing so that, when the anti-doping issues moved from WADA to the IOC for the Olympic Games, everything possible would be done to make sure that people who should not be in Brazil would not be there. Second, WADA had also made substantial efforts to reaccredit and build the capacity of the laboratory in Rio, so he was pretty confident that, in the build-up to the Olympic Games that year, WADA had done almost as much as was possible for WADA to do, and he hoped the athletes could take confidence from that. Who went to Brazil was a different issue, but it would be fair, certainly to the IOC and the people from WADA who had done so much work in the run-up to Brazil, to make that perfectly clear.

DR BUDGETT said that he was very grateful to WADA for the help with the task force that had been going regularly to Brazil over the past few years and for the formation of the intelligence task force with identified NADOs from around the world which would actually make the programme over the coming three months more effective than ever before at an Olympic Games, and would help WADA stop athletes cheating from going to the Olympic Games in the first place, rather than trying to catch them when they arrived there. Everybody knew that was a more effective way of doing things. He thanked WADA for all of the help with that.

MR POUND wondered whether the time had not come for WADA to take another look at its model. If, on the basis of whatever intelligence WADA was able to gather, it appeared that country X or sport Y or NADO Z was problematic, they should be put on a monitoring list of some sort in which the onus would shift. The onus would no longer be on WADA to prove that they were not compliant, but would shift to them to demonstrate to WADA's satisfaction that they were compliant. That would increase the flow of information and access to the sport or country. Along those lines, perhaps the WADA administration could start thinking about the paradigm shifts that would get WADA into a better place.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the members for the debate and thanked Ms Scott for the very clear and forceful way in which she had presented the athletes' position. That would certainly be made public and the questions raised on compliance would be dealt with in part by WADA along the lines of Mr Pound's most recent suggestion; the other fell into the lap of the major event organisers all round the world but, if they saw that WADA was moving in the right direction, perhaps they would as well.

DECISION

Athlete Committee Chair report noted.

6. Finance

– 6.1 Government/IOC contributions update

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members that he would take them through the finance papers. He would be available together with the management team to answer any questions. The Foundation Board had the formal task of approving the year-end accounts for 2015, including the report of the audited accounts by PricewaterhouseCoopers.

The members would see the usual information about the contributions made by governments and the IOC at that stage of the year. The news was good. WADA had reached 81.22%, but he had received information that morning that Turkey had paid, for which he thanked Professor Erdener, so the percentage was 83.22%, better than the previous year at that stage.

After the general positive comment on the level of contributions, he had to make some negative comments on contributions by region. Approximately 1.4 million dollars were missing in Europe, with payments by two important countries, Italy and Spain, still outstanding. WADA was missing some important countries in Asia, Qatar, UAE, important countries in America, including Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela in South America, and countries in Africa, including South Africa, Morocco and Ivory Coast.

He mentioned the usual additional contributions. WADA had received 237,000 US dollars, and he thanked in particular Japan and Kuwait. That was all the information about contributions.

DECISION

Government/IOC contributions update noted.

– 6.2 2015 year-end accounts

MR RICCI BITTI said that the accounts were to be approved by the Foundation Board. WADA had achieved 99% of budget contributions from the public authorities, the same amount as in 2014, and received 716,000 dollars in additional contributions in 2015. There had been very different results from the budget; in fact, it had presented a profit of 1,113,000 dollars, and there was a negative result in the profit and loss line of 1,166,000 dollars. That was due to a few factors, the main one being the loss on exchange rates for about 2 million US dollars, and the additional expenses in relation to the investigation commission. One was totally relevant. For about 2 million dollars and additional investigation costs, the variance was about 100,000 dollars. If it had not been for the exchange rate, WADA would have shown a profit of 800,000 dollars. He reminded the members that the exchange rate loss was an unrealised loss, so it was a loss that was not affecting cash, only the reserve of the organisation, but it was significant: it was the second year and, for that reason, he informed the members that, to minimise the impact, WADA had adopted a financial strategy of currency hedging based on monthly local currency needs for WADA's expenses. That would avoid holding large sums of foreign currency and the re-evaluation impact on the exchange rate. It could be positive, but it had been very relevant over the past few years in terms of profit and loss, and it did not look good, even though it was only an unrealised loss. That was the situation according to the documents.

The overall position of the agency was stable. However, as the members had heard that morning, and he was starting to anticipate, WADA needed more activities, so it would need more money, and it was very short of money in general. WADA did its best; he thought it worked miracles. He spoke as a WADA man and not a sports representative, and advised that the members needed to think seriously about the matter. It was imperative to increase funding, as the 2015 profit and loss document showed, since WADA did not have a large reserve. It had a reserve of six million dollars, which equated to two months of activity, which was a very short time for any organisation, even though it was not WADA's job to put money aside or have an investment portfolio.

In terms of the report of the auditors, it had once again been very favourable, with no deficiencies found or suggestions for improvement to be made. He thanked the management, including the Director General and Ms Pisani, the Finance Director, for their wonderful job. There was only a small correction noted, and it had been considered absolutely immaterial.

It was his pleasure to introduce Ms Beauparlant, who would present the 2015 audited accounts.

MS BEAUPARLANT said that she was a partner at PricewaterhouseCoopers' Montreal office, and had been in charge of auditing the WADA statements for the past few years. She worked with a colleague, Mr Dévaud, who worked at the PricewaterhouseCoopers office in Lausanne, Switzerland, and was ultimately responsible for signing off the audit report of the financial statements. She was present that morning to provide the members with a status of the audit work and cover the significant accounting and financial reporting matters dealt with during the audit. PricewaterhouseCoopers had substantially completed its audit of WADA's financial statements for the year ending 31 December 2015. PricewaterhouseCoopers was consequently ready, subject to the approval of the financial statements by the Foundation Board, to release a report. As the auditors of the agency, their responsibility was to issue an audit opinion on the financial statements and also to confirm the existence of an internal control system designed for the preparation of financial reporting. PricewaterhouseCoopers was in a position to conclude that the financial statements for the year ending 31 December 2015 gave a true and fair view of the financial position, the results of operations and the cash flow in accordance with the IFRS, and complied with Swiss law and the foundation deed. PricewaterhouseCoopers also confirmed that

an internal control system was in place for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with the requirement of the Foundation Board. The audit work had been conducted in line with the audit plan. As part of the work plan, PricewaterhouseCoopers had discussed the key risks and audit areas of focus and the audit approach. During the course of the audit, PricewaterhouseCoopers had reviewed management accounting policies and positions, management judgements and estimates in establishing the financial statements, and the financial statements' presentation and disclosure. During the year ending 31 December 2015, there had been no unusual transaction to be accounted for, no new IFRS standards or disclosures significantly affecting the financial statements, no new accounting methodology or change in accounting policies, no internal control deficiencies or recommendations for improvement that she believed merited the attention of the Foundation Board. The uncorrected missed statements identified during the audit did not affect the audit opinion due to their immateriality to the financial statements taken as a whole.

Those were the highlights of the audit and, unless there were questions, that concluded her report. She thanked the agency's management and staff who had assisted PricewaterhouseCoopers in carrying out its work.

MR RICCI BITTI asked the Chairman to propose formal approval.

THE CHAIRMAN told the members that, as a Foundation Board, it was important that WADA formally approve the accounts for the year ending 31 December 2015. Were they approved?

MR RICCI BITTI noted that the result was not as bad as it might appear, as there was also the part on capital investment, which he had not mentioned. It was under the profit and loss line that WADA had spent 534,000 dollars less than budgeted, but WADA had not finished some projects, so they would be carried over the following year.

DECISION

2015 year-end accounts approved.

– **6.3 2016 quarterly accounts (quarter 1)**

MR RICCI BITTI stated that, at the end of March, 57% of the total budgeted income had been received, allowing him to show a kind of profit of 11 million dollars, which was confusing and misleading. Obviously, it did not reflect reality because income was seasonal, coming at the beginning of the year, and expenses were spread throughout the year. There had been a small gain on exchange, which was good news in relation to the new measures put in place, but he did not know if it would continue throughout the year. The major events were already covered, such as the ADO symposium in Lausanne, which had been very successful. The expenses for the ethical review working panel, litigation and the Independent Commission were covered, and the situation was under control. He would not spend any more time on that matter, as he did not want to take away the work from the Finance and Administration Committee at its meeting in July, at which one of the important items would be to review the 2016 budget so as to present at the September Executive Committee meeting the usual revised budget for the year end.

DECISION

2016 quarterly accounts approved.

– **6.4 2017 budget – preliminary planning**

MR RICCI BITTI referred to the 2017 budget. In relation to the draft budget for 2017, the exercise had just started, as there were a number of items that the WADA Finance and Administration Committee, at its July meeting, would consider to propose a final budget in September. The process was to be undertaken until the Finance and Administration Committee reviewed the 2016 budget and all related matters. Once the trend for 2016 was clear, the 2017 budget could be prepared, but he could make some policy anticipations. The Finance and Administration Committee had already tried to do some simulations for 2017 as usual, and had presented the budget for 2017 some time previously as it always presented it and would continue to do so. The Finance and Administration Committee and management had prepared the

simulation, but his view was that only with an increase of 5% would WADA be able to survive. That 5% would include what the Olympic Movement had requested for many years: the return of the travel expenses of members of the Foundation Board and Executive Committee, so that accounted for some 2%, something like 1.15 million dollars. The 2% was included in that 5%, and that was the only figure that would, according to the simulation, allow WADA not to deplete more than 500,000 dollars of the reserve every year and allow it to be profitable. In response to a letter from CAHAMA calling for a balanced budget, that with the 5% was a balanced budget because, if one did not make a profit, one could not make capital investment. It might look funny, but the 5% option proposed as the most sustainable for the future of 2017 was the only one that would be balanced, otherwise WADA would go under and would not be balanced. That was unfortunately the situation.

As Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee, he stated that WADA was increasingly living on charity. WADA received contributions for investigations, special research contributions, and three kinds of additional special contributions. He believed it was time to include them in the permanent budget. WADA needed that money. He appreciated the contributions very much. The Olympic Movement was ready to match the contributions, but the problem was that they were one-off contributions and did not solve the problem. WADA was underfunded. He had heard many messages around the table that the fight against doping in sport and the fight against corruption to defend the integrity of sport were very important and in the public interest. That should be reflected in an understanding that, without money, WADA could not carry out such activities.

To conclude about the CAHAMA invitation to consider a balanced budget, which he understood, WADA would need to cut activities if the members did not want to have a balance sheet without profit. A balance sheet without profit, not including capital investments, which were absolutely a must for WADA, such as ADAMS, the Code implications, compliance (which was becoming more and more complicated), would be very difficult in years to come if the members did not understand the minimum needs of the organisation. He was sorry to close with his anticipation of what the Finance and Administration Committee would do in July. He assured the members that many options would be presented and he would recommend the best one for WADA, but he had to send out the message because everybody around the table wanted more activities, although there could be no more activities without money.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members if they had any observations.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI welcomed the statement made by the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee and added some elements coming from CAHAMA. For a number of years, she had underlined the need for a projection in budgetary terms. CAHAMA had asked for a number of years for different options in the budgetary proposals and was pleased to understand from the presentation that there was indeed an intention to come forward at the next meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee with a number of options for proper consideration. CAHAMA had said that, when speaking about balanced expenditure, it meant that it was prepared to make a particular effort, for instance in relation to budgetary expenditure for trips to the meetings, in the sense that it was prepared to consider that the money might be more useful at that very moment for something that WADA would consider to be a high priority, namely investigations, the new team to be set up, etc. It would all obviously cost money. It was more important to invest resources in that direction rather than reimbursing people for travel. She did not want to give the impression that CAHAMA wanted to diminish or prevent WADA from developing. The point was, how was the increase going to be redistributed for the real priorities of WADA which had to correspond to the real challenges of WADA? That was a different light that she was focusing on the question of the letter from CAHAMA.

WADA was facing, in finance terms, very interesting developments. She was very pleased to see such a response in terms of voluntary contributions, but she also fully agreed with Mr Ricci Bitti that it was not possible to work on a budget in which the voluntary contributions had become so important. She followed Mr Ricci Bitti completely. She believed that there were efforts being made by the WADA management and also very much by Mr Reddie as President, as she

had seen his pleas for contributions, including during his trips to capital cities where he called for more money. The money was coming in and was good for the present but, in the longer term, those resources needed to become part of the regular WADA budget, as there would be many different things to be done. From that point of view, she congratulated WADA on the results achieved in relation to contributions, because the ratio between the ordinary budget and voluntary contributions was reaching a new dimension, which it might not have been possible to anticipate some years previously. If the voluntary dimension were integrated into the ordinary expenditure in the future, WADA would desperately need a multi-year projection of the needs of WADA. She had been asking for that for years and she hoped that WADA would really be able to do so.

She had taken note, with great interest, of the question of asking through contracts for reimbursement or payments by those ADOs that were not compliant, i.e. that they should pay for what was done by WADA to help them to become compliant. That was also a very good step forward. The only caveat she had was that it was possible provided that the legal system in the countries in which the ADO was present considered that in conformity and it did not cause legal difficulties. The principle itself, if ADOs were not compliant, they would be supported, but would have to pay for that, was a good one, and would also be good for the budget.

She would appreciate it if the Finance and Administration Committee could take into consideration those elements at its next meeting, reconsider and come forward with a number of hypotheses. She was sure that everybody would be satisfied.

MR RICCI BITTI appreciated what Ms Battaini-Dragoni had said in general terms. The Finance and Administration Committee would come with options and a three-year plan if required, but WADA had always given two-year projections as opposed to one-year projections in the past. The Finance and Administration Committee always took care of distribution. It was always good to get the message, but the distribution of the money was already very accurate, and the people who did the exercise knew where to put the money. He could assure the members of that. He would say that the exercise went beyond scope of the Finance and Administration Committee, because there was not enough money, so distribution was very accurate.

He explained that the position of the Olympic Movement in relation to travel was a matter of principle. The money was coming from the same people: governments and sport. The Olympic Movement believed that to make the people around the table more 'WADA' when they were at the WADA meetings and less accountable to the bodies they represented was a good governance principle. The money did not change anything, but a good governance principle was usually for the people at the top of the body, such as the Foundation Board and the Executive Committee, to be more 'WADA' and more accountable. He believed it was a good thing, but it was only cosmetic, because the money was spent by the same people at the end of the day.

He was interested in the final point made by Ms Battaini-Dragoni. Ms Battaini-Dragoni was right. There were some costs in the process of compliance, because a country that was not compliant had to continue to do testing. Such costs were automatic, and had to be covered by the country that was not compliant or by the IF that was not compliant. Then there were the costs incurred by WADA. Those were the ones to which Ms Battaini-Dragoni had referred, and they were obviously a good point to be put on the table. He agreed with Ms Battaini-Dragoni, but was reluctant to consider the effectiveness of securing that money, because not all organisations were ready or able to pay huge costs. He recommended that the WADA management consider that. The principle was very good. People who were not compliant should pay something, but the feasibility should be studied, as there were different costs: automatic costs, penalty costs, cost of WADA personnel to support the process of re-admittance, and so on. He thanked Ms Battaini-Dragoni for mentioning the point, which was very important for the future, but he recommended that the WADA management analyse it, because it was a little more complicated than it seemed in terms of feasibility.

THE CHAIRMAN warned the members of the Finance and Administration Committee not to miss the meeting in July that year.

DECISION

2017 budget update noted.

7. Education

– 7.1 Education Committee Chair report

MR MOSES informed the members that a meeting of the Education Committee had been held at the end of March at the WADA offices. There was a continued focus placed on the issues surrounding doping in sport and, as the voices of the clean athletes increased, WADA needed to increase its focus on anti-doping through values-based education. WADA's stakeholders needed to invest more in those preventative programmes. In other words, he was referring to the psychology of cheating, the entourage and the different influences on athletes, the risks and rewards, the penalties and sanctions, understanding why athletes might be induced and might consider cheating. The values were international competitions, Olympic Games, fair play, level playing field: those were the values that the Education Committee wanted to implore athletes to understand, value and respect. That was the core issue and what the Education Committee did. The Education Committee comprised a very diverse set of people who represented education, research, federations, science, sport bodies and so forth, so various points of view were heard all the time. The representative from the WADA Athlete Committee, Andréanne Morin, had been present at the meeting, and had given an update on the recent Athlete Committee meeting and the outcomes, and had given the athletes' perspective on anti-doping to the Education Committee to enhance anti-doping education. The Education Committee would like to make sure that the WADA Athlete Committee and the Education Committee stayed in touch. All of the Education Committee members extended their thanks and appreciation to the team led by Mr Koehler as to the quality of work and the commitment to promoting education globally.

The outcomes of the meeting had been compliance, and the Education Committee had indicated that, when it came to compliance, strict principles had to be applied when measuring education compliance. There had been an issue that morning that went straight to education. The NADO in Spain had been put under suspension and had been giving instructions and assistance to several countries in Latin America, and the aim was to make sure that the education component was not cut off, as that was one of the most valuable things that WADA had to offer the athletes, notwithstanding the compliance issues of an organisation.

With respect to partnerships, government and sport needed to work hand in hand. There were some crossover areas and they could definitely work together to promote values-based education. All ADOs should establish an athletes' committee. He highly recommended that athletes be involved in ADOs and should be engaged in shaping the environment to protect clean sport. More investment was needed in anti-doping education, and included having more dedicated staff and education departments. In relation to the education approach, the Education Committee strongly supported the fact that education should be as important and as mandatory as testing was for athletes. Based on research, the committee stressed that doping controls and detection were not enough to combat doping in sport and, as a result, it was necessary to ensure that prevention in the form of effective values-based education was an integral part of the work. Social science research was the fourth and final point. All anti-doping organisations needed to ensure that they evaluated their education programmes, assessed outcomes and adapted programmes accordingly, and WADA had a survey tool available for free on its website for ADOs to use.

The committee supported the continuation of the education partnership programme, and had targeted three research areas for 2016. One was very pertinent, as the Education Committee would do some research to better inform a whistleblowing policy, and it had been recommended that the Special Research Fund be used for that area of research. The Education Committee would therefore be looking into some of the elements of whistleblowing and assist where it could.

The Education Committee had targeted research to develop and improve scenario-based learning resources in which a theoretical scenario was presented to the athletes in an educational package, and there would be an interactive response, so they would learn and understand by dealing with a real case scenario. Lastly, the Education Committee would expand the ADO research survey package to four to five countries in Africa and possibly in Asia. Having said that, he asked Mr Koehler to provide a brief overview of some of the key activities within the department.

DECISION

Education Committee Chair report noted.

– 7.2 Education report

MR KOEHLER informed the members that he would provide a brief update on his report. He wanted to highlight a few points. One was the call from the Athlete Committee in relation to social science research and the gap in education programmes, and that gap was a resource to guide, help and assist parents on anti-doping. The department had taken on the request, worked with NADOs and IFs that had current programmes, and would be releasing a parents' resource within one month which would be online and available for parents to use to identify or help athletes or their children when faced with doping or starting that discussion.

He had mentioned the online sport physicians' tool kit in the past. WADA had developed that several years previously but, over the past year, the IOC had partnered with WADA and added three modules. Mr Moses had mentioned the importance of making education mandatory and he was pleased to say that the IOC had made education mandatory for all physicians going to the Olympic Games in Rio through national education, if available; if not, they would be required to do the three modules in the sport physicians' tool kit related to Olympic Games activities.

In terms of social science research, he was pleased to report that WADA had concluded its second update from the 2000 review. WADA had done a peer review and a social science review of all literature since the beginning. It was a 555-page report. WADA was about to summarise it and share it with all stakeholders, and basically it was a gathering of all research done in the field of social science and anti-doping.

Finally, he highlighted the ongoing education partnership with the IOC, the IPC, the ICSSPE, the International Fair Play Committee and WADA. They were working together to develop a values-based resource to assist teachers with what they were already teaching and using sport as a mechanism on values and how values could enhance a person's wellbeing in society and protect clean sport. It was an ongoing project, and WADA had commitment from all the organisations involved. He expected to have the initial resource ready by the end of that year, after which there would be testing and piloting with teachers. Part of the partnership with one of the partners, UNESCO, was to promote the resource. The resource was not yet ready but the framework was available, and UNESCO had produced a video to highlight what WADA was trying to achieve and do with teachers globally, recognising that WADA would not be included immediately in the curriculum, but at least would have a resource to assist with what was already being taught. He was pleased to show the video that UNESCO had released with its partners.

That concluded his presentation.

DR PASCUAL reported on his experience using the tool kits developed for coaches and physicians. He had found that having online versions of those was very important. Coaches received their paper tool kit and used it all the time but, when he gave the courses, he emphasised that the participants had access to the online version, and they took that information back to their countries without the physical tool kit. He had found it very difficult to find the online version on the WADA website and he asked WADA to review access to the information as, even for him, it was difficult to get a link. In fact, he had just tried and had found the physicians' tool kit online but not the coaches' tool kit. It was a very useful tool.

MS BOKEL thanked Messrs Moses and Koehler for their comprehensive report. She thought that the Foundation Board members were talking about the effectiveness and priorities and, if

she could quote Mr Niggli, everybody had heard and supported Ms Scott's strong call for timely investigations. Reading about smart testing and smart education, perhaps a good link between the athletes' hub and the learning gateway could be established to support education for athletes and to focus on other things that were a huge priority.

MR MUYTERS referred to what Mr Moses had raised about education programmes in South America. Europe thought that, since the non-compliance of Spain was due to the fact that there was currently no government in Spain, Spain should be able and allowed to continue with the education programmes in South America.

MR KIMURA appreciated the Education Committee and WADA's work to promote education. NADOs in various countries had been developing their own information and education materials under WADA's guidance and Japan, in partnership with WADA, had been developing teaching material packages for the countries and regions in which anti-doping activities had not yet taken off in order to launch anti-doping education in those regions. The package consisted of visual aids such as animation movies, teaching materials and guidebooks. The plan was to develop the packages aimed at athletes, especially young people, and anti-doping officials, and to teach children the values of sport. He felt that, by having WADA make use of the resources developed by countries and NADOs, it should be possible to carry out more effective anti-doping education with limited resources. Japan was ready to work together with other partners in the future.

DR BUDGETT echoed what had been said about the sport physicians' tool kit, which was being developed with the help of many physicians around the world and was excellent, with a good multiple choice questionnaire, for which one received a certificate, which medical professionals loved, and it was compulsory for many hundreds of doctors going to the Olympic Games. It covered all the essential areas, and there should no longer be any ignorant doctors at the Olympic Games. It was fantastic protection for clean athletes. He would also support making such kits compulsory for other groups.

MR KOEHLER responded to Dr Pascual. He would see in the report that WADA was developing a new platform, to manage things internally and make it easier to transform what was on paper into an online resource, for the simple reason that people needed to take it away, so the department would take that on board when developing it further.

The IOC athlete hub idea was a great idea. WADA had already shared the resources with the IOC education department, and was willing to share any of its resources to go on the athlete hub.

It was not for him to comment on compliance.

In response to Mr Kimura, WADA appreciated Japan's support in the region, and knew that Japan had been helping many of the RADOs. He fully supported Japan's call to share resources and not to duplicate.

He thanked Dr Budgett for his work and assistance in engaging physicians globally to contribute to the success and ongoing development of the sport physicians' tool kit.

DECISION

Education report noted.

8. Health, Medical and Research

– 8.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee Chair report

MS FOURNEYRON informed the members that the first few months of 2016 had been busy for the members of the Health, Medical and Research Committee and the Health, Medical and Research Committee expert groups.

The reports from the Science Department and the Medical Department were quite exhaustive, so she would highlight only a few points.

The revision process for the updating of the 2017 Prohibited List, which would have to be approved at the September meeting, had started. The List Committee had already met twice

since the beginning of the year, in January and April, and a number of proposals had been formulated, as experts were reviewing some substances and methods for possible inclusion on the Prohibited List. The draft Prohibited List had been circulated on 5 May to all stakeholders for comments. Comments would have to be received by 20 July. As every year, all of the comments would be reviewed by the List Committee at its summer session and then by the Health, Medical and Research Committee before approval at the Executive Committee meeting in September. She would not go into details at that stage.

She stressed one particular issue: glucocorticoids. An ad hoc expert group on glucocorticoids had been established at the end of 2015. The task assigned to the group had been to review the status of different routes of administration of glucocorticoids and establish a urinary threshold to distinguish between prohibited and permitted routes. The issue was that, given the current state of scientific knowledge, it was impossible to establish when the presence of glucocorticoids in urine tests followed administration through a prohibited route or a permitted route. Clarification and simplification were required. To achieve that, several meetings of the ad hoc group had occurred over the past few months. The latest meeting had made it possible to formulate proposals for revision of the Prohibited List. From then on, all injections of glucocorticoids were to be prohibited during competition. Injections should not be received within 72 hours prior to the in-competition period. If athletes required injections during the 72 hours prior to competition, a TUE would be systematically required. The TUE Expert Group had been consulted on that proposal. There had been mixed reactions to the proposal and some amendments had been proposed. Discussions on that complex issue were not yet over, and a final proposal would need to be formulated at the Health, Medical and Research Committee meeting in August for the Executive Committee to approve at the September meeting. All she could say at that stage was that the proposal of the ad hoc expert group on glucocorticoids would need to be a balanced one, given the complex history of the prohibited status of the systematic use of glucocorticoids in sport which was a poor but commonly accepted medical practice. The outcome of the ad hoc expert group on glucocorticoids might affect the feasibility of the Unique List, which was a very important topic, especially for the athletes.

Glucocorticoids were not the only issue in relation to the Unique List; there were, in fact, a number of issues, and debates on that front were very lively within the working group in charge of the question. To be totally honest, the discussion went back and forth and did not progress as smoothly as some would like. She could give absolutely no guarantee that it would be possible to find a consensus on the issue of the Unique List. It had already been considered thoroughly at the time of the revision process of the Code, and there had not been success at that time. The issue was that the Unique List could lead to an explosion of TUEs, and that was something that needed to be taken into consideration.

The second point was the research projects. As Mr Howman had mentioned in his report, the Executive Committee the previous day had formally approved the recommendations made by the Health, Medical and Research Committee to give grants for three research projects focused on autologous blood transfusion. They would be funded by the Special Research Fund after a request for proposals launched the previous October. The request for proposals had been the expression of the discussion held at the Executive Committee meeting the previous September in Copenhagen about being more innovative and proactive in relation to the use of the Special Research Fund, so that WADA would be in a position to address its top priorities in terms of research. Autologous blood transfusion absolutely fell within the category, as it had been a challenge in terms of detection for the past decade or so. A total of 16 projects had been received through the request for proposals. Three independent external reviewers who were haematology experts and had knowledge about the haematological module of the Athlete Biological Passport had reviewed the projects and provided evaluations. She wished to acknowledge the importance of the Special Research Fund to maintain the capacity of WADA to invest in innovative anti-doping research such as autologous blood transfusion. She was very grateful to the governments, which had contributed up to 5.8 million dollars to the research fund, and to the IOC, which had matched the funds as promised. In total, it meant

an additional 11.6 million dollars for research and was an excellent result and very good news in those times of budgetary constraints and after years and years during which the WADA research budget had been constantly decreasing. She was confident that results would follow. Other calls for research proposals were about to be launched in relation to the prevalence of doping in sport and the biological markers in support of the Athlete Biological Passport.

In relation to laboratories, the WADA Laboratory Expert Group had been quite busy with the accreditation process of the accredited laboratories and the revision of several technical documents, which had been conducted to reflect the latest advances in anti-doping science and to provide guidance to the laboratories. The updated technical documents had been formally approved the previous day by the Executive Committee.

Various laboratories had undergone disciplinary reviews in recent weeks and months that had led to the suspension or revocation of their accreditation, namely Moscow, Beijing, Bloemfontein and Lisbon. The report of the Legal and Investigations Department and Mr Niggli would provide the members with the latest information on the status of the laboratories later that day.

She thanked the President, who had made a very useful public statement the previous week to remind everybody about the rationale and process behind the laboratory suspensions. Because the pace of the revocations and suspensions of the laboratory accreditation was to her knowledge unprecedented, she wanted an opportunity to explain once again how the accreditation review process was conducted and how the Laboratory Expert Group intervened on that matter. Under the ISL, WADA had a duty to control the analytical performance of laboratories to deliver accreditations or maintain accreditations. That monitoring process included blind or double-blind aptitude tests, site visits by WADA experts and occasional complaints by ADOs. The monitoring process had been threatened over the past few months and the latest suspensions were a direct result of the policy. Most of the time, the monitoring process revealed minor technical or organisational issues that could be easily fixed by the laboratories, but it also happened that more serious issues were revealed that were blatant breaches of the ISL rules. The most serious issues were reviewed thoroughly by the Laboratory Expert Group. The most concerning cases were then transferred to the WADA Disciplinary Committee, which included two legal experts and one scientist. The Disciplinary Committee decided whether or not to recommend that the WADA President sanction the laboratory. In most cases, the sanction was a suspension of its accreditation for an adapted period. The maximum period of suspension was six months, during which time the laboratory could fix the issues. It had to be noted that, as a result of the suspensions, all collected samples were transported securely to one of the remaining 31 WADA-accredited laboratories worldwide so that there were no gaps in the anti-doping sample analysis procedures. The process was pretty solid, but she thought that WADA could probably improve it in two ways. First, it was necessary to think about a way of shortening the delay between site inspections and sanctions. It was currently too long and created some puzzlement sometimes for observers. Second, WADA needed to reinforce efforts to strengthen the independence of the laboratories from the NADOs.

She was happy to announce that the Brazilian anti-doping laboratory in Rio had undergone its first site visit since regaining WADA accreditation, in conjunction with the IOC in November 2015. It had continued to make good progress and she was confident that it would be ready on time. The final visit was planned shortly before the start of the Olympic Games to ensure that everything was on track.

That concluded her report. There were many other activities related to health, medical and research that she could discuss, but she believed that the members had a lot of written information in the very comprehensive medical and science reports, so she would stop and encourage the members to consult those reports, and would be happy to answer any questions with the assistance of Dr Rabin and Dr Verneq, whom she thanked.

THE CHAIRMAN said that people should understand that the issue of glucocorticoids was public. Everybody was aware of the issue at that stage, and he appreciated that there was much work to be done.

MR PENGILLY asked about anti-doping prevalence. Athletes had asked for some time about research, to understand the extent of the problem. At the previous Foundation Board meeting, the members had been told requests for proposals were going out. Could Ms Fourneyron confirm whether or not they had gone out and, if not, what the reason for the delay was?

MS FOURNEYRON responded that the first request for proposals had been on autologous blood transfusion. The second was related to the prevalence of doping. She knew that it was a question that the athletes had been asking for some time and that it was very important.

DR BUDGETT said that Ms Fourneyron had been eloquent in saying that glucocorticoids was a major challenge, and he appealed to WADA to make sure that the final proposal would not actually make things worse for the clean athletes and that, whatever was proposed, the reaction on glucocorticoids be proportionate to the extent of the problem.

DECISION

Health, Medical and Research Committee Chair
report noted.

– 8.2 Science report

THE CHAIRMAN noted the very full report from the Science Department and Medical Department in the members' files.

DECISION

Science report noted.

– 8.3 Medical report

DECISION

Medical report noted.

9. Athlete Biological Passport

DR VERNEC informed the members that he would provide a summary of the Athlete Biological Passport programme, which was moving into its seventh year and was part and parcel of intelligent anti-doping programmes. He would first address the haematological module. There were 44 ADOs that reported Athlete Biological Passport tests in ADAMS, including all the IFs that dealt with endurance sports. Since the start of the Athlete Biological Passport, over 500 athletes had been sanctioned for blood doping based on Athlete Biological Passport targeting for the most part, in which substances such as EPO or other blood doping substances had been detected. More impressively, perhaps, there were currently more than 110 athletes who had sanctioned by the Athlete Biological Passport without the detection of any prohibited substance or method. Most had been IAAF cases in the past few years; in the earlier years, they had been mostly cycling cases, which had decreased quite a bit, although there were still some sporadic ones coming up. That made one wonder if there had been a deterrence effect in that sport, whether athletes had stopped cheating, were cheating less, or were cheating in a more subtle and sophisticated fashion. He did not know, but it was something WADA was keeping a close eye on. WADA was certainly not sitting back and congratulating itself on the haematological module, and had been pushing to improve it, working on critical elements such as measuring plasma volume, which would help tighten up the Athlete Biological Passport. Almost every variable measured in the blood was per volume. As soon as one was dehydrated or going to altitude, changes in plasma volume would change some of the numbers and make it more difficult to analyse. One big issue that had been plaguing the module had been the restricted transport time between sample

collection and analysis. Red blood cells would degrade over time during transport; therefore, WADA had worked with a group of scientists to come up with an innovative method to increase that transport time from the present 36 hours to 60 hours, starting in January 2017. That would be of great benefit, particularly to some countries and ADOs operating in regions not close to laboratories, would increase flexibility and should decrease some of the costs. A number of technical documents based on the changes to the blood stability score had been approved the previous day by the Executive Committee. It was necessary to bear in mind that, even if the science improved, proper implementation by the ADOs was still needed. As an example, in 2015, there had been 8,200 athletes with specific blood Athlete Biological Passport tests done, but 4,200, or slightly more than half, had had only a single test. The whole concept of the passport was to measure variables over time so, if most of the athletes had been tested at one single point in time, one could hardly say that a lot had an Athlete Biological Passport. There was work to be done in terms of the strategies and implementation of the programme.

Talking about the steroidal module, although it was clearly more logical to use personalised rather than population values to guide further analytical testing such as IRMS testing, it had not yet been possible to extract very meaningful data. There were some very positive cases coming out of the steroidal module, including things that had not been expected such as the detection of sample switching, in which athletes had been sanctioned, but WADA had not been able to gather a lot of data that showed how effective it was. It was not more expensive, but WADA could not say how effective it was. WADA had been able to identify the issues preventing it from getting the information. One of them was the famous lack of entry of doping control forms into ADAMS. There were some issues at the laboratory level, issues of consistency, of not reporting in ADAMS from the laboratory, and the fact that ADAMS itself was not currently programmed to extract some of the data that WADA would like to see to make some sense out of the steroidal module, and of course with the changes to ADAMS there had been some delays in that area. All he could say was that WADA was going to be addressing all of those issues in the next year or so.

Regarding the doping control forms in ADAMS, 40% of the doping control forms had been put into ADAMS the previous year, and that figure had gone up to 56%. An optimist would be happy but, at the end of the day, 56% was simply not acceptable. The concept of the Athlete Biological Passport was that it was longitudinal. Since the steroidal module had started 27 months previously, 81% of the athletes had actually had two samples or less. Some of that was expected; if in-competition tests were performed on lower-level athletes, they might have a single test, but the reality was that all athletes had a steroidal passport and, if one calculated how many had doping control forms in ADAMS, how many had only a few tests, about 15% of the athletes actually had a steroidal passport.

WADA clearly needed to advance the Athlete Biological Passport further. WADA would be engaging a biomarker group to help look for new biomarkers. Some progress had been made on plasma volume. WADA needed to invest in research on confounding factors, such as altitude and oral contraceptive pills and, as much as he believed entirely in investigation, he asked the members not to remove any of the money from research, because the value of the investigations could go down without the fundamental research and science to back up the investigations.

Another thing WADA was looking at was pushing ahead with the endocrine module to indirectly detect the use of prohibited substances or methods affecting the human growth hormone pathway. To that effect, WADA had convened a meeting in London the previous December to develop a study to validate and advance the use of IGF-1 as markers for a longitudinal endocrine module and had started working with 12 ADOs and six laboratories to continue and validate the use of IGF-1. That work had been launched in April that year.

He underscored the value of the Athlete Biological Passport in monitoring groups of athletes and in assisting, complementing and even driving some of the investigations that had happened and would hopefully be happening in the future.

DECISION

Athlete Biological Passport update noted.

10. World Anti-Doping Code

– 10.1 Compliance Review Committee Chair report

MR BOUCHARD addressed the athletes' call to look into the issue of sanctions. The answer to Ms Scott's call was a clear yes. He would make it a priority and would report to the Foundation Board at the next meeting.

He informed the members that, since the briefing at the Foundation Board meeting on 18 November, the Compliance Review Committee had met three times: in December in Lausanne, on 5 April in Montreal and via teleconference on 3 May. A number of topics had been discussed. His report would cover a number of elements, and he referred the members to the various documents in their files.

First, on the Code compliance survey, major progress had been made. The members had copies of the survey and could take a look and would see that, although lengthy, the questionnaire was key for a sound monitoring programme. Filling it in for the first time would require some hours of work; updating it in the future would take less time. The online version being developed would help minimise the required time to answer the questions. Over the past few months, a number of changes had been made to simplify the questionnaire as much as possible. Those efforts would continue, and the Compliance Review Committee members were helping to facilitate the process. The draft questionnaire would soon be distributed to all signatories so that they could prepare for when they would have to complete it. Overall, the Compliance Review Committee was pleased with the progress made to date.

On the ISO accreditation process, the Compliance Review Committee had been informed that ISO accreditation had been granted to the compliance monitoring programme on 11 April. The Compliance Review Committee acknowledged the achievement within the prescribed time and congratulated the WADA staff. It provided all ADOs with some guarantee of an objective and documented process that was fair and transparent.

On the use of ADAMS, included under item 10.4 in the members' files, the issue had been brought to the attention of the Compliance Review Committee at its April meeting. It followed a clear recommendation by the Independent Commission report and a request from athletes that WADA look at all sports in all countries. After discussing the issue, the Compliance Review Committee had fully supported the mandatory entry of doping control forms and TUEs in ADAMS. The committee members were of the view that, if WADA's role was to monitor the anti-doping system, it had to have access to relevant information such as doping control forms and TUEs. While other systems could be used, the Compliance Review Committee members were of the view that the information had to be in ADAMS; without that, there would be no serious answer to the athletes' call. It did not come as a surprise, as it was already a mandatory requirement under the Code and the international standards.

The ISL, under item 10.1.1 in the members' files, had been discussed at length by the Compliance Review Committee in April and May and was the subject of a recommendation by the Compliance Review Committee, and he would explain why the committee was making that recommendation. Under article 4.4 of the ISL, for a laboratory to maintain its accreditation status, the NADO and/or the NOC had to be Code-compliant. The Compliance Review Committee acknowledged the importance of the article as being a significant incentive for signatories to be Code-compliant, as experience had clearly shown. On the other hand, the Compliance Review Committee acknowledged that certain laboratories were truly independent from their NADOs, were not directly funded by governments and were also

serving international clients. As the rule currently stood, its implementation might have a negative impact on those laboratories and potentially on the fight against doping in sport by having an impact on ADOs other than the local NADOs that made use of them. The Compliance Review Committee was of the view that an exception could be brought to article 4.4 of the ISL, to avoid the suspension of certain categories of laboratories without compromising the main objective. The objective of the amendment was to avoid taking away the accreditation of laboratories significantly serving ADOs other than the NADO declared non-compliant. The laboratories mainly servicing a local NADO declared non-compliant would continue to be subject to losing their accreditation. The Compliance Review Committee was of the view that the proposed amendments provided the required nuance in the application of the current rule.

Focusing on the procedure of reinstatement when non-compliant signatories successfully resolved outstanding issues, and also on the financial consequences of non-compliance, the Compliance Review Committee members had discussed the procedure of reinstatement and the financial consequences of non-compliance when the committee had met in December and May. It had been clear from the discussions that it was important for members that the process be transparent and documented. The Compliance Review Committee would be taking steps in that direction, and was also making recommendations to the Foundation Board that would help achieve the objective. The first step suggested was that the Compliance Review Committee be more specific on the reason for a recommendation of non-compliance. The objective was to provide more guidance to WADA and the signatories on the requirements for reinstatement. The second step recommended was that, pending exception, the procedure of reinstatement by the Foundation Board should not take more than two months from the time the signatory had addressed the required corrective measures. That was to avoid potential delays, and he was insisting on the word 'potential', as no delays had been experienced to date. The recommendation was to ensure that delays would not occur in the future. The Compliance Review Committee members were also of the view that approving the recommendation would also help clarify the reinstatement process for non-compliant signatories. The third step being recommended was that the Compliance Review Committee favourably considered the signature of an agreement between WADA and the non-compliant signatories to help outline a common understanding of the requirements to be met before being reinstated. The Compliance Review Committee members had also agreed to have a cost recovery clause included in the agreement. The Compliance Review Committee members were of the view that an agreement would help provide answers to the first question asked by signatories declared non-compliant: what do I need to do to regain compliance? The signature of an agreement would also clarify the financial matters and could contribute to removing any ambiguity regarding the financial responsibilities. The Compliance Review Committee found it appropriate that some costs incurred by WADA in a reinstatement process should be recouped from a non-compliant signatory. Experience had shown that the reinstatement of non-compliant signatories had the potential to generate significant expenses for WADA. It could constitute excessive costs of doing business for an organisation with limited financial capacity. In addition, the Compliance Review Committee members were of the opinion that having some costs of reinstatement borne by the non-compliant signatory would also serve as an effective incentive to be compliant with the Code in the first place. Thus, the Compliance Review Committee endorsed the proposed agreement included in the files as a template that could be customised on a case-by-case basis.

Focusing on specific cases of non-compliance, the Compliance Review Committee was pleased to see that progress was being made on many fronts. Since the Foundation Board meeting on 18 November 2015, a number of signatories had been removed from the list of non-compliant signatories, including Israel, Argentina, Ukraine and Bolivia. Other signatories had been on the watch list (they would have been declared non-compliant on 18 March if they had not taken the required steps to become compliant). Some of the signatories had taken the steps, including the Brussels Joint Communities Region of Belgium, the German-speaking Community of Belgium, Brazil, Greece and France. In the case of Brazil, Greece and France, although they had met the requirements to be reinstated as compliant signatories, there was

still work to do to remain compliant, and the Compliance Review Committee would continue to monitor the situation. There were unfortunately other signatories on the watch list that had not yet taken all the required steps to become compliant. As of 19 March 2016, those signatories had been moved from the watch list to the list of non-compliant signatories. Those signatories were Mexico and Spain. In both cases, progress was being made. In the case of Spain, WADA recognised the unfortunate situation that it was facing and really hoped that, after the elections in June, a government would be established and the problem would be solved.

The Compliance Review Committee was making recommendations to the Foundation Board, and the recommendations would modify the list of non-compliant signatories if approved. The Compliance Review Committee recommended that the Andorran ADO be removed from the list of non-compliant signatories. The committee was very pleased that the recently adopted anti-doping legislation and rules by Andorra were currently in line with the Code.

The Compliance Review Committee recommended that the Foundation Board declare the ADO of Kenya non-compliant with immediate effect. Whilst the Compliance Review Committee acknowledged that the three required legal instruments, including the legislation, policy and anti-doping rules, had been adopted by the Kenyan authorities, the Compliance Review Committee could not ignore that, in many regards, the legislation was not in line with the Code, as a result of changes made to a draft that WADA had approved in the parliamentary process. The Compliance Review Committee could not ignore the fact that it was not clear how many articles of the new legislation would be interpreted, because they had not been written as they should be. The Compliance Review Committee could not ignore that there were inconsistencies between the legislation and the policy and anti-doping rules. The policy and anti-doping rules, but not the legislation, were in line with the Code. On several occasions, WADA and the Compliance Review Committee had communicated the importance of having the Kenyan legal instruments aligned with the Code by 2 May 2016 and the importance of consulting WADA in the event of any amendments during the legislation adoption process. Those were the factors that justified the recommendation of the Compliance Review Committee.

The Compliance Review Committee recommended that the Foundation Board declare the Polish Commission against Doping in Sport automatically non-compliant on 12 August 2016 should some outstanding issues not be resolved by that date. In other words, the Polish Commission against Doping in Sport should be on the watch list. The Compliance Review Committee understood that the Polish authorities were taking the matter very seriously and had made some significant progress on the matter. A meeting had even taken place the previous day. The Compliance Review Committee therefore hoped that Poland would meet the deadline knowing that the ball was in their court. The reasons for the Compliance Review Committee's position on Poland were explained in the members' files and information regarding those issues had been shared with the Compliance Review Committee at its April meeting. It was on the basis of those issues that the Compliance Review Committee had drafted its recommendation to the Foundation Board. More specifically, some of the issues that would need to be addressed by Poland were related to the appeal process, article 13 of the Code, and more specifically to the non-recognition of the CAS as the last instance jurisdiction for all anti-doping cases. The timelines to appeal set forth in the Code were not complied with and the right to appeal had not been granted to entities with such a right in the Code. Those were very important issues. There were other aggravating factors that further supported the Compliance Review Committee's recommendation, and they had been shared with the Compliance Review Committee members at its meeting on 3 May but were not part of the documentation in the members' files, so he would speak to those. Under the new legislation, the Polish NADO did not have the legal authority to automatically impose its jurisdiction on NFs. If NFs did not recognise the Polish NADO and/or its rules, that left the door open for them to use their own rules, disciplinary panel and so on. WADA had already experienced a number of issues of cases being dealt with by NFs, in terms of unreasonable

length of proceedings, constant lack of reasoning in the decision, notification issues and NF rules not being in line with the Code. The Polish Government had acknowledged the problem and informed WADA that it would start working on a piece of legislation to address the issues. The Compliance Review Committee appreciated that commitment to act but was of the view that this was an extremely unfortunate situation, in which the Polish legal system, which had previously been deemed in line with the Code, had been modified and was thus no longer in line with the Code. That sent a very negative signal in the fight against doping in sport, and that was why the Compliance Review Committee was of the view that the issues should be dealt with by the Polish authorities by 12 August. If not, a status of non-compliance should be the consequence.

In relation to Russia, the Compliance Review Committee had been informed by WADA staff on the progress made and would reassess the compliance issue when requested to do so by WADA. A full report was in the members' files and would undoubtedly be discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Bouchard and his committee for the amount of work that had been done in what was a complex area. Before he put the committee's recommendations to the Foundation Board for approval, he asked for questions.

MR MUYTERS thanked the Compliance Review Committee for all the work done to date. In Europe, Code compliance was important, and everything should be done to promote Code compliance in terms of legislation and implementation. In relation to Spain, he had already mentioned Europe's opinion, and in relation to Poland there was a problem of legislation and Code implementation, and it was necessary to separate the two problems. Concerning the legislation, he agreed with the Compliance Review Committee that Poland should be put on the watch list and make amendments by 12 August so that the legislation became Code compliant. If Poland could not arrange that before 12 August, he agreed that Poland should be declared automatically non-compliant. In relation to implementation, Poland had asked for extra time and he hoped that WADA would be willing to give Poland extra time to solve that problem. There was no doubt that Poland was really willing to solve the problem as soon as possible.

MR ESTANGUET stated that the Olympic Movement agreed to the proposal in 10.4 on the use of ADAMS. It was time for all ADOs to report TUEs in ADAMS. That had a direct impact on the effectiveness and use of the passport. When would the decision to make it mandatory to report via ADAMS be implemented after the Foundation Board meeting?

MR NICHOLSON informed the members that he was present because Ms Coventry had been unable to attend, as she was training very hard for Rio, but she had sent a statement and included some athlete statements as well. He wished to read those, starting with Ms Coventry's statement: *Sydney was my first Olympics, Athens was the Olympic Games at which I won my first medal, Beijing was filled with extravagance and my most successful Olympics to date. London will also be my greatest accomplishment, because I overcame injury and still came in sixth in the world. Rio will be my fifth Olympics and possibly my last. I wanted, like most athletes and my previous experiences, to leave the sport with good memories. This unfortunately will not be true. Our sport movement is rigged with dopers and, worse still, filled with adults, coaches, parents, doctors and supposed role models who condone and encourage the use of banned substances. I have no confidence that I will be competing on a level playing field in Rio and my disappointment is echoed among other athletes.*

He proceeded to read some of the comments from other athletes: *I am an athlete currently competing and have issues on how doping situations are handled. Why have rules and regulations if the consequences of those rules and regulations are not enforced? It made an unfair, uneven playing field.* That comment had been submitted by an anonymous Olympic hopeful.

With the Rio Olympic Games quickly approaching, now more than ever we must see steps made to cleaner Olympics. It has been extremely disappointing that doping has gone on for

this long with so little done by WADA. I personally feel that WADA has let down every clean athlete in the sport. I know Rio will be far from clean in relation to doping athletes, and that breaks my heart for the many athletes who are competing clean in all levels of sport. Cammille Adams, London 2012 Olympian, 2015 world champion silver medallist.

I have continued to place a lot of hope in the many opportunities for WADA to step in and clean up the system. Time and again I have been disappointed. A change needs to be made for the good of the athletes, the sport and the spirit of competition. When will enough be enough? Jimmy Finnegan, London 2012 silver medallist.

I find like many of my peers, a difference in the principles and ideas of fair play to our reality. Unlike some of my peers, I do not believe that a centralised and more powerful entity is a solution. On the contrary. I believe such an act would eventually create a deeper and more profound corruption of power. However, the fact remains that, as athletes, we open ourselves to the invasion of our privacy and the invasion of our bodies for the sake of a cleaner sport. Yet all of these invasions serve only as a route to despair when, one after another, athletes, in particular star athletes, are created and protected by their state. To be sure, I give the benefit of the doubt to athletes. That they want to believe they are competing clean, even if they are not. We cannot be endured in the impunity of the state to deliberately corrupt the fair field of play. If not deliberate, what have you as the rule-makers done to lead down this path? Anthony Evans, Olympic and world champion.

Ms Coventry's comments continued: *We want investigations into doping across all sports and countries where there is any suspicion of known doping. We also want to see actions being taken and followed through to prevent continued doping. I am an athlete and a member of WADA. I have a vested interest in protecting our sport. We, WADA, market and portray ourselves as the organisation for clean sport and protecting clean athletes, but we are not. We do not have the power or finances to hold individuals, their entourage or their countries accountable in order to make the necessary changes to protect our athletes. We either need to get full autonomy and independence to take action or stop marketing ourselves as the organisation that will get this done.*

He read another quote: *As a coach, I see the immense training and emotions the athletes go through, so I support the means to have WADA quickly become the comprehensive international testing agency. The whole process, including which tests are given to the athletes, what time the tests are given and the collections, must be professionally handled and the transparency of the entire process from the IF to the doping control officers' interactions with the athletes must be intimately managed with the highest level of integrity. David Marsh, US Swimming women's head coach.*

Ms Coventry's final comment was: *A few athletes do stand up to make a difference. It's not working on the scale we need it to. What incentives are there for dopers or even the few people who may know who is doping to come forward? I believe that the majority of athletes want clean sport but their focus is on training, not trying to clean up a sport. Trust is therefore placed on WADA to act on our behalf because they have the purpose, experience and integrity to make a difference, but WADA needs the independence and resources to make a complete difference. This is not a time for half measures.*

He added that WADA really had to challenge the IOC as well, if not more so, as it was IOC and not WADA that had the power to make the change.

MS QUALTROUGH noted that Canada completely agreed in principle with the committee's proposal that non-compliant signatories should be required to sign an agreement with NADOs to financially contribute to the costs incurred by WADA to monitor and assist signatories to achieve Code compliance. However, the extent of the costs involved and whether or not the signatories had even the capacity to pay the costs were not clear. In the context of a developing country, that could be extremely challenging and might in fact contribute to the signatories remaining non-compliant. She was wondering whether WADA could incorporate some kind of flexibility into the proposal. With respect to 10.4, Canada and the NADO fully

supported the global use of ADAMS; however, Canada used SIMON, and the CCES staff members were currently manually inputting SIMON data into ADAMS, which was time consuming, prone to error, and it was a pretty tight timeline, so she wondered if there might be an assurance that there would be a universal interface available for other systems to transfer to ADAMS and if there was any kind of flexibility in the wording of the recommendation to say 'ADAMS or another WADA-approved system'.

MR BESSEBERG said that many IFs had a big problem in relation to the Code and the non-compliance of Russia, because Russia was hosting many major international events, and he knew that Russia would apply to host the world biathlon championships at the IF congress in September. The member federations would grant the event. The same situation applied in relation to big international events: the sports acted as the rights-holders and organisers at the top giving the rights. That was a headache, and there had already been many international events given to Russia before it had been declared non-compliant, as far as he could see. According to the Code, the IFs should do everything possible only to give big events to those in compliance with the Code. He sought clarification from WADA as to what to do. It was not only his federation. Many other IFs had large international events in Russia. The country was applying to host a major event that was five years away, but the decision would be taken in September.

MS SCOTT expressed appreciation to Mr Bouchard for addressing the call to action for sanctions and serious consequences on a declaration of non-compliance. That was obviously fully supported by the athletes. She emphasised the urgency of the matter. There were countries and NADOs being declared non-compliant, but there was no real follow-up action. She urged WADA to undertake that as soon as possible.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI asked if there was already an interface in ADAMS to enable those who were not yet in ADAMS to provide the information to be taken into consideration. If certain countries were not yet using ADAMS and the interface was not properly functioning, the countries should be given more time to be able to connect.

MR BOUCHARD responded to the questions and comments. On the issue of education that had been raised, he would say that that was not an issue that had been discussed by the committee and he was not aware of the specifics of the elements put forward, so he thought it was an issue that would be best addressed by the Foundation Board. Nevertheless, education could be conducted within the territory of the signatories and outside, and there were major differences between the two, especially if there was a non-compliant country being asked to conduct education sessions in other countries. It seemed to him that there was an issue of values and ethics there. On the issue of Poland and the distinction between legislation and implementation, he agreed that, in relation to those two issues, Poland had not been made aware of the two at the same time. The process was very clear: three months. That having been said, on implementation, the three months could extend beyond 12 August. The request was to have more time, but he wished to define more time. He was prepared to look at the moment Poland had been notified of the second issue, implementation, take three months as of that moment and move it forward; that was a possibility.

Mr Estanguet was asking when, and he would reply as soon as possible.

With regard to the point made by the Canadian minister about the capacity to pay, and he thanked the minister for the question, that had been part of the discussion, and that was why he was referring to the endorsement of an agreement but also allowing for a case-by-case approach, because not all cases of non-compliance would be the same. Some would be more important than others, and a quick fix would be possible for some but not for others, which was why the agreement was a template and could be customised.

On the issue raised by Mr Besseberg in relation to sanctions and consequences, there had been an appeal for those issues to be covered, and the Compliance Review Committee had undertaken to look at that as soon as possible to answer Ms Scott's question and come back

to the Foundation Board with recommendations. Mr Niggli would deal with the issue of ADAMS.

Regarding Mr Nicholson's intervention, he thought that the comments shared were motivation for the Compliance Review Committee to continue its work and ensure that all signatories were compliant as soon as possible.

MR NIGGLI said that he thought that the ADAMS issue was pretty clear. Everybody understood that there had been a recommendation from the Independent Commission that the data needed to be in the systems, and there had been a call from the athletes for more transparency and investigations. In the real world, there was one system available and WADA needed the information in the system. There was no interface that worked. It was a matter of providing the human resources needed for that to happen. WADA was working on redevelopment and so on, but he could not say exactly when that would happen. It currently had to happen immediately. In relation to deadlines, the rule was that WADA would hope to have the doping control forms in the system within 15 days after the test. For the backlog of those that had not been entered, WADA had given until the end of the year, but he currently hoped to get the doping control forms within 15 days after the test. That did not mean that the country would be non-compliant after 15 days; there was a whole process of compliance, and WADA would hold dialogue with those countries. The principle was that it was necessary to enter the information within 15 days of the control taking place.

MR MUYTERS clarified that, for Poland, he was suggesting the fixed date of 12 August for the legislation, but was asking for one month for implementation.

THE CHAIRMAN told Mr Muyters that WADA was dealing with the entry of doping control forms into ADAMS. The clear message had been heard from the athletes; that was a recommendation being made by the Executive Committee and he was keen that the Foundation Board accept it and implement it as quickly as possible.

MR GODKIN asked if Mr Niggli was talking about the backlog being entered, including for countries that did not use ADAMS, by the end of the year, but was looking for declarations of non-compliance prospectively for doping control forms not loaded within 15 days from that point forward. Was that correct?

MR NIGGLI responded that he was saying that, once the rule was passed, organisations would be asked to enter the new doping control forms within 15 days of the test. From the beginning of that year, they would have more time to enter whatever backlog there was.

MR GODKIN thanked Mr Niggli for the information, noting the significant difference.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members would be happy to accept the recommendation.

DECISION

Compliance Review Committee Chair report and update noted and compliance recommendation approved.

– 10.2 Compliance update

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that, at the previous meeting in Colorado Springs, the Foundation Board had declared the Russian anti-doping agency to be non-compliant. Since that date, WADA had been working fairly diligently in attempts to resolve that situation so that it could, at some future date, become compliant. There was currently and had been continued comment, be it media comment, expert comment or any comment on the situation in Russia, much of it uninformed, so it had been considered best to see exactly the situation that had operated since the agency had been declared non-compliant and what the current situation was.

MR KOEHLER informed the members that he would provide them with an update on how far WADA had come since 18 November, when the WADA Foundation Board had declared RUSADA non-compliant, and provide milestones on actions that had been taken, provide an update on

what had been done in Russia and look at what had to be done on the way forward. Following the declaration by the Foundation Board on 18 November, RUSADA had been declared non-compliant. Immediately after the declaration of non-compliance in November, a WADA delegation led by the Director General had met the Russian minister of sport and his delegation in Germany on 26 November to discuss the way forward and what needed to be done. One of the key outcomes had been to ensure that testing was happening in Russia during the non-compliance period. Following that meeting, from 1 to 5 December, five key RUSADA staff had resigned from their positions and, immediately after, on 9 to 11 December, recognising that it was necessary to fill the gap, WADA had engaged the UK ADO to see if it would be interested in or willing to carry out testing in Russia during the period of non-compliance. On 10 December, the director general of RUSADA had resigned and, on 18 December, following those meetings and after discussion with UKAD, WADA and RUSADA, UKAD had formally accepted the mandate to do testing in Russia during the non-compliance period and carry out testing in Russia as best as it possibly could. UKAD had realised that somebody had to stand up to protect the clean athletes during the period of non-compliance. Once agreed, a contract had been drafted to outline the roles and responsibilities of all the parties involved. That contract had been drafted just before the Christmas holidays on 22 December. During that time, WADA had been going back and forth with RUSADA to finalise an agreement. Finally, on 20 January, the roles and responsibilities had been agreed to between WADA, RUSADA and UKAD, and an agreement had been signed. The agreement covered the expenses for UKAD to carry out the work. The agreement also covered WADA expenses; when WADA representatives had to travel to Russia, the Russian anti-doping agency was expected to pay for travel. On 3 and 4 February, there had been another joint meeting between RUSADA, UKAD and WADA to talk about the practical mechanisms of how to implement testing in Russia. The testing by UKAD had not started in Russia until mid- to late February. At the same time, WADA had recognised the Independent Commission recommendations that international people were needed in RUSADA to work in parallel and watch over the development of the agency, to develop more autonomy and ensure transparency within the organisation. In February, WADA had secured the first international expert, Mr Nicholson and, in March, WADA had secured the second one, Ms Lukosiute-Stanikuniene, from Lithuania. On 9 March, there had been an overall project plan developed separately to talk about RUSADA. It was a different plan to that developed by UKAD. It was a plan for RUSADA to fulfil certain obligations to work its way back to compliance. Between March and mid-April, WADA had waited for RUSADA to provide agreements to cover the costs of the international experts. There had been an agreement that RUSADA would pay for the services of international experts. On 15 April, RUSADA had agreed to the terms and conditions. On 27 and 28 April, there had been another project team meeting between UKAD, WADA and RUSADA to talk about current testing happening with UKAD and the international experts' remit when it came to working with RUSADA towards compliance. The first international expert, Mr Nicholson, had started his work in Russia on 26 April. WADA received weekly reports on progress and status, and the second international expert, Ms Lukosiute-Stanikuniene, had just started on 9 May.

When it came to the roles and responsibilities of the organisations, to make it clear to everybody what role the different organisations were playing, the UKAD role was an interim measure, to fill the gaps given that RUSADA did not have the ability to test. UKAD had allocated staff to work alongside RUSADA staff, engaged an intelligence officer, a testing coordinator, a manager and a Russian-speaking expert to assist with translation. UKAD had to review the risk assessment of all athletes and sports, develop a test distribution plan and the registered testing plan criteria to guide the testing in Russia. UKAD was also responsible for managing testing on Russian athletes through the use of private sample collection agencies. It was not UKAD staff or doping control officers doing the testing; it was private sample collection companies such as IDTM carrying out sample collection under their jurisdiction. UKAD was also responsible for ensuring the coordination of the transport of samples to WADA-accredited laboratories and analysis. Three separate laboratories were currently being used. UKAD was responsible for reviewing and accepting all TUEs from Russia, and would assist the international experts to assess and retrain RUSADA doping control officers when the time came. UKAD was working to further develop the current capacity of staff in RUSADA.

RUSADA's main responsibility was to fully cooperate with UKAD and WADA. RUSADA was expected to share all test plans done in the past or planned at the time of non-compliance. RUSADA had to share information on testing in Russia in an internal database and provide full and unrestricted access to UKAD in relation to all Russian athletes in ADAMS. RUSADA also had to ensure that the appropriate protocols were in place to guarantee the export of samples from Russia to the WADA-accredited laboratories.

WADA had full oversight of the entire project, in terms of what UKAD was doing to fill the testing gap and what the international experts were doing when it came to the overall rebuilding of RUSADA. WADA was obliged to attend all meetings with UKAD and RUSADA and had agreed to work with RUSADA and the two international experts contracted to assess and monitor the way forward for RUSADA's compliance.

There was no question that the work being done with RUSADA had been a huge strain on WADA resources. A lot of time had been spent on the matter, a lot of staff had been dedicated, and it had not been easy. As part of the other recommendations made and additional responsibilities, it had been agreed that the Council of Europe would appoint a person to sit on the governing board of RUSADA. Mr Khrychkov from the Council of Europe had already attended a RUSADA board meeting. He had mentioned the two international experts who would work with WADA towards compliance. It had been agreed, given that RUSADA had an external result management panel, that RUSADA would review and be responsible for result management with the close oversight of WADA, which had the right to appeal and reviewed all recent decisions. Finally, RUSADA had been given permission to continue to carry out education initiatives throughout Russia during the period of non-compliance.

Some of the limitations and challenges faced during that time included capacity. Looking at the capacity of the private sample collection companies in Russia, the agreement had started off with one company: IDTM. IDTM had a maximum of 10 doping control officers in Russia. That was a major limiting capacity on doping control in the country. Since then, UKAD had engaged two more companies to try to expand that mandate. As he had mentioned, there had been delayed payments from RUSADA to WADA, UKAD and the private sample collection companies, which at one point had stopped accepting mission orders from UKAD due to lack of payment by RUSADA. WADA had had to step in and work with the ministry and RUSADA to ensure that payment was made on a timely basis, and currently RUSADA was back on track. The delayed agreement on getting the experts in place had been a limitation. WADA had wanted them in earlier, but there had been negotiations on costs and signing an agreement. The experts were now in place.

Access to closed military cities in Russia was an issue. Russia had seven (and possibly 10) closed military cities in which some athletes were known to train and reside. Currently, 30 days' notice was required to gain access to those cities. The issue was to gain immediate access with no notice. There was presently an agreement to provide six-month access to doping control officers in Russia; however, two doping control officers had recently been on a mission to a closed city, and they had not had authorised access. Following arrangements to conduct the sample collection process just outside of the closed city, the federal security bureau (FSB) had shown up and threatened the doping control officers that, if they ever came within 80 km of the military city again, the German doping control officer would have their visa revoked and no longer be given entry into Russia and the Russian doping control officer would have criminal charges laid against them.

In terms of numbers and testing statistics in Russia, he referred to the statistics report from 18 November 2015 to 5 May 2016. There had been 2,244 tests conducted on Russian athletes as reported in ADAMS. Of those tests, the IAAF had carried out 403 tests and UKAD, filling the gap in Russia, had carried out 247 tests. An additional 426 tests had been planned but, as he had mentioned, due to the capacity of the private sample collection providers and lack of payment by RUSADA, those mission orders had never been filled. UKAD currently had 230 tests planned and accepted by the sample collection providers. Of the 2,244 tests conducted, 1,444 had been conducted on summer Olympic athletes, and 800 tests had been conducted on winter Olympic athletes by IFs, NADOs and UKAD. It would be remiss of him not to give the members an idea of

what that meant in comparison with the statistics from 18 November 2014 to 5 May 2015. Comparatively, 6,890 tests had been performed on Russian athletes during the same period the previous year, of which 4,250 had been on summer and 2,640 had been on winter sports athletes.

In terms of results, based on UKAD's intelligence testing and the work it had been doing to date, of the 247 tests conducted, it had identified 19 whereabouts failures across 18 sports, 20 missed tests on athletes reported, 79 filing failures and one whereabouts violation. A combination of three missed tests and filing failures was required for a whereabouts violation. In addition, there had been one refusal from an athlete. Of the 247 tests, there had been 49 adverse analytical findings and one atypical finding across 13 sports, of which 47 had been from meldonium, one from stanozolol, and one from meldonium and a stimulant.

Looking at the way forward, WADA would continue to work with the international experts to assist and oversee the development of RUSADA, to work with UKAD and ensure that governance issues were addressed. All the issues had been outlined in a detailed project plan presented to RUSADA. All of the information that WADA had was being shared with the IAAF independent task force, as it had a decision to make.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any questions.

MR PENGILLY asked a simple question in light of the report. Given the fact that there had been 99 whereabouts failures across 18 sports, what assurance could WADA have to give athletes around the world that the athletes Russia would be sending to Rio were clean?

MS SCOTT followed up on Mr Pengilly's comments in relation to the level of confidence for athletes going to Rio. It was very disappointing and disturbing information presented and she wondered if the WADA Foundation Board and WADA would be willing and able to publicly recommend some kind of sanctions or action, so that athletes going to Rio could be reassured that the playing field there would be level and that athletes involved in doping leading up to the Olympic Games would not be there.

On behalf of Sport New Zealand, MR GENDALL shared the concerns of Mr Pengilly and Ms Scott and noted that the statistics were very disturbing and of great concern. In New Zealand, it would be necessary to give assurances to the New Zealand athletes that the participation and competition would not be compromised by some competitors who, according to the statistics, might not be cooperating fully with anti-doping measures, and he shared the question posed by Mr Pengilly. How would WADA assure the athletes that the playing field would be level? He accepted that the task force was doing an excellent job, but the question related only to Russian competitors.

MR PATEL stated that he would not pass comment given that the UK, through UKAD, was an interested party. He welcomed Mr Koehler's very informative presentation and findings. He was keen on the whole transparency agenda and more regular reporting of findings going forward would be welcome.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he risked being very unpopular, but he believed that the matter was somewhat more complicated. He fully shared the concerns expressed by Ms Scott and New Zealand, but believed that there were many more factors to be considered. Justice was individual and not global. Each country had its own characteristics. If one started scrutinising country by country, there were many things to be considered. WADA had to be very prudent. Second, there was the matter of jurisdiction. Jurisdiction regarding participation in the Olympic Games was not WADA's job, in his opinion.

MS BOKEL thanked Mr Koehler for his report. She agreed with Ms Scott and Mr Pengilly, but she thought that there was something missing. Having heard that athletes were gathering in military bases, for which 30 days' advance notice was required in order to access them, it was not only about the athletes but also about the athlete support personnel and the administration, and that should be considered for sanctioning as well.

MR REEDIE said that he was not entirely sure that he could give the members the kind of assurance that they wanted. The purpose of the presentation had been to give the members information on the current state of play in Russia. He could only draw from that that it was unlikely that the Compliance Review Committee was going to make a recommendation of compliance at any early date, and that was what WADA's responsibility was: to decide whether ADOs or IFs were compliant or not. He rather took the view that more regular information would be helpful, particularly if that showed an improvement. He did not think that one could automatically assume that athletes were gathering in military bases in closed cities. He thought that people would be able to draw their own conclusions from the presentation given. It would clearly become public, and that was fine, as it meant that WADA would not have to deal with constant rumours from other sources on what the situation might be in Russia. At the same time, he was very wisely advised by Mr Ricci Bitti that it was a very complex situation, so he thought that the assurance that WADA could give for the athletes was that every possible effort was being made, as discussed, on intelligent testing plans in the build-up to Rio. There was one sport in Russia that was currently suspended, track and field athletics, and the decision on that would be taken by the IAAF on 17 June. He could give no further guarantees. The members knew the situation just as well as he did, that efforts were being made. The members had to hope that they would be successful.

MR KOEHLER clarified that, for the closed cities, 30 days' notice to get access was required, but the doping control officers would not have to do that every time they had to go. He told Mr Gendall that, for the 99 filing failures, it took three of those, either a filing failure or a missed test, to have a whereabouts failure. The 99 was broken down into 20 missed tests (attempts to test athletes who had not been there) and 79 for which the deadline to submit whereabouts had been missed. That was how the numbers broke down.

DECISION

Compliance update approved.

– **10.3 Non-compliance**

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that they had a very clear recommendation (slightly amended as far as Poland was concerned) on the removal of Andorra, the non-compliance of Kenya and the hopefully short-term non-compliance of Poland. Were the members happy to accept the recommendation?

In relation to the proposal under item 10.4, MR NIGGLI suggested, in an attempt to keep things simple, that the date in the paper should be kept to for legislation and an extra month be given for practice, so there would be no doubt about dates.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that that seemed eminently sensible.

There had been a discussion the previous day at the meeting of the Executive Committee and another clear feeling that day in relation to Spain, which was pretty unique in that it did not have a government, although he had to say that, if the Spanish authorities had acted a bit earlier, they would not be in that position. If there was a demand for education services and if such services were available, WADA should be prepared to allow a concession to allow them to continue their educational efforts. He was sure that the Spanish authorities would be happy with that.

DECISION

Recommendation on non-compliance approved.

– 10.4 Mandatory entry of DCFs and TUEs into ADAMS

The discussions on this matter are referenced above, under 10.1 Compliance Review Committee Chair report.

DECISION

Recommendation regarding mandatory entry of doping control forms and TUEs into ADAMS approved.

11. Legal and investigations

– 11.1 Legal and investigations report

MR NIGGLI said that a number of the items in his report had already been discussed. The Foundation Board had discussed investigations, but he highlighted that, as part of its current activities, WADA had provided training to IFs and NADOs on how to gather intelligence and make sure that they had the right methods to store and use the intelligence when necessary, and also share it. That was an important part of what had been done over the past few months.

On data protection, Europe had adopted new legislation to enter into force in about two years' time. Everybody was aware of the impact of the legislation; the country holding the presidency of the European Union, the Netherlands, would be organising a one-day conference on data protection in June. The important thing was for all member states of the European Union to recognise through their legislation the public interest of anti-doping; that was fairly straightforward, but needed to happen before the new text entered into force to avoid any data transfer problems.

The members would see in his report an update on the laboratories that had gone through the disciplinary committee, and he did not wish to add to that. The work was ongoing with a number of them to ensure that they would regain accreditation as soon as they had fixed the problems identified through the proficiency testing programme. The next visit of the science team to the Beijing laboratory would be in June.

A number of ongoing and solved cases could be seen in his report.

DECISION

Legal and investigations report noted.

– 11.2 Whistleblowers

MR NIGGLI referred to the information in the members' files, and informed the members that Mr Stepanov had addressed the Executive Committee by Skype the previous day, and he thanked Mr Stepanov for his availability. His suggestions would be taken into account in the development of a whistleblower programme. He had been told that day that the term 'whistleblower' was rather negative and that 'informant' would be a more appropriate word. He would try to use that in further documentation.

DECISION

Whistleblowers report noted.

12. Anti-Doping Administration Management System (ADAMS)

MR NIGGLI said that the members would see the statistics on current use of the system. That was a system WADA would continue to use. There would be no change to the current system for a period of time. WADA had agreed on a freezing period so that there would be no surprise during the Olympic Games. After the Olympic Games, there would still be regular improvement and maintenance of the current system. At the same time, there was ongoing IT development of the New ADAMS. That was an IT project, and IT projects were always challenging. The work was

ongoing. There were currently some issues with one of the service providers, being handled by the IT Department and the Legal Department. They were likely to result in some delays, but he would provide further information to the members as the project advanced. If the members had questions of a non-technical nature, he would be happy to answer them

THE CHAIRMAN commented that he had had trouble with IT programmes in WADA for even longer than Mr Niggli had.

DECISION

ADAMS update noted.

13. Regional offices

– 13.1 European – Lausanne

13.1.1 2016 Anti-Doping Organisation Symposium report

MR DONZÉ stated that he would combine the report on the European regional office with the report on IF relations and the WADA symposium for ADOs, as some of the members would know that WADA's European regional office was the first point of contact with IFs, and it had also been responsible for the organisation and development of the WADA ADO symposium since 2012.

The Lausanne office was responsible for liaison and relations with IFs and a number of stakeholders in Europe from the Olympic Movement and public authorities and governments. As the members would see from the report, the office had beefed up government and NADO relations activities in Europe by hiring a manager specifically responsible for such matters in Lausanne.

He gave some highlights of the main activities conducted by the office since the previous meeting of the Foundation Board in November 2015. In the lead-up to the Code-compliance monitoring process to start later that year, support and assistance was being given to IFs in all areas of anti-doping. The office had continued to strengthen guidance and assistance to IFs in terms of practice of the 2015 Code and international standards, had conducted courses, had a person in Lausanne responsible for ADAMS who was organising the regular training of stakeholders, an intelligence and investigations officer in Lausanne who had put together a course on information-gathering and intelligence-sharing which had been given to numerous groups of IFs, NADOs, and so on. The office had continued to conduct, in close cooperation with the colleagues from the WADA Standards and Harmonisation Department, a Partnership to Quality project, through which WADA worked with IFs to look in greater depth at their anti-doping programmes and what could be further strengthened and improved so that, when the monitoring of compliance with the Code started that year, they would be in a better position in terms of compliance. The office representatives had met a number of IFs and planned to involve 15 IFs in the programme prior to the Rio Olympic Games.

IF and NADO cooperation had been touched upon the previous day at the Executive Committee meeting, and it was a priority. The office had been asked by the Foundation Board and Executive Committee to do more in terms of further optimising cooperation between IFs and NADOs, which were key stakeholders, and had put together a small group of IFs and NADOs to work on the development of guidelines to optimise IF-NADO cooperation. At the end of the day, it came down to mutual trust, practical implementation, but it had been felt to be a useful document by the anti-doping community and the office would continue to develop it to include concrete examples of best practice and to facilitate good cooperation between IFs and NADOs.

As was the case every year, the office had also been involved in the SportAccord convention. It was traditionally a very busy week for WADA with presentations at several meetings. The office had also held, for the third time running, a practical workshop for and with recognised IFs. WADA had been contacted some years previously by ARIFS, which had asked WADA whether it would partner with it to hold a very practical workshop for its members as part of the SportAccord

convention. It was a very successful workshop that had been held in Lausanne at the time of the SportAccord convention, involving IFs of all types.

He had said that the office had beefed up government relations activities. It had been felt strongly by the office and by stakeholders that it was important to enhance European government relations activities from Lausanne, and the position of a NADO and government relations manager had been created for the European regional office. He was happy to have Florence Lefebvre Rangeon, who had come from the Brussels office of the EOC and had been very active over the past few months and weeks working with governments and NADOs.

The office continued to pursue its activities and fruitful and productive cooperation with the European authorities, including in particular the European Commission and the Council of Europe. The office had participated in the usual meetings of CAHAMA and the monitoring group of the Council of Europe convention, and would be involved actively in the conference organised by the European Commission on the fight against doping in sport in a European context, which would include data protection issues.

To conclude his report, he would give some information on the 2016 edition of the WADA ADO symposium. The event had become quite significant over the years. It had gone from being a small IF gathering when first launched to being a pretty major gathering of ADO practitioners. It was the largest annual gathering of anti-doping practitioners worldwide and the largest annual WADA event, and he had been very pleased to experience once again a record number of participants. More than 500 participants had registered, representing ADOs, IFs, RADOs and major event organisers, as well as laboratories. Representatives of the media had also been invited to attend the first day of the symposium. The focus had been very much on partnerships and quality practice, so really the quality of the practice of the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code leading up to the compliance exercise to start later that year. WADA had renewed a number of experiences and innovations, namely a full day of practical workshops for participants, which had been much appreciated by the participants. WADA had opened the symposium to WADA-accredited anti-doping laboratories to try to enhance synergies and further cooperation between all parties involved. WADA had sent a survey to the participants after the symposium and the feedback had been very positive, and the participants had felt it was a very successful symposium. Beyond the fact that WADA sought to achieve better World Anti-Doping Code practice, there was a very strong component of cooperation between the various ADOs. It was a wonderful opportunity for all ADOs, including IFs and NADOs, to share practices, expertise and experience, and was a wonderful opportunity to maximise synergies and opportunities. The ADO symposium, which lasted three days, was currently joined by other side meetings, including the general annual meeting of the Institute of National Anti-Doping Organisations, and WADA had organised quite a number of other meetings, including training for IFs in terms of information-gathering and intelligence-sharing, and was already looking at the future of the symposium. Based on the feedback received, WADA would hold an internal debriefing session to see how to continue to make the symposium evolve, but also try to manage it as much as possible in terms of its growth, as it meant a significant amount of work for the Lausanne office and WADA in general. That concluded his report. If there were any more questions, he would be very happy to entertain them.

THE CHAIRMAN supported Mr Donzé's comments that the ADO symposium in Lausanne was a major event and accomplished good work.

DECISION

European regional office update noted.

– 13.2 African – Cape Town

MR SWIGELAAR informed the members that the regional office had been engaging key stakeholders in the region since November. He wished to highlight one or two of the engagements, obviously bearing in mind the fact that his report and Mr Koehler's report on NADO development covered some of the visits extensively. In November, ANOCA had convened its

general assembly in Mauritius. The IOC president had set the tone at the meeting by conveying a very strong message on the importance of anti-doping and the threat it posed to sport. He had followed that up with a presentation and had brought the message closer to home, focusing on closer cooperation between WADA and ANOCA and the need for relevant and measurable programmes in Africa. The general assembly had adopted encouraging resolutions in support of WADA and the Code and anti-doping in general. That had been followed up by WADA's attendance at the ANOCA executive committee meeting in Zimbabwe the previous week, where discussions had focused on priorities and the exploration of practical means through which WADA and ANOCA could work together in support of clean athletes. It was believed that the interactions would lead to significantly more collaborative initiatives between WADA and ANOCA.

The regional office had also had very fruitful discussions with the newly appointed Nigerian sports minister, who had gone to Cape Town to meet WADA and look at ways in which WADA could assist Nigeria and Nigeria could implement and enhance the anti-doping programme. The process was ongoing. The South African Institute for Drug-free Sport had been brought on board to partner with WADA and assist Nigeria at the level of building capacity.

In December, the regional office had also travelled to Ethiopia to meet all stakeholders and discuss the development of the NADO. The discussions had focused on the establishment of the NADO, the need for more testing and education, as well as the legislative requirements in support of the NADO. Since then, the authorities had implemented a number of the recommendations emanating from the discussions and already testing had increased. Much more was expected and, in June, WADA would visit Addis Ababa again to consider developments and see how to enhance progress in that regard.

In April, the regional office had travelled to Morocco and met with the Moroccan stakeholders including the government and the NOC, and discussions were ongoing between the parties to ensure that a sustainable, robust and relevant programme was implemented without further delay.

The discussions with Egypt and Kenya were ongoing and the regional office, together with colleagues in Montreal, continued to work with the relevant authorities as well as partners (Norway in the case of Kenya, and the South African Institute for Drug-free Sport) in those countries. Detailed updates in relation to Kenya and Egypt were in the documents and in his report, and in Mr Koehler's report there were further details in that regard. He would be very happy to take any questions.

DECISION

African regional office update approved.

– **13.3 Latin American - Montevideo**

MS PESCE informed the members that details of the work carried out in Latin America were outlined in her report. In addition to continuing to develop detection and deterrence methods in the region, including more effective testing and sound result management processes, prevention was always among the activities that the office sought to strengthen anti-doping programmes through capacity building, awareness and values-based education. She showed a video of an education activity carried out at the youth national Paralympic games in the city of Natal the previous November, where the national Paralympic committee had worked together with the Brazilian NADO, ABCD, to bring the innovative experience to more than 3,000 athletes and coaches. It was an example of one aspect of an education programme using events to generate awareness about anti-doping issues as well as getting buy-in from athletes through social media.

DECISION

Latin American regional office update approved.

– **13.4 Asian/Oceanian - Tokyo**

MR HAYASHI informed the members that he would like to focus on the recent development of the regional policy and programme, especially focusing on priorities in 2016, including funding,

the UNESCO convention, Code compliance and implementation, and RADO/NADO enhancement and partnership.

On finance, the Asian region already shouldered 20.46% of WADA's regular budget; in addition, the region had wielded a stronger presence in additional contributions to WADA. The members would see from the graphs the additional contributions to WADA by the region. As reported by the Director General in contributions to the new research fund, 65% of total government contributions came from the region's countries: China, Japan, Korea, Saudi Arabia and Qatar.

In relation to the development of Code compliance, NADOs and NOCs acting as NADOs had already adopted the NADO rules and RADO rules to be in line with the Code and were promoting their Code compliance, focusing on practice. In practice, especially on testing, based on preliminary testing figures in 2015, major NADOs and RADO member countries were becoming very active, especially thanks to WADA grants to RADOs.

Partnership was a key word in the region. He wished to thank the key partners, referring to the first establishment of the RADO prototype Oceanian RADO supported by ONOC, and the first signature of Code-compliant major event organisers by the OCA. The OCA also supported the various kinds of RADO programmes, and he showed the members a picture of the RADO conference supported by the OCA. The members would also see the agreement between WADA and OCA. He looked so small behind the picture of the President. He had tried to jump but missed the shot! He thanked Sheikh Ahmed, and he recognised the support of ANOC and its president. Without the strong support and initiative of the governments, there would be no development of anti-doping programmes in the region. The members would see a photo of the first intergovernmental meeting on anti-doping in the Asian region. The Director General had facilitated government involvement to support the anti-doping activities from the very start. The members would see a picture of the governmental meeting in India, with too many media representatives present in Delhi on the compliance of India in 2009. Qatar was also a strong supporter of the activities of the regional office. Korea was a member of the Foundation Board and also strongly involved in cooperation in relation to anti-doping capacity building. China had hosted the gene doping symposium. So, as the members would see, the Director General had been at the centre of cooperation and coordination for the development of anti-doping policy and programmes, and he thanked Mr Howman.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that he was very surprised that, coming from the land of the camera, Mr Hayashi had been unable to get in the photograph!

DECISION

Asian/Oceanian regional office update noted.

14. International Federations

Item dealt with under 13.1.

DECISION

International federations update noted.

15. NADO/RADO relations

MR KOEHLER highlighted a few items in the department report. One was a change in the documents, identifying that there were 127 countries involved and 16 RADOs. Recently, in relation to the South American RADO, Ecuador had indicated that it would not be part of the RADO and would develop one on its own, and El Salvador had had some problems getting an agreement between the NOC and the government, which was a condition to be on the RADO, to sign a RADO board form, so the country was no longer part of that RADO in central America.

He also wished to mention a few areas in which additional funding had been provided to assist the RADO countries. The Japanese Government continued to provide a fund, and 173,000 dollars had been provided that year to assist RADOs in Asia. The Australian Government had helped continuously with the Oceania RADO and was considering extending that agreement over a two-year period, and that was worth 120,000 dollars. The President had mentioned earlier the assistance for education of the RADOs, and that had been through Olympic Solidarity, which had provided a 200,000 dollar grant in the lead-up to the Olympic Games to enhance education programmes throughout the regions. The OCA, in cooperation with the Thai NOC and sport authority, had hosted the fourth RADO conference in Thailand and covered the majority of the costs during that time.

There had been mention earlier that day of the Rio task force held on 27 April 2016. He provided a brief update on the status and the task force report. Overall, the task force had been pretty pleased with the progress of Rio 2016, under the leadership of Professor Henrique de Rose and the direct responsibility of James Slater, who had come in only relatively recently to manage the operational aspects. However, there were a few concerns involving transport requirements and available transport for the doping control staff during the Olympic Games. There was a need to increase the cooperation and partnership between ABCD and Rio 2016. There had been an additional scoping of volunteers: 30% extra for chaperones during the Olympic Games. Unfortunately, those numbers had been reduced and the 30% additional volunteers scoped were no longer there, so Rio was running a very tight ship; it had the right numbers and he hoped that all the volunteers would stay for the duration of the Olympic Games. The good news was that 115 international doping control officers had been recruited and would be going to Rio for doping control. ABCD, the NADO in the country, had ratified the rules in time for the Olympic Games, and finally ABCD had been asked to provide a detailed flow chart on how intelligence from the central intelligence area would be transferred to the IOC during games-time so that anything coming in to the country was flagged with the IOC and its task force in addition to whereabouts information. Overall, that had been the last task force meeting and he was pleased that WADA had not needed to have another one. Hopefully, everything would go according to plan in Rio

Finally, he wished to mention three countries, and the issue of providing assistance. It had been mentioned by Mr Pound earlier: the whole idea of NADOs having to prove that they were compliant as opposed to WADA having to do so. He had listed in his report NADOs that required extra attention, and there were three that he wished to identify. One was Argentina. WADA was partnering with Colombia to ensure that the Argentinean NADO would be up and running in time for the Youth Olympic Games in 2018, and he was pleased to say that WADA had seen significant progress in Argentina through hiring of staff and a commitment to move forward. In terms of India, WADA had experienced many delays with the Indian NADO in terms of a partnership WADA was trying to establish with the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority; however, the previous week, the Indian secretary of sport had been in Montreal and provided full commitment to ensure that partnership would happen, and the Indian NADO continued to improve and increase its programmes. Egypt had been on his list for a few years. There had been a meeting one month previously between the government, the NOC and the NADO, and he was very pleased with the progress achieved, and WADA was looking at a few small technical details that needed to be approved. On 20 April, the NADO working group had met in Montreal, and he handed over to Mr Andersen, the chairman of the group, to highlight some of the outcomes of the report.

MR ANDERSEN said that he was sure that the members were aware that the NADO ad hoc working group had been established by WADA to hear the views of NADOs, as they did not have a seat around the Executive Committee and Foundation Board tables. They were at the coalface of anti-doping in sport, contrary to governments and the IFs to a certain degree, so that group had been set up to enable the members to hear the view of NADOs from around the world and also to give input to the Foundation Board and the WADA management on current issues.

A number of issues had been discussed during the one-day meeting on 20 April, including the independent testing agency, Russia, whistleblowers and a whistleblower policy, and how NADOs could contribute to enhancing the fight against doping in sport. The members had a report in their folders, so he would provide only a few highlights. The independent testing agency for IFs

and the entire anti-doping movement was welcomed. It was also felt that the role of WADA needed to be further discussed and the role the NADOs played in that process needed to be further articulated. WADA could not play both roles (regulatory body and testing agency) due to a real or perceived conflict of interest and welcomed the exploratory work to be undertaken. The situation in Russia had been discussed, and he had just read some disturbing news from the New York Times which would add to issues relating to Russia. The group also embraced Ms Scott's open letter calling for further investigations in Russia and looked forward to receiving an action plan proposed by WADA in response to the letter and her intervention that day and the previous day. It was felt that, moving forward, additional resources needed to be allocated for compliance monitoring. That would include strong investment to assess Code compliance, and that was in line with what had been discussed that day. WADA needed to further explore the implications for stakeholders in relation to non-compliance and consider a dynamic approach depending on why a country was declared non-compliant. There had to be tools and a list of consequences in that regard, and there had been an idea of, if need be, looking at the Code in due course in order to see whether more consequences could be added.

The whistleblower policy had been discussed, and he was happy to see that it was currently under way.

In terms of what NADOs themselves could do, they could do testing on foreign athletes in their own countries. That was important, because NADOs and doping control officers should not be obliged to travel long distances to test athletes. If every NADO were to test foreign athletes on their soil, that would help improve the testing regime and protect clean athletes.

The group also encouraged NADOs to establish athlete committees, because that was why they were there: to protect the clean athletes.

That concluded his report, but he had two words for Mr Howman. The NADOs wished to thank him for his leadership and guidance over many years. Mr Howman had always had the clean athletes' interests as a priority. He had also supported and promoted NADOs in the fight against doping in sport and highlighted the important role that they played. He had often challenged the NADOs to be more effective and efficient and his legacy would continue. He looked forward to seeing the enhanced role of the NADOs. He thanked Mr Howman for everything he had done for NADOs and for clean athletes.

MS SCOTT thanked Mr Andersen for listening to the athletes. He had mentioned the New York Times article that had just come out. It would be remiss of her not to mention it because of the sheer number of athletes affected by it. It was noteworthy and important. She did not wish to be antagonistic, but it simply underlined the importance of the role that WADA had in leading investigations for the athletes. It was absolutely imperative that WADA be shown to be leading the investigations and keeping the protection of clean athletes at the heart of the movement. That would do enormous amounts in terms of restoring faith and giving athletes trust in the system.

MR NICHOLSON said that Mr Koehler had mentioned the volunteers for Rio and all the cutbacks that were being seen. Was there any assurance that, for the Paralympic Games, there would be the number of people required for testing in terms of volunteers?

MR KOEHLER responded that he had been informed that the recruitment for the Paralympic Games was on the same track as the Olympic Games and the recruitment for international doping control officers was also on target. The 30% had been an additional amount in case people dropped out. As far as he knew, recruitment was on schedule.

MR NICHOLSON asked about extra training for those athletes with high support needs.

MR KOEHLER replied that he understood they were getting extra training.

DECISION

NADO/RADO relations update noted.

16. Government relations (including UNESCO convention)

Item dealt with under item 3.

DECISION

Government relations update noted.

17. Communications

THE CHAIRMAN said that Ms MacLean was much involved in other things that day and would not make a formal presentation but, if there were any questions, he was sure she would be happy to take them.

DECISION

Communications update noted.

18. Standards and harmonisation

MR RICKETTS said that he would give a short presentation. He touched on three elements of the Standards and Harmonisation Department's report, which included an overview of the technical document for sport-specific analysis and its implementation in 2015, the WADA Independent Observer programme for the Rio Olympic Games and Paralympic Games and also the pre-Rio intelligence gathering task force, in which WADA was involved.

The TDSSA was a new technical document developed by a WADA expert group in close cooperation with the IFs and in consultation with the NADOs and laboratories, and in 2014 he had given a presentation on that new technical document. The previous year had been the first year of implementation. It had been a year for ADOs to put in place the necessary measures in their test distribution plans, to enable the minimum levels of analysis to be applied to those sports and disciplines identified at different risk to the three groups of substances, which were erythropoiesis stimulating agents (otherwise known as ESAs or EPO and its various analogues), growth hormone and growth hormone releasing factors. He had some graphs to quickly show the impact that it had had in its first year. First, the figures on the slides were being finalised for the annual testing figures report, so there was still some final accounting to do, and the figures were not to be taken as final but they were certainly very close. In that graph, red represented blood and blue represented urine. There had been 227,073 samples collected in 2015; 93% of those had been urine and 7% blood, representing overall an increase compared to 2014 of 9,300 samples (4%). In terms of the three prohibited substances on the TDSSA, the blue column related to 2015 and the red 2014, and the members would note an increase in the number of samples, with just over 6,000 additional ESA tests conducted, 5,000 for growth hormone and almost 20,000 for growth hormone releasing factors. In terms of the level of testing on sports between those tested in 2014 versus 2015, the members would see on the screen the quite dramatic increases in sports receiving such analysis: 42 new sports for ESAs, 31 for growth hormone and 47 for growth hormone releasing factors. Looking at the testing authorities, the bodies that authorised the tests on the athletes for the three substances, there had been an increase of 54 testing authorities conducting tests for ESAs that had not in 2014, an increase of 39 for growth hormone and an increase of 127 for growth hormone releasing factors. In terms of adverse analytical findings, there had been increases for growth hormone releasing factors and also growth hormone, but a reduction in ESAs. Looking at the particular sports in which the reductions had occurred, cycling and athletics, he went back to the fact that athletes might be moving away from ESAs and moving towards other aspects of doping and substances. Overall, there had been a good level of testing for those substances, new sports and testing authorities conducting such tests and, given that 2016 was a year of compliance, he expected the level of testing to continue to increase for those ADOs that had fallen short in 2015. Of course, conducting the tests was quite easy to do to tick the box, but conducting at the right time on the right athletes was a very important factor, and WADA was working with the ADOs to ensure that they were doing that. In doing so, new

testing strategy guides had been developed to assist those ADOs and coordinators planning the tests to ensure that they understood how the substances worked, where the risk periods and various detection windows were, etc. In summary, the initial figures were promising and were certainly heading in the right direction; however, more data were required and all the ADOs were required to apply that over some time before WADA would be able to accurately assess the impact.

In terms of WADA's Independent Observer programme for Rio, teams of experts for the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games had been established. The members of the teams were contained in the report. The chairs of the two teams were listed on the slides and both of those gentlemen were very experienced members of previous Independent Observer missions and also experts in their fields. WADA had established agreements with the IOC and IPC to enable the Independent Observer programmes to integrate into the games and they had been gladly accepted by the two bodies. For the first time at the Olympic Games, Independent Observer team members would be present from the opening of the athlete village to oversee the testing programme and laboratory operations and, for the Paralympic Games, the Independent Observer team would arrive earlier than it had done in the past.

The pre-Rio intelligence gathering task force was another important enhancement in protecting clean athletes. It was the result of a recommendation made in the Sochi Independent Observer report which the IOC had taken on, and it had asked WADA to assist in establishing an independent intelligence gathering task force leading into the Olympic Games in Rio. Its objective was to review the testing programmes of athletes qualified for Rio and to recommend testing to the IFs and the NADOs where the gaps existed. It was for athletes focusing on high and medium risk sports. WADA could not look at every athlete across every sport. The task force consisted of six NADOs, from Australia, Denmark, Japan, South Africa and the USA, with UKAD pitching in and acting as the secretariat of the task force. WADA would also be providing oversight and the necessary reports. He thanked those NADOs for their efforts and commitment to the project. The task force gap analysis did not replace the testing programmes of the IFs and NADOs but supplemented them; to be effective, WADA required the support of the IFs and the NADOs to provide the necessary information when requested and conduct the necessary testing as recommended by the task force. Letters were currently being sent to the various organisations to request information. Gap analysis was currently being conducted and the process was moving along quite rapidly. The outcomes of the task force would be handed over to the IOC prior to the opening of the Olympic village. There would be a continuation of the intelligence being passed on which could be integrated into the Olympic Games testing programme. That had not been done before. It was a model that would pave the way for what could be done in the future, and it would also be a good learning curve for IFs and NADOs as to how they should be identifying athletes at risk and testing them before they went to the Olympic Games. He hoped that it would provide greater protection to the clean athletes and greater confidence, knowing that the work was going on and that those athletes who might not have been tested would be tested before they got to Rio. That concluded his presentation. He would be happy to take any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that those were major programmes and he thanked Mr Ricketts for everything that had been done to date and wished him well, particularly on the intelligence-gathering efforts on the way to Rio.

DECISION

Standards and harmonisation update noted.

19. Any other business/future meetings

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that Mr Patel wished to take the floor briefly.

MR PATEL said that some of the members might be aware that Mr Cameron had hosted a major anti-corruption summit in London earlier that day, and it had included a session on sport. He gave a few pointers as to how the sessions had been determined. There had been some serious allegations about corruption in sport recently. The previous December, the UK Government had published a wide-ranging sports strategy, including a section on integrity, and the UK had committed to work with key partners to tackle the scourge of corruption in sport, and it had been about looking forward and not backwards. There were some reasons as to why that was important. Everybody would agree that sport had a lot of societal benefits and positive impacts, and one could not let corruption in sport affect that. Over the past few months, there had been discussions with key partners (some of whom were around the table that day), including the IOC, the IPC, the Commonwealth Games Federation, ASOIF and AIOWF, as well as several other governments and also international organisations such as the UNODC, the OECD, the Council of Europe and the Open Government Partnership. That recognised the fact that one could not tackle corruption in isolation. It required a coordinated approach, and that was something at which WADA was expert. The sport session had been chaired by Sir Philip Craven, from the IPC, and Pâquerette Girard Zappelli, the IOC's chief ethics officer. At the IOC's international forum on sport integrity, to be held in 2017, the IOC would convene a new partnership called the international sport integrity partnership, bringing all the key stakeholders together to discuss and coordinate their approaches to combat corruption in sport, and that would meet on a regular basis. Looking ahead, he would very much welcome WADA's contribution to that effort and he reiterated that the partnership respected the autonomy of sport and was not a UK-led initiative. A range of governments backed the initiative and were committed to playing their part going forward. If anybody had any questions, they should feel free to contact him.

THE CHAIRMAN recalled the very happy gathering that had taken place the previous evening. Mr Howman was unlikely to get away that day completely free of comment. He was told that there was a video for Mr Howman's last Foundation Board meeting.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that it had been a privilege to have been sitting in that chair for 13 years and referred to the magnificent team he had worked with over that period. A lot of tributes had come to him as a person; he owed just as large a tribute to every member of the management team whom he had asked to do a lot almost daily, including weekends. Every time he had asked, people had responded. He thanked every one of the team. The nice comments about him had almost made him cry, because some of the things said in the corridors had not been so pretty. Mostly that was because the staff had not understood his colloquial expressions. Also, one of his grandchildren was actually Australian, and he was the one who played cricket, and they beat New Zealand a lot! He thanked every Foundation Board member, the President and his previous presidents for all the support and commitment they had given to him. It made it much easier when there was such a group of committed people all battling for the rights of the clean athlete. His career had been built around supporting athletes, and it would continue when he went back to New Zealand and became a barrister again. He intended to be the independent person who would be available to support athletes in the problems they encountered as they fought for a level playing field.

THE CHAIRMAN said that Mr Howman would remain in Montreal for about five or six weeks, and the thought did occur to him that his timing was not exactly perfect. Ms Scott had mentioned the two issues. He placed it firmly on the record. He understood the pressures and understood where Ms Scott was coming from, and WADA would try very hard not to let her down.

The Executive Committee would meet on 21 September; WADA had been invited to Warsaw but, for reasons the members would be aware of, it would not be appropriate to meet there. He hoped to go to Poland at a future date. WADA would meet in the offices of ANOC in Lausanne. The next Foundation Board meeting would be in sunny Glasgow. The dates had been set for 18 and 19 November, but the sport diary for meetings was almost impossible, and on 16 and 17 all of the NOCs and almost everybody else from the sport movement would be in Doha. The Glasgow

people had managed to push the arrangements back by one day, so the meetings would be held on 19 and 20 November.

He thanked the Director General and the whole team from WADA. The meetings were very well set up and WADA was very well served by its staff, and the quality of the service received made deliberations much easier. He thanked the audiovisual providers. Finally, he thanked the interpreters for the work they did. He thanked all those present for their help. WADA lived in very difficult and troubled times. There was much work to do and WADA would do it to the very best of its ability.

DECISION

Executive Committee – 21 September 2016;
Executive Committee – 19 November 2016, Glasgow,
Scotland;
Foundation Board – 20 November 2016, Glasgow,
Scotland.
Executive Committee – 17 May 2017, Montreal,
Canada;
Foundation Board – 18 May 2017, Montreal, Canada.

The meeting adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

SIR CRAIG REEDIE
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA