

**Minutes of the WADA Executive Committee Meeting
17 May 2014, Montreal, Canada**

The meeting began at 9.00 a.m.

1. Welcome, roll call and observers

THE CHAIRMAN started by welcoming one or two people. Coming from the sport movement, he really thought it was rather nice that he could sit round the table with three Olympic gold-medallists. Ms Beckie Scott had taken over the chair of the Athlete Committee and represented ANOC; Mr Tony Estanguet, representing IOC athletes, was a gold-medallist in canoeing; and, of course, there was the new chairman of the Education Committee, Mr Ed Moses. The three athletes were very welcome. Mr Moses was chairman of the US anti-doping agency. He also welcomed Mr Alain Lobognon from Côte d'Ivoire, representing the African continent. Dr Steinacker would be coming in at around midday and would sit in for Professor Ljungqvist, the Chairman of the Health, Medical and Research Committee. Professor Ljungqvist had had a hip replacement and was apparently moving around very quickly on one crutch. Mr Andy Parkinson would be representing Ms Fournayron, who had been moved to a different department in the French Government, but he was hopeful that she would be able to retain her position on the Executive Committee, although her field of expertise in France would be different. He welcomed everybody. He advised the members that he had invited Mr Pound to come and join the Executive Committee at around 10.30 a.m. Mr Pound had chaired the Working Group on Compliance Reporting and, being a Montreal resident, it was entirely appropriate that he come to present his committee's report under item 7.1. He would be trying to adjust the agenda in such a way that Mr Pound could come in at around 10.30 a.m.

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

The following members attended the meeting: Sir Craig Reddie, President of WADA; Rev. Dr Makhenkesi Stofile, WADA Vice-President, South African Ambassador to Germany; Ms Beckie Scott, ANOC Representative; Mr Gian Franco Kasper, IOC Member and President of the FIS; Mr Francesco Ricci Bitti, President of the International Tennis Federation; Prof. Dr Ugur Erdener, IOC Member, President of World Archery; Mr Tony Estanguet, IOC Member and Member of the IOC Athletes' Commission; Mr Michael Gottlieb, representing the US Government; Mr Yoshitaka Sakurada, Minister in Charge of Sports, Japan; Mr Godkin, representing Mr Peter Dutton, Minister for Sport, Australia; Mr Andy Parkinson, representing Ms Valérie Fournayron, Secretary of State for Trade, Crafts, Consumer and Social Economy and Solidarity, France; Mr Alain Michel Lobognon, Minister for the Promotion of Youth, Sports and Leisure, Côte d'Ivoire; Mr Francisco Boza, President, Americas Sports Council (CADE), Peru; Dr Steinacker, representing Professor Arne Ljungqvist, Health, Medical and Research Committee Chairman, Honorary IOC Member; Mr Edwin Moses, Education Committee Chairman, Board of Directors, USADA; Mr David Howman, WADA Director General; Mr Rune Andersen, Standards and Harmonisation Director, WADA; Mr Frédéric Donzé, Director of the European Regional Office and IF Relations, WADA; Mr Rob Koehler, Education and Programme Development Director, WADA; Ms Julie Masse, Communications Director, WADA; Dr Olivier Rabin, Science Director, WADA; Dr Alan Vernec, Medical Director, WADA; and Mr Olivier Niggli, Legal Director, WADA.

The following observers signed the roll call: Richard Budgett, Christian Thill, Françoise Dagouret, Andrew Ryan, Yoshihisa Nagayama, Sergey Khrychikov, Samba Kone, Liene Kozlovska and Atsuyuki Asano.

– 1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any conflicts of interest, which would be recorded.

2. Minutes of the previous meetings on 12 and 15 November 2013 in Johannesburg

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the minutes of the previous Executive Committee meeting. The minutes were very full and very informative, and had been distributed. He was not sure that there had been any particular observations on the minutes. If not, could he regard them as an accurate record of the meetings?

DECISION

Minutes of the meetings of the Executive Committee on 12 and 15 November 2013 approved and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that his written report was before the members. The first item was UNESCO. The following day, the members would receive a presentation from Dr Saleh Konbaz, the chairman of the conference of parties of UNESCO. There had recently been a meeting of its bureau, which comprised the chair and the vice-chairs and the rapporteur from UNESCO, along with the UNESCO secretariat, to talk about the way in which it would run its conference of parties in 2015. That would include the responsibilities that the states parties had under the convention itself, the monitoring programme into which they would enter for 2015 and so on, so the Foundation Board would hear from them the following day. WADA had had a meeting the previous December with the UNESCO management team in an effort to ensure that the 2015 conference of parties would be more pragmatic and successful, and he was encouraged with the positive response that WADA had received as a result.

For Interpol, Mr Matthieu Holz would be completing his secondment from the French Gendarmerie in June that year, so there would be a vacancy at Interpol for somebody to take over his role, and he looked to the governments to see whether somebody could second another member of their police force to Lyons for that purpose. He hoped that that would occur. WADA had encouraged Mr Holz to join it and the members would see that he would start in Lausanne in September and WADA was very pleased about that.

WADA also needed a secondee for the World Customs Organisation, and he had been talking about that for the past couple of meetings. WADA did have a prospective opportunity and would be speaking to the responsible government over the next couple of weeks, and he hoped that, by the time of the meeting in September in Lausanne, there would be somebody in place in Brussels. It was very important for WADA to be able to conduct its work with somebody within the international organisation to do the work from their perspective.

The NADOs with which WADA had been working included Brazil. There had been significant movements within the Brazilian NADO, which had been called the ABCD. There were currently 17 people on the staff and, quite importantly, the organisation had attracted Mr Luis Horta, a very prominent member in Europe, specifically Portugal, to join it for a period of time. WADA thought that Mr Horta would add his expertise and his experience in anti-doping would be very valuable, as there was very little experience within the current team. Brazil had not yet become operational, but was planning to conduct 800 tests this year, and he hoped that WADA would be able to work with the ABCD this year to ensure that that practice was of high quality, and that the numbers of

people needed to carry it out, in particular DCOs and chaperones, would be properly trained so that they were ready, not only to work at a national level in Brazil but also to assist the organising committee and the IOC in 2016. WADA had advised the IOC of its concerns in relation to planning, and would stay engaged with the IOC and the organising committee to see what WADA could do to help with regard to the 2016 programme and the national ABCD programme.

Regarding India, the visit that WADA had hoped to conduct in June had had to be postponed. India was willing to host WADA; there had been a recent election in India and a new government would be formed. That would have an impact on the bureaucracy. WADA would have to wait for the dust to settle after the election to see who would be involved in the NADO, and he was looking forward to a WADA team going there in September or October that year to conduct a training course for the result management people and also to conduct an audit of the national anti-doping programme.

Regarding Jamaica, the recommendations and reports that WADA had delivered to the minister in Jamaica had been fully accepted and implemented. The recommendations made by WADA to totally change the governance of the board of JADCO had been carried out. There was a new board, there were no conflicts of interest, there was a new staff, and WADA had partnered with JADCO and the CCES to allow some training of the people who were part of the new staff. He was very pleased that the Canadians had been able to help, and he looked forward to telling the members shortly that the programme would be back on the rails as it had been in 2011 and at the beginning of 2012.

He had nothing to report on progress in Nigeria. The country had political and civil unrest issues. He had spoken to WADA vice-president and the African regional office director and WADA was looking to focus its energy on Nigeria over the coming months to ensure that it adhered to the promises made about establishing a national programme.

There had been some advances in Egypt but, again, this was a country that had an election coming up and some issues internally and politically. WADA had told the Egyptians quite clearly that the opportunity for them to establish the laboratory would depend on the way in which they progressed their anti-doping programme. The laboratory was excellent and was in place, and had been put on the programme to advance within the WADA Science Department, but WADA had to make sure before that advance was taken that samples were being taken in an appropriate way by a national agency, so talks with Egypt would continue.

In Kenya, WADA had encouraged the Kenyan Government to undertake an inquiry into the availability of prohibited substances there. That inquiry had been completed, and a report had been delivered to the minister. WADA did not have a copy of it, but was aware of some of the contents of that report through a media conference that had been conducted in Kenya upon the handover of the report, and he and the African director had written the previous day to the minister requesting a copy of the report and offering WADA's help to implement the sensible recommendations, some of which WADA was already alert to. He was pleased with the commitment that the government had shown in getting the report completed, and pleased that some of the recommendations were sensible and practical; however, of course, the implementation of those recommendations was something that had to be carried out and he wanted to make sure that the Kenyan Government got all the support it needed from WADA and the African office in particular.

On ADAMS, he wished to highlight one issue, as there would be a full report later on. He knew full well that ADAMS needed to be enhanced to the position that it would be able to work with other systems. There was a clause in the Code that said that, from 1 January 2015, one either had to use ADAMS or a system approved by WADA. He did not want to have to look at a whole lot of different systems to approve them. He would prefer it if everybody were on ADAMS. One way of ensuring that would be for WADA to look at a way of enhancing ADAMS, and WADA was going out with a request for proposals, which was essentially a tender procedure, to get IT people to come to WADA

with ideas on how they could enhance ADAMS. Allied with that would be the platform that he strongly suggested needed to be put into place for investigations; so, rather than doubling up and looking at two projects separately, WADA wanted to do them together because there were some connections that were obvious for investigations and the current situation relating to ADAMS.

Regarding management, this was the last Executive Committee meeting that Mr Andersen would be attending as a director. Everybody would miss him; he had been with WADA for more than 12 years, and would be leaving to return to his home country where he had future employment with the Norwegian Government and Olympic Committee, and he wished Mr Andersen well and thanked him for his service to WADA. At the same time, WADA would be welcoming Mr Niggli back to Montreal as general counsel and chief operating officer from the law firm with which he had been working in Lausanne. His expertise would be invaluable to WADA internally; everybody knew Mr Niggli well and had missed him during the time he had spent in Lausanne.

More generally in management, WADA was reforming or restructuring to deal with the new tasks expected of the agency under the new Code and rules. Mr Ricketts would take over as Director of Standards and Harmonisation; Mr Koehler already had the responsibility for the RADOs and NADOs. WADA was looking at hiring extra people to fill certain gaps and was advertising for an additional lawyer. WADA was looking for an analyst for the passport programme to work with Mr Sottas in Lausanne, and it was considered that another couple of people needed to be added to the team to carry out the tasks that needed to be done from the following year onwards. The management team would be looking at ways and means of including its needs in the draft budget, which would be presented to the Finance and Administration Committee in July, and he would be interested to hear from the members in terms of prioritisation of activities going forward. He needed to say, and he stressed, that prioritisation was becoming vital. It was very clear that the activities decisions would need to be considered carefully and closely bearing in mind cost. The members should recall that the mandate was being extended all the time and there were no opportunities to decrease activities because each time the management made a suggestion to decrease WADA's activities it was told by its governors that it should not put activities aside as they were all vital. A very serious discussion about how to progress in those areas was needed, and he said that bearing in mind the report to be received from Mr Pound in relation to compliance, and the resources that would be needed for that, as well as the IT tools he had already mentioned that morning.

The Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games had been very successful events for WADA. A hard copy of both the reports from the Independent Observer teams was available if anybody wished to see them in hard copy. He had provided the link so that the members could look at the reports. He was very pleased with the relationships with the IOC and IPC teams during the events, and the reactions to the suggestions or recommendations in the reports. It was a very healthy situation to report that WADA was working closely with such bodies to ensure that the anti-doping programmes in the future would be enhanced and would protect clean athletes. There had also been very successful Outreach teams at both events, and there had been athlete representatives in the Independent Observer and Outreach teams, and the experience of those athletes in terms of participation would be invaluable to the WADA Athlete Committee, which would be able to take on board some of the issues as it went forward.

Still to come in 2014 would be Independent Observer and Outreach teams going to the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow, the Youth Olympic Games in Nanjing and the Asian Games.

Turning to the extra issues in his report, the food contamination matter remained a problem. WADA was developing a research project in Mexico; there was very good cooperation with the Mexican Government, and he hoped that it could be accelerated and that the outcome of the project would lead to a position whereby clenbuterol could be analysed in laboratories to show that it was part of contaminated food or otherwise

ingested. That was the area on which WADA was trying to concentrate with the Mexican authorities.

He had mentioned the Veerpalu case. This was the Hgh case about which WADA had been told to go away and look at the decision limits provided for the measurement of Hgh in laboratories. That research had been completed; the two research projects had been married and put together in one document and it had been submitted for publication. As soon as it was accepted for publication, WADA would be able to advise the ADOs to carry out testing for Hgh again. There had been a bit of a ping pong competition with the publishers, but WADA was now in a position whereby it thought that the article was ready for publication, and he trusted that it would be accepted within the next couple of weeks so that WADA would be able to tell everybody to check the samples that they had stored and recommence Hgh testing.

There had been another Hgh case relating to a German athlete that had gone to the CAS and been successful. The test had been upheld. That was interesting in itself. A different slant had been taken by the panel on the way in which it looked at the technical document, and it had manoeuvred in a legal way to provide a successful outcome for the German anti-doping agency.

Regarding the Moscow and Rio laboratories, WADA was awaiting another letter from Moscow, but apparently it was on its way; therefore, the issues confronted in relation to the Moscow laboratory would have been fully resolved in a couple of days. As for the Rio laboratory, WADA understood that the new building for the laboratory in Rio was nearly complete. He knew that the laboratory would not move into that building until the end of June 2014. Once it had moved, the laboratory would be able to commence the necessary work required for reaccreditation. A substantial amount of remedial action was required for that, some of which was as a result of cases that had turned up after WADA had revoked its accreditation. There had been three false positive cases, all in football, which had been made known to WADA after the revocation process had taken place. There was more remedial work required as a result of that and it was likely to take many months.

He had mentioned three legal cases in his report following consultation with the legal team. The first was the Campbell-Brown case, whereby a partial sample had been collected outside the IST. He meant that the partial sample, instead of being sealed, had not been sealed, and it had been left with the athlete rather than with the DCO, so it had been left unchaperoned and unsealed for a period of time. There was a rule in the international standard that stated that, if that breach did not affect the integrity of the sample, it could still go forward as a positive case. The panel had decided that the integrity had been affected, as there could have been environmental contamination. That was a long shot in scientific terms, because to be contaminated to produce the metabolites in a urine sample that had been found on analysis was pretty far-reaching; however, it showed that the panels were looking at strict liability for the ADOs in the same way as they looked at strict liability for the athletes, and WADA had to be very cautious in the way in which it advised ADOs to ensure that they did not slip up. This was the first that had been seen for quite some time, but it was a major one, so there was a message there in relation to sample collection.

The second case he had highlighted related to the two Korean badminton players who had been sanctioned for failing to give their whereabouts information. The athletes had not known that they had to give their whereabouts information; the NF had not advised them, but had assumed and accepted the responsibility of providing the information to the IF. The IF had found out about that and had said that that was unacceptable from an athlete perspective and had set aside the sanctions. It had also fined the NF for making a very serious mistake. WADA was worried, not just about the badminton case, but also about that fact that, at national level, a number of NFs were not adhering to IF policies or rules. WADA needed to work with the federations and come up with ideas as to how that problem could be overcome. He knew that there were some federations, such as the ITF, which had a strong policy stating that all of its members would adhere to its policies and

its rules would be followed by national members. It was quite a simple process, overcoming the issue of result management being out of kilter.

The last case he had mentioned in his report related to a Colombian swimmer, and he mentioned it because WADA had not been aware of it. The whole case had gone through the CAS procedure without WADA being informed. WADA could have been informed by the CAS and would like to be informed by the CAS of every anti-doping case that went to it, but WADA had not been informed by the national swimming federation or the laboratory, both of which had been involved. The case presented to the CAS had been shambolic, but it could have been dealt with, had WADA been involved, to ensure full and appropriate evidence for the panel to consider. The athlete had been exonerated and, on the evidence, quite fairly exonerated. In so exonerating, the panel had been quite critical of the laboratory, and WADA had looked at that and the package given to the panel to determine whether there was anything that WADA needed to do in relation to the laboratory. Thus far, nothing had come out of that that would lead to a disciplinary process for the laboratory, but WADA had had to deal with the media as a result of the outcry after the case.

He foreshadowed the fact that WADA had draft statistics for 2013, and those would be sent as usual to the ADOs for review and comment. This showed that, over the past two years, WADA had come a long way in terms of the information that it could accumulate from ADAMS and, again, it showed that, if information was put into ADAMS and everybody used it, WADA had good material to work with in terms of trends and ways and means of advancing the practice of anti-doping in a sensible and efficient way. There had been 293,000 samples collected in 2013, representing an increase on what had been collected in 2012. There had also been a slight increase in adverse analytical findings, and the report would show that 642 testing authorities had delivered samples to the laboratories. Most people would have thought that the IFs and NADOs did that work primarily, but that was not the case, and a whole lot of issues came from having 642 testing authorities, which would be outlined when the feedback was received and the entire report produced in due course.

That completed the matters he wished to highlight and comment on in relation to his report.

THE CHAIRMAN clarified that WADA circulated the statistics for comment before there was a final publication.

MR PARKINSON said that the Director General had mentioned some development with ADAMS. Having seen how ADAMS could be used at the Olympic Games, it was truly a sensational system when used properly, and one of the WADA staff members, Ms Mercier, had been superb at drawing out lots of information. His only question about ADAMS had to do with the enhancement around the intelligence-sharing capability mentioned and, before WADA started investing time and money in IT solutions, it was necessary to understand exactly what WADA's role was when it came to intelligence sharing, and particularly making sure that WADA had a legal basis for that sharing. He knew that the Australians, the Americans and the Europeans had all had legislative challenges regarding the sharing of information.

The other point he wished to mention was the impact of the Code, appendix 1. This really demonstrated the significantly enhanced responsibilities of WADA. What was missing for him was the cost. He believed that the Europeans had mentioned that a number of times the previous year. Before understanding the impact from a resource perspective, at least an understanding of the rough cost of implementing the Code was necessary.

He wished to mention the Independent Observer report from the Olympic Games and, specifically, the fact that there were three recommendations in there for WADA, and he wondered whether there was any feedback as to whether those recommendations had been accepted and if they would be put into place. He made specific reference to the fifth recommendation, which was that there was an urgent need to better understand and

define how athletes provided whereabouts around a major event, which continually raised challenges for athletes and NOCs, and it would be good to get some solutions on that.

MR ESTANGUET shared the concerns of the athletes regarding the situation in Brazil. He knew that Brazil was currently facing a lot of difficulties, but he thought that it was necessary to find an alternative solution so as to be sure to guarantee the fight against doping in sport in the region over the next two years, starting as soon as possible, as it was known that the athletes would be going there very soon to prepare for the Olympic Games. They would be going there the year before the Olympic Games, so WADA really had to focus all of its energy to be sure that, if the NADO or the laboratory was not effective, other ways of guaranteeing clean games could be found for the clean athletes.

MS SCOTT said that she had a few questions about the Tyson Gay case. This athlete had received a reduced sanction for providing substantial assistance, and there had been a fair amount of athlete reaction to that and a lot of curiosity and questions about the kind of substantial assistance that had been provided to receive such a reduced sanction. Her point was that the communication around such situations and cases in the media needed to provide some more information so as to mitigate such responses when something like that happened.

MR MOSES said that he could talk later to Ms Scott about the case but, in general, two years was what everybody was reading in the papers. However, there had been a confession for a competition in 2012, the Olympic Games, and USADA had also removed the medal from Tyson Gay and stripped him of all his performances for 2012, and three or four other significant cases had spun out of that case, and the members would probably be hearing about those shortly. One of them would probably be big and disappointing news, so there were five other cases, all because of his testimony, which was more substantial than had ever been seen at USADA. He was aware that people were upset, but there would be more to come. A medal had been turned in and that was something that probably would not have happened had the athlete not volunteered the information.

MR BOZA expressed a concern about food contamination, because the athletes ate food every day so, if contamination could lead to a doping case, how could WADA know whether or not food that had been ingested was to blame?

MR LOBOGNON raised a concern coming from Africa. The previous November, the Taekwondo World Cup had been organised there, and access to laboratories had been a major difficulty. There was a laboratory in South Africa, and one in Northern Africa, but Abidjan had had to send its samples to France. The event had taken place, but it had been necessary to wait for about two weeks before receiving the results, and that was not very good. Would it not be possible to do something to expedite matters? He had begged WADA to allow Côte d'Ivoire to have a laboratory because, when a sample was sent out, the results came in many weeks later, and even spectators worried about the reliability of the results, whereas if the athletes were tested on the spot, cheats would have a harder time. With the Brazil World Cup and then the Olympic Games to be held there, should not matters and procedures be accelerated to ensure results a few hours after the tests took place?

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded to the questions and comments one by one. With regard to what Mr Parkinson had said, the issue in relation to the investigations platform was one on which a number of meetings had been held with experts, both legal and otherwise, as to how an investigations platform could be developed, bearing in mind the legal issues and responsibilities confronted, particularly with trans-border sharing. That was something that had been done and would be done as WADA went forward.

As to the impact of the Code, WADA had built into the 2014 budget room for the hiring of five or perhaps six more people to carry out the activities WADA was being required to carry out. WADA had not yet hired all of those people; it was in progress with regard to some and there was hesitation in relation to others, because there was

information that would determine what WADA actually needed, and he referred to the compliance report. A budget for 2015 was already being prepared, and some of the issues that would need to be addressed would have to be included in that budget, and then it would be a question of prioritisation. There was the impact report and the reports next to his report had been annexed throughout 2013 for that purpose. He still asked for comment on the prioritisation of those activities, if anybody had a suggestion as to what WADA needed to make its number one priority. The management would then respond.

Mr Parkinson had mentioned the Independent Observer report. WADA was looking at the recommendations closely. They had been made public only that week. He was looking at the recommendations that affected WADA, and Mr Parkinson could be assured that WADA would give appropriate reaction and response to the recommendations and the practicality of their implementation. There would be a response to that in the coming weeks.

He thanked Mr Estanguet for his observation on Brazil. WADA was certainly very alert to that issue and had worked with the national agency for the past three years. It was regrettable that it had taken so long for the agency to pick up the challenge to actually start being operational. That year, it was operational. 800 tests was very few for a big country such as Brazil but it was a start. It needed to be in a position whereby it was able to take contracts from IFs and NADOs to carry out work on their behalf in the country as well, and Mr Estanguet's point about athletes training in Brazil over the next couple of years was very respected. There were some DCOs willing to do private work on the continent, and he was sure that the IFs with links to those companies would use them, so that would be done for IFs, and WADA would do what he had said before: try to work with the NADO to enhance it.

As for the Tyson Gay case, it was on WADA's table. Any case involving a sanction, particularly those that involved substantial assistance, came to the WADA Legal Department so that it could determine whether or not WADA ought to intervene. In Tyson Gay's case, WADA had until 2 June to decide whether it was going to appeal or not. WADA had the information and the full file but could not talk about that until it had considered it carefully and made a decision as to what it would do. He had talked to Mr Niggli about issuing a protocol to all ADOs on how to deal with substantial assistance and how to assure the public that the information received under substantial assistance was substantial. It would be quite tricky because much of the data received was confidential and would be used to process inquiries or sanctions against other people, in particular members of the athlete entourage, who could not be sanctioned because of urine and blood collection: they had to be sanctioned based on the collection of evidence or information from outside. Then there was the balancing. WADA would work with those who had exercised the clause over the past few years, as it was not a new clause and had been in place for some time, on what protocols should be followed by ADOs when considering issues of substantial assistance. WADA would try to organise a meeting to focus on that.

WADA had to be very alert to the fact that, while the period of appeal was still open, WADA could not talk about the case publicly. That was the same with every case. WADA had to be careful not to prejudice anybody's rights in such processes.

He told Mr Bozo that WADA was very alert to food contamination. There were really only two countries in the world about which WADA was concerned with regard to positive doping cases: Mexico and China. China had dealt with the issue quite considerably, whilst the Mexican Government found it very hard because, in some of the provinces of Mexico, the 'bandidos' were running the industry. It was hard for the federal agencies to deal with the issues from a criminal perspective. WADA was trying to advance it in a scientific way to avoid police confrontation. Athletes had been alerted to the fact that, when they went to China and Mexico, they should listen to the authorities about where they should eat. He remembered the Pan American Games in Guadalajara at which the organisers had said which restaurants were safe to eat at, and the Chinese authorities had done the

same thing. That was how WADA was trying to progress the practical issue and it would do it again, because those messages needed to go out on a regular basis.

He understood what the minister from Côte d'Ivoire was saying. Côte d'Ivoire could apply to have a laboratory in its country, but he warned him that it would probably cost about six million dollars even to start, if there was a building, so it was not an inexpensive venture. On top of that, maintenance and payment for the people who serviced the laboratory were necessary. WADA had an emphasis on Africa in terms of its strategic approach towards laboratories. It needed laboratories in Africa, which was one of the reasons why Egypt had been put on the list of potential laboratories. If the minister was interested in establishing a laboratory, perhaps he might talk to Dr Rabin during his stay in Montreal, so that Dr Rabin could advise him on the process.

The management team was looking at all of the issues that had been raised so that, when a draft budget was considered by the Finance and Administration Committee, it would have all of the necessary data for consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN said that there were at least three people who had been on the Independent Observer team in Sochi in the room. He had gained the impression that that had been a very successful exercise, and had had the opportunity to speak to the IOC medical director, who was grateful for the assistance given. He thought that the whole exercise had been a success and the reports from the Olympic Games and the Paralympic Games were on the website should the members wish to read them. It was a very good example of the very complex business undertaken at the world's leading sport events in the interest of protecting clean athletes.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

4. Operations/management

- 4.1 Endorsement of Foundation Board composition for Swiss authorities

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL reminded the members that the Executive Committee had to recommend the endorsement of the composition of the Foundation Board for the authorities.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members were content that the record of members of the Foundation Board could go to the Swiss authorities.

DECISION

Foundation Board composition endorsed.

- 4.2 Constitutional amendments

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the constitutional amendments were those that had been found as a result of looking for chairs of the working groups and for more practical ways of dealing with issues that required decisions from the Foundation Board. At present, there was a rule in the constitution that said that, to be a chair of one of the working groups (the Finance and Administration Committee, the Education Committee, the Athlete Committee and the Health, Medical and Research Committee), one needed to have been a Foundation Board member, so that had been expanded to say 'or an Executive Committee member' because some Executive Committee members had not been Foundation Board members. The issue of expedited process related to decisions required under the constitution by the Foundation Board, and he felt that, with six months between each of the meetings, issues might have to be dealt with by the Foundation Board that could be dealt with by electronic vote.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members if they required further information on the slight change in practice. Was everybody clear about what WADA sought to do?

DECISION

5. Legal

– 5.1 Legal report

MR NIGGLI stated that the members had his written report in their files and he did not intend to go through all of it. He wanted to update them on a number of points that had arisen between the time of writing of the report and that day.

On the first item, the issue of data protection, there had not been much progress at EU level, since the European Commission was currently involved in elections; therefore, the legislative work was on standby until a new European Commission was in place, after which WADA would have to see how the work developed.

As for recognition of Quebec providing adequate protection for data, he said that there had been no progress by the European Commission, which was regrettable; however, there had been an interesting meeting between the WADA President and the Swiss minister in charge of sports at which the issue had been addressed. From a Swiss perspective, Switzerland was not part of the EU and made its own decisions as to which country it recognised as being adequate, and the Swiss minister had provided assurance that he would deal with the matter, and hopefully Switzerland would put Quebec on the list of countries recognised by Switzerland as being adequate. That would at least solve the problem for many of the IFs based in Switzerland and put to bed an issue that had been on the table for far too long.

On the other cases, he referred to case 1, which was an old case: Operación Puerto in Spain. There had been a decision from the state court; WADA had appealed that decision one year previously and, since then, had heard nothing back from the Spanish court as to whether there would be a hearing and, if there were to be one, when it would take place. That was regrettable, but there was nothing that could be done and he hoped that the Spanish justice authorities would find time to deal with the matter sooner rather than later. At stake was the question of the blood samples, which were still frozen at the laboratory, and which WADA hoped to get hold of if a positive decision were issued by the Spanish justice authorities.

Case number 4, another Spanish case, was finished (rather than resolved) because it was a case in which the athlete had taken advantage of the old Spanish legislation to drag the case before the administrative authorities in Spain and avoid having his case dealt with by the CAS until a decision in Spain was issued. It had taken so long that, by the time there had been a resolution in Spain, science had evolved, in particular for the hCG test, and a further confirmation test was currently required for such substance, but the sample from the athlete had been destroyed long ago, and the athlete had since retired. Given all the circumstances, and in fairness to the athlete, WADA had decided to withdraw its appeal. Spanish legislation had changed since then, so the main problem had been solved, which was the most important thing.

Case number 7 had been recently resolved and the sanction was 15 months instead of three months, so the appeal had been upheld.

On case number 14, the Director General had highlighted the fact that, since the Veerpalu case, which had been a big disappointment, the Sinkewitz case had recognised the validity of Hgh. There was another pending Hgh case, which WADA hoped would confirm the decision taken relating to Sinkewitz, providing a body of case law to support Hgh testing. Added to that was the fact that the publication on validating the method should soon be available, which was good news.

As for the last remark on his report, the Director General had briefly mentioned the Colombian swimming case, in which WADA had been unable to do anything as it had not been aware of it, but there were a number of issues with cases by NFs in particular which forced WADA to go to the CAS and appeal national-level decisions. This was not currently

satisfactory and he would prepare a more detailed report on the issue faced for the September meeting so that the members would see some detail, and some recommendations on how to address the issue, both at the IF and NADO level.

THE CHAIRMAN said that there was a considerable level of activity in the Legal Department. Were there any specific questions on the cases to which Mr Niggli had drawn the members' attention or on any of the others listed there? For example, had nothing happened with regard to case number 2 on the European Court of Human Rights on whereabouts?

MR NIGGLI responded that WADA had not initially been a party to the case. It had been started in France and regarded an appeal from the football players' association against a decision of the French State Council, and it had been brought before the Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. WADA had intervened and had been accepted as an intervener so as to bring background information to the court. Everybody had filed briefs and it was a matter for the court to organise the hearing. It would happen, but there was a bit of a backlog at the Court of Human Rights, so it would not happen overnight.

DECISION

Legal report noted.

– 5.2 Investigations report

MR NIGGLI said that the report spoke for itself and told the members that he would be happy to take any questions on the item.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that all of the members would have read it and fully appreciate the importance of the exercise.

MR PARKINSON referred to the multifaceted strategy with respect to intelligence and investigations. Could that be shared? It was really important that stakeholders and signatories understand what WADA's role was and how it would be played and how WADA could be helped.

MS SCOTT referred to whistle-blowing. How many of the investigations were related to athletes relaying information from their sports and information they had on other athletes? This was purely out of curiosity.

MR NIGGLI replied that there were several things to be pointed out on the strategy. As could be seen from the report, there were different activities. One was clearly trying to make sure that the intelligence out there was stored and used, because WADA thought that there was currently a lot of intelligence collected in different places, it was never shared between organisations and most of it got lost, so one of the strategies involved trying to bring all the intelligence together to make it meaningful and useful to everybody. This created legal challenges in terms of being able to share information across borders which WADA was trying to address. There were different ways of doing it but, in the modern world, the most logical thing would be to have a proper IT system to allow one to do that. That was what WADA was looking at and he would provide the members with more details on that in due course. The other part of the strategy was clearly having a good and permanent relationship with a number of law enforcement agencies around the world, so as to have the ability to share information and put people in contact when they had issues they wished to share with other countries, so it was a facilitator role. WADA was trying to buy some of the prohibited products on the market, and had permission from the Canadian authorities to do that, so that they could then be analysed by a laboratory and WADA could find out what was in there. Finally, there was a role of trying to monitor what was happening on the Internet, in particular in various forums, to see what the discussions were among body builders about new products and new ways of administering those products and so on. This was a multifaceted strategy, but he thought that the most important thing was being a facilitator and coordinator.

MR ROBERTSON added that WADA was also providing basic-level training in intelligence and investigations to the ADOs, training as to intelligence and evidence

collection and being able to conduct proper and thorough interviews, piece together investigations and document that in a way that would help facilitate bringing forth anti-doping rule violations. After the training was under way, WADA would advance it and be a little more precise and bring in some additional training. WADA was also interacting with law enforcement on the ability to get law enforcement more proactive as to targeting the traffickers and involving anti-doping authorities.

As to whistle-blowing, WADA did get a fair amount of tips, some of which were very vague and could not be acted on. Others were a little more specific, meaning that WADA could take testing initiatives. At most, 10% of investigations were based on anonymous tips.

THE CHAIRMAN surmised that this was a huge and complicated subject. Were the responses along the right lines? Was it the clearinghouse philosophy with which Mr Parkinson was happy? He thought that 10% was a large figure.

MR PARKINSON responded that he fully supported what Mr Robertson was doing, and the direction was right. What was important for stakeholders and signatories who were developing their intelligence capability was to really understand that, as one did not want them to be developing a capability that was either in conflict or going down a different route. The more communication that could be given to signatories on that, the better.

MR NIGGLI said that that was precisely one of the roles that Mr Holz in Lausanne would have, to make sure that, when they started getting organised for the intelligence gathering, the stakeholders got proper guidelines. Mr Holz would provide training and support to those organisations that were getting organised.

MR ROBERTSON stressed the fact that, as WADA entered 2015 with intelligence and investigations, it had to have a database to support those. It was like getting into a Ferrari without an engine, having something that was nice to look at but would not run. This was very important: an intelligence database had to form the foundation.

THE CHAIRMAN said that this was clearly an issue that would come up in July. It absolutely clarified the issue of priorities and what was the most important thing that WADA was going to do. He had sent the first quote for a database back to the Director General with a brief note telling him to forget it, as WADA could not afford it. There had been a highly intellectual discussion. What was currently being talked about was crucial and, eventually, around the table, people would have to make up their minds that, if WADA had X dollars coming in and a number of things to spend that money on, the management and a number of people would undoubtedly be strongly in favour of certain areas of activity, but there would come a time when the members would have to say what they could and could not do, and be prepared to back it up, unless of course they could meet the challenges of raising the additional funds, in which case WADA would do everything and everybody would be happy. Being a glass-half-full man, he thought that the Executive Committee should move ahead on that basis.

DECISION

Investigations report noted.

6. Finance

– 6.1 Government/IOC contributions

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members that it was his first meeting as Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee. Perhaps he had been asked because of his long-standing service on the committee, but he was very proud to succeed the Chairman and hoped to do the same job and be effective in terms of information. He would go through the paper, providing some remarks.

On the contributions, the members would see that WADA had attained 83% of public authorities contributions, which was excellent in absolute terms but still slightly below the previous year's level at that time, so he hoped for an improvement, because the

previous year had been the lowest year in terms of collections since 2009. WADA had also received additional contributions. A total of 558,000 dollars had been received from Russia and Japan, so he thanked those countries for the additional contributions.

DECISION

Contributions update noted.

– 6.2 2013 year-end accounts

MR RICCI BITTI said that 2013 had been the year with the lowest public authorities collection rate in comparison with previous years, but anyhow it had been better than budgeted, as 98% of contributions had been budgeted and WADA had received 98.88% in total, which was a little bit better, but worse than the previous year. Because of that and many other reasons he would mention, the year-end result had been an actual loss of 151,000 dollars, better than the revised budget of 235,000 dollars, the reason being additional contributions, the favourable exchange rate between Canadian and US dollars and, on top of that, capital expenditure, which was good news because WADA had been able to afford that but bad news because, with a loss, the capital expenditure of 3.2 instead of 3 million as budgeted was a direct drain on the cash reserve, so this had to be counted along with the loss of 151,000 dollars. Investments could not be counted on, as interest rates were very low and could not produce much in that period of time. Generally speaking, the overall financial position of the agency was stable; however, cash reserves were depleting. It had become imperative to increase funding and seek solutions, as WADA could not reduce its activities and new activities were required, but new activities with less money was not an equation that would work for very long. The 2014 budget had addressed that point, with the increase in contributions of 1% and the decision that the Executive Committee and Foundation Board members would meet their own travel costs; so, with the additional 1% and perhaps 1.5% less costs, the problem had been solved for 2014, but it was a very provisional situation.

The auditors' report had once again been very favourable, and no shortcomings had been found; nor had there been any suggestions for improvement, so he congratulated the Finance Department on its work, as the report of the auditors indicated that it was doing a very good job. He asked the Executive Committee to approve the 2013 year-end accounts for submission to the Foundation Board the following day.

THE CHAIRMAN recalled that the accounts would have to be approved by the Foundation Board the following day and noted that the auditor would be present the following day to speak to her report. Were the members happy to approve the accounts for submission to the Foundation Board?

MR LOBOGNON said that Côte d'Ivoire would be sending \$1,448 and would increase its contribution to the level of 5,000, and would then add another \$5,000, which would represent \$10,000 per year.

THE CHAIRMAN congratulated Mr Lobognon and the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee.

MR RICCI BITTI thanked Mr Lobognon, noting that it was important to set an example.

DECISION

2013 year-end accounts noted.

– 6.3 2014 quarterly accounts (quarter 1)

MR RICCI BITTI said that the members had received all of the information on the quarterly accounts which was not so significant, as the majority of contributions from the governments and the IOC were received in the first part of the year and obviously expenditure was spread throughout the year but basically over the second half of the year, so the 7.5 million-dollar profit was not that exciting, as it did not reflect reality since there were many expenses that would be incurred over the second half of the year.

The expenses for the Sochi Olympic Winter Games Independent Observer report were under budget and they were on budget for the Outreach programme. The ADO symposium had not yet been accounted for, but would be carefully reviewed at the July meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee.

DECISION

Quarterly accounts noted.

– 6.4 2015 draft budget

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members what was planned between then and the July meeting. He had to send out a strong message. Work on the 2015 draft budget had not yet started, as a number of items had yet to be considered. The process would be undertaken completely, as he had said, at the meeting in July. That would be prepared at that time, but he sent out a message about total contributions. After two years of zero income growth, WADA had been granted a 1% contribution increase and a reduction in travel expenses for 2014. In spite of the increase, there had been a deficit of 884,000 dollars. It was clear that, with the depletion of cash reserves to compensate for the deficit, an increase in contributions of at least 3% would be necessary, in his opinion. He mentioned that, on top of the running activities, in 2015 there would be some key and vital activities to start to implement the new Code. As already mentioned, the ADAMS upgrade was vital to make all the programmes effective, along with the platform for investigation software. Those were only two activities to which he drew the members' attention. WADA would have to review the activities in 2015. That was only a message, as the job of prioritising all the needs of the agency would be done over the coming months. All the members of the Executive Committee had to consider that WADA could not drain its reserves every year, as that would not be healthy. WADA should at least maintain the increase in activities or improve activities. The staff and management had made many efforts to become more effective, as mentioned that morning by the Chairman, but WADA needed to consider a running increase of at least 3% for 2015, and that was a minimum, otherwise reserves would go down. With his experience of sport bodies, a good reserve was at least one year of operation, and WADA's reserve was currently less than one-third of operations and was decreasing dramatically and very quickly. The members needed to consider that WADA needed the money just to continue its activities.

MR PARKINSON stated that there had been some discussions in Europe on the draft budget. Europe welcomed the cost-saving initiatives that had been taken, and he would encourage a further look at seeing what else could be saved. Europe also recognised that the new requirements of the Code required additional or certainly different resources for WADA and he was not naïve enough to think that those came cheap. It was a great opportunity to look at all the activities that WADA conducted and determine whether or not those programmes should continue. The deficit had been 884,000 dollars the previous year, and the total budget for WADA testing was 755,000 dollars. That warranted a discussion as to whether or not that budget line could be reduced, or indeed whether WADA could have an agreement with IFs or NADOs to carry some of that burden. There was an opportunity to recast the budget, and it was necessary to look at the Code requirements. The Pound report was very clear about the need for an enhanced compliance-monitoring programme. He knew that cost money. He would like to avoid a fight about money coming up. The proposal of around 3% would be challenging for the public authorities. He understood what Mr Ricci Bitti was saying and he fully supported WADA having as much money as possible, but 3% for governments would be quite a challenge. Therefore, anything that could be done to fine-tune the budget would be gratefully appreciated.

MR RICCI BITTI responded that, when talking about reducing testing, one was talking about a reduction in activities, and the assumptions were made to optimise activities but not to reduce activities. The governments already contributed a lot, and he did not wish to repeat what he had said on previous occasions, but the sport side was already making

a lot of sacrifices in the doping area alone. It paid the NADOs for a lot of tests. He was happy to ask Mr Howman to analyse what was done by WADA in testing, but that was a vital activity for the smaller federations. The IFs already contributed a lot, so to ask them to give up some services that they had had since the start of WADA was possibly not wise.

MR BOZA raised a concern: WADA would perhaps improve some expert groups, and that would also cost money. WADA needed to raise more money from the government or sport sides. There was a concern and finances were decreasing. Everybody was responsible for doing something. His country would also increase its contribution to WADA, but this was a compromise by everybody. 3% would be difficult for the countries, but where there was a will there was a way. He was talking only about his country. He did not wish to speak on behalf of the Americas. He had seen the report, and the figure of 83%, which reflected the amount of the budget, but a lot of countries had not paid. The number of countries was less. Some countries paid less to WADA and this was a problem for all those involved in sport, not only the governments and the private sector.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he would take into consideration what had been said. WADA could not continue as it was for long. It had a small reserve and was draining its reserve every year.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that the July meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee looked to him as if it was not to be missed. There were all sorts of wonderful ways of expressing statistics, and he had just worked out that the total budget was roughly the same as the annual earnings of a Manchester United centre forward, which put it all into perspective. If WADA had to meet increased obligations under the Code, quite clearly, it would have to raise additional funds. He congratulated the finance people on the accounts, and acknowledged the very considerable capital expenditure that had been made, which simply drained cash, as Mr Ricci Bitti had said.

DECISION

Draft Budget 2015 update noted.

7. World Anti-Doping Code

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

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that a decision was required under 7.1 and it seemed logical that the members listen to the report of the working group before taking any decision, so he proposed taking item 7.2 and then the members could decide whether or not to take a decision on the basis of the report.

The recommendation dealt with the fact that WADA wished to have its signatories with rules in place and to be rule-compliant by 1 January 2015.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that this really came straight from the Code itself. There was an article in the Code relating to the provision in question.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members were happy that the recommendation be made formally to the Foundation Board the following day. Immediately thereafter, WADA would have to say publicly that that had been agreed by the Foundation Board and it gave all the stakeholders clear information that the magic date was 1 January.

MR RICCI BITTI agreed with the recommendation, taking into consideration what Mr Parkinson had envisaged in his previous intervention. If there were situations in which WADA needed to intervene, WADA should be more patient, rather than stating 1 January immediately. He thought that it was always better to be positive rather than negative when starting a process. The non-compliant bodies should be an internal matter, at least at the beginning. He would put it in a positive way.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed with the principle. WADA might need to find the correct wording to say that the overriding intention of what had been decided was to do the following to protect the clean athletes.

MR RICCI BITTI added that he would declare only the compliant signatories.

MR STOFILE agreed with everything that had been said but observed that, in b) of 7.1, there was a paragraph that confused him. The paragraph said that, 'It should be noted that if any signatory does not have rules that are in line with the 2015 Code by 1 January 2015, any anti-doping programme run by that signatory might lead to a subsequent legal challenge'. What did that mean? That they should be free not to test for doping to avoid legal challenges?

MR NIGGLI responded that he thought that it meant that they would operate under all the rules that would not be harmonised with the new rules and therefore potentially create situations whereby people were treated differently under different systems. Obviously, for example, the two- and four-year sanctions would be very different.

DECISION

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

– 7.2 Report of the Working Group on Compliance Reporting

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed Mr Pound to the Executive Committee meeting. He thanked Mr Pound for the considerable efforts made.

MR POUND said that he would not present the report, as it was already there. He would be happy to answer any questions that the members might have but, perhaps by way of backswing on that, one of the primary objectives had been to make sure that WADA and the stakeholders did everything possible to become Code-compliant as of 1 January the following year and, frankly, the mental set was that there was no reason, given all the time that stakeholders and signatories had had, for anybody to be non-compliant at that time and he was hoping that a series of interim reports in September and in November would sharpen the focus on the need to be Code-compliant by 1 January. It was accepted that WADA wanted to, should and would provide any assistance it could and whatever assistance was requested of it from signatories in that endeavour. It was important to understand as well the philosophical basis on which the report had been prepared, and that was that the group had taken as stated the objectives of the 2015 Code as reflecting the desires of those who had negotiated and adopted it, and the group had taken to heart the provisions of the Johannesburg declaration as a statement of the intent. Probably the biggest shift in perspective on that was that WADA and all of the signatories had changed from punishing offenders to saying that the reason they were doing that was to protect the athletes who competed fairly, and that was the objective and the purpose of the rules to which all had subscribed. The sense was that there had been a swing back in Code enforcement, particularly at the adjudicative level, to being criminal and having to prove beyond all reasonable doubt the elements of a sport offence, which had never been the idea, so the burden had shifted in favour of those who had cheated rather than those who had not. In terms of mechanics, the principle element to consider for the purposes of making the recommendation to the Foundation Board was the proposal that there be an independent group of experts to deal with aspects of compliance. The reason for that was that the Foundation Board was too big and the range of skill sets was too large to enable it to be sufficiently nimble to act quickly and decisively when required in the right circumstances; so, if the members could focus on that aspect of the report, that might give them an opportunity to provide some guidance to the Foundation Board. A subsidiary point of that was that WADA had to get back to being nimble, able to act quickly when discovering situations of non-compliance, and the reason for that was that, every time there was non-compliance, the clean athletes were not being protected, and that was the primary objective of WADA.

That was what had guided the working group in the preparation of the report that the members had before them. He thought that they would find that the various recommendations were consistent with that philosophical approach. If the Executive

Committee members did conclude that a separate group of independent experts was necessary, the group (or some variation thereof) could be looked to, as basically most of the members would be willing to participate in that kind of a role if requested.

That said, if there were any questions or any elements of the report that were not clear, he and the other members of the working group present would be happy to try to respond. There had been excellent cooperation from the management of WADA in getting the information needed for the purposes of being able to write the report, and he thanked all the members of the group who had worked extremely diligently to try and put together a report that was comprehensible and not so long that people would fall asleep long before they had finished reading it.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Pound very much and echoed the thanks to those people who had served with Mr Pound. It seemed to him that, in asking the questions, the members should actually concentrate on pages 6 and 7, which were the recommendations, one of which was the clear recommendation that WADA have a group of independent experts. Had Mr Pound indicated that the members of his group might be prepared to serve on that group or had he misunderstood?

MR POUND responded that, if the Executive Committee members recommended that the Foundation Board accept the idea and they were wondering who might be available to do that, the answer was yes.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Pound and opened the floor for debate but thought that, in practical terms, to allow the Executive Committee to make a recommendation to the Foundation Board, the Executive Committee should actually be comfortable that the recommendation that it made covered the nine or ten specific items indicated by Mr Pound there.

MR MOSES thanked Mr Pound for all the work he had done in the world of WADA and drug testing. One of the more important things that Mr Pound had said was that drug control was ultimately about the athletes, servicing the athletes and providing a level playing field, and that was the philosophy at USADA. He felt it was USADA's job to protect the integrity of the sports, some of which were not in a position to do it themselves, through having drug testing, but also to provide a level playing field for the athletes who wanted to remain clean. He completely rejected the argument that everybody else was doing it, because USADA had conducted interviews with athletes who had preferred to retire rather than become professional cyclists and dope and be in that type of lifestyle, so USADA protected a lot of athletes who never had a voice, who never got heard, and whom nobody ever represented. That was what organisations such as WADA and USADA and the other national ADOs were there to do, to protect people who did not have a voice, never complained but were victimised, and there were thousands and thousands of them out there. One of the debates that USADA always had, and Ms Scott had brought it up earlier with respect to the Tyson Gay case, when such arrangements had to be made and sanctions did not appear to be strong enough, a lot of feedback was received from the athletes, as they thought that the sanctions were too lenient, and he had often found himself in a funny position, as USADA had to keep US athletes off Olympic teams when certain evidence was received, as had been the case in 2012, when five or six cyclists had not been able to go on the Olympic team because USADA had known that, had they gone to the Olympic Games, it would have been very embarrassing for USADA and for the USOC. As such, USADA had to make those hard calls, and it put USADA in a very tough position between an Olympic committee that wanted the best athletes to go to the events and the organisation that was there to protect the athletes from themselves. At the end of the day, the athletes had to be protected and that was USADA's job. With respect to compliance, some of the feedback from US athletes had included questions as to why they should have such strict doping controls, as their athletes were part of one of the most rigorous programmes in the world, they went to the Olympic Games and had one of the cleanest teams and, around them, the countries against which they were competing did not even have programmes, they were non-compliant, and they felt that the playing field was not level, so USADA

had to deal with all of that as well. Once again, it put USADA and the NOC in a terrible place. It was up to WADA and the NADOs and everybody else to provide that clean level playing field so that the athletes felt satisfied. USADA was between a rock and a hard place on almost every issue, but he felt that it was doing the right thing ethically, and that was the most important thing, to represent the athletes who did not have a voice, who were not present, who could not go to the papers and complain, and who had to simply sit back and accept that athletes around them had been dirty, and that was what USADA did. He thought that what Mr Pound had said was true: be true to the ethics of the doping control process and hold the athletes accountable, as well as the laboratories; everybody needed to be accountable in order to achieve success.

THE CHAIRMAN assured Mr Moses that he was not alone. The same thing happened in his country. The athletes felt that their country had a great system and everybody else in the world cheated. It was wrong. Protecting the clean athletes was right and it had to be much wider than just a few able and competent countries.

MR RICCI BITTI represented the IFs and welcomed the job that had been done and the contributions. Compliance had to be an item that deserved a more serious approach than perhaps it had in the past. His concern was about how the operational system would work. He welcomed all the proposals, but what did compliance really mean? In terms of the effectiveness of the system, compliance depended on the level of sophistication of the different organisations, the money involved, etc., and obviously the situation of a small federation, or a NADO or RADO that was not organised, could not be changed. His position was still that he was looking at more than compliance: he was looking at the operational cooperation between the players involved, meaning the NADOs and the IFs. In his opinion, cooperation was not yet optimal. WADA needed to play a role. Some consideration still needed to be given to the role of WADA regarding all this. WADA was seen as a clearinghouse and it had to maintain a reference role. He did not know how the expert group would fit in to all of this. He welcomed and supported all the recommendations made and commended Mr Pound and the members of the group on their contributions, but thought that some details needed to be refined.

MS SCOTT thanked Mr Pound for the report. The athletes also very much welcomed the report and appreciated the recommendations made. Non-compliance had been a long-standing source of frustration for the athlete community, so this felt like a very progressive step forward. Personally, she was especially appreciative of two shifts in perspective, the first being towards the protection of the clean athlete; that was an important paradigm shift that could really shape and guide the group as it moved forward. The other was a word that had really struck her, that it was necessary to be 'nimble' and respond quickly when situations arose, and that was a tremendously important part of that. When an athlete was aware of situations that were coming up and brewing around, the source of frustration when nothing was being done or mobilised to tackle it could be great, so she really appreciated the inclusion of the capacity to act and respond quickly when situations of non-compliance arose.

MR BOZA congratulated the group that had made the spectacular document. On the implementation side, he agreed with Mr Ricci Bitti because, in his case, the composition of the NADO was currently being changed to give more power to the NOC to be more active, and this was being passed by law. The official compromise was to implement all the points, but he could not personally guarantee that this would be effective as of 1 January, as there were some things that were out of his hands that could not legally be controlled. He thought that this was the case for many countries in the region. He was referring to his country only but thought that there were a lot of countries in the region that would have that problem. The compromise from his side was to implement the 2015 Code but, on that specific point, he did not know whether it might be made somewhat different.

MR STOFILÉ echoed those who had lauded the initiative. It was a very important step that WADA was taking, and it was also a very science-based approach to monitoring compliance. It would be based on scientific and empirical evaluation of facts, and experts

must be allowed to deal with all the meticulous issues. He also agreed with Mr Boza that, in the appendix to item number 3, WADA should be very careful about placing it as a target. 1 January 2015 was absolutely correct, but it was not possible to say that there was no reason why stakeholders should not meet that target, as there were many reasons. It was a matter of fact. In many governments of the world, sport was not an area of interest and anti-doping was not even considered as a topic to be dealt with: it was dismissed outright. So, if one were a chief whip in parliament or congress, the priority of bills going through the legislative sausage would totally disregard the decision of 1 January 2015. One needed a very powerful lobby group, a very powerful RADO, regional activities, lobbying ministers and their governments in those areas, and that was not a given. He remembered a discussion in 2004 or 2005 about signing the UNESCO declaration. The same discussion had taken place. It had been possible to break own records in terms of a lot of people signing ahead of the deadline. It had been the fastest signature with a number of countries, but it had not come automatically: it had not been a voluntary spontaneous activity. There had been a lot of work to do, especially with the heads of state, and he was talking now about the African continent, where ministers were dispensable. One spoke to one group one month, and the next month there was a new group and it was necessary to start afresh and reintroduce the issues. They had no control over the matter; the control lay with the heads of state and government but, ultimately, the control was in the parliaments or congresses, where lobbying had to be done for fast tracking. It could be done, but it needed a lot of effort. He thought that WADA should keep 1 January as a target, but the members had to keep at the back of their minds what Mr Boza was saying: that government processes were very slow, very complicated and sometimes very convoluted. If there were a coup in Africa in the coming two weeks or months, then the whole thing would be at a standstill. It would be necessary to wait for the resolution of the problem before moving the issue forward again. Those were some of the unforeseen, un hoped-for consequences of working with government systems and structures. Once again, it was a very good thing and he liked the term Mr Pound had used and the idea of being nippy about doing things, because the more there were delays, the more the members came back and discussed the same things, and the more tensions grew; but, if WADA did it in a very fast and a very nippy way, it could work, and he had confidence in the members sitting there. They could meet the deadline; even Peru could meet the deadline if it received collaboration from those who made the decisions on international agreements because, unfortunately, at the government level, there was only one area in which international agreements were signed, either by the president, or executive, or by the parliament, or legislative.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he had been intrigued with the word 'nimble'. He was familiar with the intention that it was the Foundation Board. It was a really major decision to declare a federation or a NADO non-compliant but, if one were to be nimble, the expert group would presumably have to take a reasoned and balanced decision. Was it Mr Pound's intention that, if this were to be nimble, it be done by circulatory vote, rather than wait for a Foundation Board meeting twice a year? The other bit that seemed to him to be particularly significant was the principle of tiered compliance. Nobody had mentioned that, and it meant that the compliance sanctions applied to the IAAF would be very different to the compliance sanctions applied to the Shinty Association (he was choosing a sport that the members might not have heard of). With that kind of thing, and based on what Mr Stofile had said about governments almost by their nature being slow to adopt rules and regulations, he would be happy for guidance before deciding on 7.1, which was a specific decision to have things in place by 1 January.

MR BOZA observed that, if there were independence, more budget would be needed, and therefore an increase in income.

MR POUND joked that he did not think that WADA needed to worry about money since it did not have any. Dealing generally with the comments, it was a work in progress, a new Code and a new approach, so there would be some empirical experience to be gathered and absorbed as WADA went on; however, it was important, as every

once in a while there was a drift off to the side that made it sound as if it was WADA's responsibility to be compliant. It was not. Every ADO had the primary responsibility to be Code-compliant. That should not be forgotten or blunted.

In terms of protection of clean athletes, one of the initiatives WADA would have to consider (and it was not without its delicacy) would be to go to the CAS and leave aside what had been decided to date because, under the new Code, the object and spirit was the protection of clean athletes, so the arbitrators had to absorb that and not fall back into the old criminal law approach. He did not think ultimately that it was the system that made it work; it was the conviction of every signatory. It was a responsibility that they had all signed on to; therefore, they had to discharge that responsibility and could not push it off onto somebody else.

He was not unsympathetic to some of the problems NADOs might face with government involvement. All of the governments had been part of the Johannesburg declaration. They had all known the previous November that 1 January 2015 was the compliance date for the new Code and all had known that there would be consequences if their governments were not compliant. He was interested, as Mr Stofile had started talking and, by the time he had finished, he had come around to where he had hoped the discussion would end up which was that, if governments wanted to do it, they could do it, and WADA had in the past provided quite a lot of examples of how governments had responded in a very timely manner in an issue that was important.

Regarding the Chairman's comments on being nimble, that was a work in progress but, yes, if there was a serious situation identified by the expert group, if that was the direction in which WADA decided to move, it would not be necessary to wait until a November or May meeting. There were ways of taking decisions, and it might be possible to delegate some of them to the group itself if that was the choice of the Foundation Board.

As to the tiered approach, the working group had been very much aware that that concept had been floated by the Executive Committee on previous occasions, and it seemed to resonate. The group had not got weighed down by it, as there were groups dealing with risk but, conceptually, yes, there was a different level of compliance about which one had to be concerned with the IAAF (to use the example given previously) compared to sports whereby the risk or circumstances were either less or very different, and he thought that a sophisticated anti-doping system ought to be able to accommodate those differences.

MR PARKINSON asked if he could make one further point. The working group had discussed the need to support compliance rather than punish non-compliance, and everybody had accepted that the power of everybody doing what they were supposed to be doing was far greater than actually having punitive consequences. That said, particularly for the Executive Committee and the Foundation Board, there needed to be a clear recognition that, when there was wilful non-compliance, WADA needed to be strong. That was as important as supporting those that needed assistance, and that would require some tough decisions, potentially in the future, of which WADA needed to be very aware.

THE CHAIRMAN asked Mr Pound if he would recommend that, to produce an expert group, WADA put that out to tender, or should that group come from the combined knowledge of the people around the table?

MR POUND responded that that was a policy and governance decision that ought to be considered, but he thought that the people around the table probably knew the best people to do that and he did not think that the best outcomes would be achieved by working studiously at not having anybody who had hands-on experience making the judgement calls.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Pound. He asked the members to note and acknowledge the work that had been done. The report would go to the Foundation Board the following

day and the recommendation was to move it forward with a clear understanding and approval of what was being done, which would involve creating an expert group, eventually creating some tiering of compliance, giving WADA the ability to help people to be compliant as opposed to being a policeman. Were the members happy that WADA should do that, as the next stage clearly needed that decision before WADA could follow on?

DECISION

Report of the Working Group on
Compliance Reporting noted.

- 7.3 Technical Document on Sport Specific Analysis progress report

THE CHAIRMAN said that Mr Ricketts had been leading the effort on WADA's behalf with a particularly good expert group.

MR RICKETTS stated that, in addition to the update paper that the members had in their files, he had been asked to give a brief presentation on the technical document due to the technical nature and also the importance and change that would bring to the anti-doping programmes of many ADOs. The technical document was certainly one of the many enhancements contained in the Code, and that would support a more effective system moving forward. In essence, the technical document would outline the minimum levels of analysis for sports and disciplines determined to be at risk with regard to those prohibited substances that were not included in the analysis of a standard urine sample. This meant that every ADO, IF, NADO or major event organiser that conducted testing on those sports deemed at risk in relation to the specific substances would have to meet those minimum levels of analysis. The substances that the drafting group had categorised would be in the technical document and included erythropoiesis-stimulating agents, or ESAs, so that was EPO and the group of similar substances or analogues that fell under that category; Hgh and growth hormone releasing factors; and the group of insulins as well. Substances that were contained in the standard urine sample were not being reviewed, so the stimulants and anabolic steroids were not part of the technical document review and remained part of the minimum level of analysis that ADOs had to conduct in their standard testing programmes. Any sport that was exempt in the technical document from the substances would not require that minimum level of analysis; however, that was not to say that those substances were not prohibited for those sports. They remained on the Prohibited List and were prohibited, and any ADO could test at any time for them.

The technical document was a mandatory document; it fell under article 5.4.1, and outlined that it must be developed in consultation with IFs and other ADOs, and that process was well under way. The implementation side of that was linked to the International Standard for Testing and Investigations, and that clearly set out the steps to develop an effective, intelligent and proportionate test distribution plan.

In terms of where the technical document fitted into that, it was one important step in the overall development of a test distribution plan and the members could see in the bubbles on the screen the various steps to be taken to implement an effective test distribution plan, and step six was where the ADOs would prioritise the type of sample analysis that they would apply to the groups of athletes that they had identified were at risk and that they were testing.

In terms of why it was a requirement, the majority of samples collected were urine and the additional analysis menus for EPOs and growth hormones were an additional cost to that, and it was also currently at the discretion of the ADOs as to whether or not they tested for those. There had also been limited monitoring of that aspect and clearly the statistics showed that there was an imbalance in certain ADOs doing more testing in some countries or some sports than others, which went back to the point that Ms Scott had raised about athletes being tested across the board for the same things.

In terms of what the technical document was looking to achieve, it would be closing the loopholes in analysis by setting the minimum level that needed to be achieved; ADOs would be held more accountable and, in doing so, there should be an increase in the quality of the programmes, as well as an increase in the capacity and proficiency of the laboratories that were actually doing the analysis. There would be new tools developed and, obviously, with some of the smaller NADOs and IFs that were required to meet the minimum levels and were currently doing nothing, there would need to be development of those, so he was conscious of that as well. That would obviously increase the level of deterrence and hopefully there would also be an increase in detection and catching those who were cheating, the key point being the greater protection of clean athletes.

In terms of the WADA-accredited laboratories, there would be an increase in the number of analyses for the specific substances, and there was currently a very detailed review going on with all the WADA-accredited laboratories to understand the capacity of the laboratories as they were. There would obviously be ongoing work to increase that capacity where required. That would mean that, in the interim or in the lead-in period, there would be a requirement for some ADOs to ship some samples to other laboratories that had that capacity, so that needed to be understood as well.

In terms of how the technical document had been developed, it had been primarily based on the physiological risk against the performance enhancing benefit of those substances, looking at the physiological and non-physiological demands. The drafting group had categorised those sports with similar physiological aspects together, so power and strength sports were all grouped together, cardiovascular and endurance sports were also grouped together, as were aiming sports and gymnastics, to make the comparison a little easier, and that had worked out quite well. The performance benefits of the group of prohibited substances being looked at had also been considered, as well as the laboratory capacities.

In terms of the members of the group, there was a very good mix of expertise from sport, NADOs, the IOC and the IPC, the laboratory side of things and also physiology and anti-doping expertise. This had been a great group to work with. The members had got down to the nitty-gritty and, given that there were only seven months during which to turn the project around, was on track. The group should be commended for the work done to date.

The success of the project would be based on the consultation process with the IFs and the other ADOs. That had begun in December after the World Conference on Doping in Sport in Johannesburg, during which a paper had been circulated to all the ADOs to provide direction and information about where it was heading, and the appointment of the group had also occurred then. There had been several consultations directly with the IFs about the physiological aspects and their response had been very good and they had been heavily involved. The drafting group had looked at over 100 different sports and disciplines, and it had been quite an interesting experience learning about a lot of sports about which the members had previously not known a great deal. At that point, the draft minimum levels of analysis for the sports and disciplines, for the Olympic IFs, and for the recognised and non-recognised federations had all been distributed, and there would be consultation for the next two weeks or so, after which the group would be sending them to the NADOs and major event organisers.

WADA had also taken the opportunity to engage with stakeholders and at other conferences and symposia, and the members would see that WADA had been quite busy over the past five months, giving presentations and holding meetings.

In terms of how the minimum percentages would be presented, the members could see an example on the screen. It would contain the sport and discipline, so there would be a break-down into disciplines rather than just sports, and that also applied to the recording of statistics; so, rather than just looking at athletics and appointing a percentage, athletics would be broken down into sprint, middle distance, long distance, throws and jumps.

In terms of how that was converted into tests, the ADO would apply the percentage to the number of tests allocated in the test distribution plan, and it would be measured on that aspect.

As to utilising resources, the focus of the technical document should be on the international-level athletes for the IFs and on the national-level athletes for the NADOs. Testing outside of that was always welcome but the tests should not be focusing on master athletes or recreational athletes.

Regarding the flexibility that the ADOs would have, they would be able to determine when to conduct the testing, in-competition or out-of-competition, selecting the athletes and the timing of the tests, so that should all be based on their own risk assessment and risk factors in their own jurisdiction, and also the intelligence to which they had access. The key message was that WADA would be testing the right athletes for the right substances at the right time, and the effectiveness of the programme would be based on that aspect. If it were not done correctly, it would have to be addressed.

Regarding the impact of the technical document, for those ADOs above the minimum percentage levels, there should be no change, and there were NADOs and some IFs that were above the set minimum levels. Those below the minimum would have to raise their game; they would need to increase their analyses and change their test plans to accommodate that. Obviously increasing would have a financial impact and WADA might see a decrease in test numbers, but the offshoot would be an increase in quality. WADA would be monitoring that through ADAMS and he was sure that would be an important part of the compliance programme moving forward.

There would be some changes in development requirements to assist with the implementation. The Director General had mentioned the statistics and that there was a much greater level of detail. Mr Robertson had also spoken about the use of intelligence and having access to that. WADA was also developing a new testing guideline to assist ADOs in the development of their testing plans, and also how to apply the technical document within that. There should be greater use of the Athlete Biological Passport programme, and obviously there would be help needed for those IFs or NADOs that had not been implementing it for the sports that should have one. Laboratory prices would be published from 1 January along with the various analytical methods of the laboratories available, and he had mentioned the capacity of the laboratories increasing. Also very important would be building those partnerships between the ADOs, IFs and NADOs so that data could be shared along with intelligence.

In terms of the process, the group was currently in consultation with the IFs to finalise the physiological assessment and had proposed draft minimum levels of analysis to them. The Olympic IFs were due back the following Friday, and the documents would be circulated among the other ADOs (the NADOs, major event organisers and other parties) towards the end of May.

The experts in the drafting group would be meeting in mid-June to review any submissions from the IFs or the NADOs regarding the draft levels, then the draft technical document would be published at the end of July, tabled at the WADA Executive Committee meeting in September, published in October and effective as of 1 January. Everything was currently on track and he hoped to continue with the work.

In summary, the technical document would ensure that a minimum level of analysis was applied by all ADOs globally for those sports that were at risk. It would enhance the quality of the testing programmes; there would be development required for ADOs, and WADA would continue to consult with the IFs and the NADOs and other ADOs, not just in the development but also in the implementation, which was very important. It was the first year of operation, so things would need to be looked at. WADA would be monitoring that and it would be reviewed annually.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Ricketts very much. This had been decided when the new Code had been written. The implications were very substantial. There had been a

suggestion that an additional expert might be added to that group who came from a less risky sport. Had anything come of that?

MR RICKETTS replied that ASOIF had been spoken to about that and, given the stage in the process with the big meeting coming up in June, there had been some concern about whether it would be appropriate for the person to come in at that level. The group had been happy about inviting another member to join it, and it had been agreed that perhaps the member should be added to the group at the end of the process and moving forward.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was happy that WADA had done what it had said it would do. He asked if the members had any questions on the very substantial piece of work.

MR PARKINSON observed that it was an excellent piece of work to date and he very much looked forward to seeing the final results. There were a couple of points he wished to mention, and he thought that a lot of the developing NADOs would need a lot of support understanding and applying it. He hoped that such support would be provided. Given the experience in Sochi, it might also be helpful to be crystal clear as to how to define a test, particularly since a percentage against the number of tests would be provided. He had run into different interpretations of what a test was, which did seem somewhat bizarre, but the reality was that people counted tests differently around the world. That might be a helpful thing to include.

MR RICCI BITTI thanked the group because it was fundamental for the IFs. The Olympic IFs were obviously the most sophisticated part of the group, along with the larger NADOs. It was a very good start and he was very pleased with it.

MS SCOTT asked about the sport-specific substances in the hypothetical situation whereby a new substance was discovered as being used in one sport. Would it then be added to the test protocol for all the sports in that specific group? How would that work and what would the time frame be?

MR GODKIN asked if Mr Ricketts had thought about enforcing non-compliance and the ramifications of that in the earlier stages.

MR RICKETTS thanked Mr Parkinson for his comments and said that he would make sure that they were put on the agenda. There had been some questions already from IFs about how a test was defined and how it would be evaluated, and the group was keeping a tab of all those questions and would develop an FAQ. All those that were very relevant would be part of the text in the actual technical document.

In terms of the new substances that might come on board, that would be part of the Prohibited List, if one was saying it was a brand new substance, so the review of the Prohibited List would be part of the review of the technical document, and any new substances being abused would be added to the List, and the risk level of the sports affected would be looked at.

Regarding the question about non-compliance enforcement, that would be part of the overall picture of looking at why the ADO had not met the minimum level. There was certainly an opportunity in the Code for those that found it too difficult to start off with to apply for a reduction, which would be looked at by an independent group, possibly the group with which he was currently working, so that would certainly be an option, but he thought that the ramifications would be part of the overall compliance process and looking at how to develop and improve it first of all.

THE CHAIRMAN summarised the process, which would entail taking it forward and reporting to the Foundation Board the following day that this was under way, and he complimented Mr Ricketts and the really high-powered group of experts who were moving it forward in a very good way.

DECISION

Technical Document on Sport Specific
Analysis progress report noted.

8. Athlete Biological Passport

DR VERNEC said that he would be giving the members a short update on the Athlete Biological Passport, with a focus on the new steroidal module. As many of the members already knew, the passport was a way of indirectly detecting doping without actually looking specifically for prohibited substances. It could be used for targeting and it could also directly lead to an anti-doping rule violation. The haematological module had been operating since 2009, and there were more than 40 ADOs running the programmes. Half of those were IFs and, obviously, the emphasis was on endurance sports. From 2008-2013, there had been 340 positive blood doping cases, approximately double the rate in the years before the passport. Those included positives from finding ESAs. Of those 340, 53 had been positive Athlete Biological Passport cases alone.

Looking at the steroidal module, which had been operational since the start of that year, the basic processes and principles were the same as those for the haematological module. There were 20,000 matched urine samples in ADAMS for the first four months of that year. All urine samples had to have a doping control form entered into ADAMS which made it possible to put a name to an athlete (it remained anonymous as a BPID number), to generate a steroidal profile. Without a doping control form, there would be only individual results, so it would not be possible to create any sort of profile. The calculations were all done automatically in ADAMS, and individual reference values were used rather than population values. That meant that there would be fewer unnecessary IRMS tests and fewer athletes would fly under the radar. The blue line in the middle of the slide was the T/E ratio. T/E ratios of 1:1 were the norm but anything above 4:1 could be considered atypical and would then result in an IRMS test. The data on the slide were for an athlete with a naturally high level and every result except for one was over 4:1. This was a case in which there would be a lot of IRMS testing or, at the very least, dialogue between the ADOs and the laboratories. Other athletes snuck under the radar and, looking at the blue line again on the screen, the normal T/E ratio for the athlete was 0.15:1, and that athlete had been used as a case and given testosterone, as could be seen with the arrow, at which point there had been a 10:1 increase in the level of testosterone, which had been easily picked up by the adaptive or steroidal module but, if using the 4:1 ratio, would have been completely missed. The final example showed an athlete who had been tested since 1 January and, again, looking at the blue lines, the values were about 0.8:1, and again looking at the upper and lower red lines, the athlete could not take any sort of a substance without immediately triggering an atypical passport finding. What was also unusual about that particular case was that there were a lot of numbers, because the athlete had done very well at the Olympic Games and had been tested before and after the podium. It was unusual to have so many numbers. The reality was that, for most athletes around the world, there might be one or at best a few samples in, so there would not be a lot of statistics being generated at that still early stage. Again, he had put the 4:1 line because, if the athlete had a result increasing it to 1.3:1, or maybe only a 30% increase, that would immediately trigger an atypical passport finding, which was far below the 4:1 with which WADA had been operating for so many years.

He would not say anything about the TDEAS, which was a fundamental part of the steroidal module, as his colleague would be talking about that momentarily, and the revised version needed to be put up for approval by the Executive Committee.

He did mention that the system was set up in a single database system, which was ADAMS. There was one athlete, one passport, and shared data; therefore, multiple organisations were putting information in, everything was calculated automatically, and there was very little administrative work other than putting the doping control form into

ADAMS. Of course, by having it in ADAMS, there was the ability for WADA to fulfil its monitoring role.

Unfortunately, he had discovered that there were many ADOs not just not using ADAMS, but not putting the doping control forms in and, as he had mentioned earlier, one could not create a longitudinal profile if one did not know who the sample belonged to. There were criteria that had been given to the laboratories to give them some guidance on what to do for the steroidal module when there was no use of ADAMS. He did not wish to spend time on that, other than to say that there was a significant disadvantage globally when the ADOs were not using ADAMS.

In the event of an atypical passport finding, basically two things would happen. The first was automatic notification: it went to the laboratory, the laboratory did an IRMS, if the IRMS was positive for an exogenous steroid, that would be essentially an adverse analytical finding and it would move along to sanctions. If the atypical passport finding was done but the IRMS was negative, further expert evaluation and testing would be needed. WADA had advised the ADOs to associate with laboratory-associated athlete passport management units, or APMUs. More so than the haematological module, the expertise was really at the level of the laboratory experts for the steroidal module, so that was where WADA was trying to get people to get engaged with a number of laboratory APMUs that were already up and running. The APMUs would recommend effective and strategic testing, would manage the passports and go all the way to compiling documentation packages and issuing adverse passport findings. There were some costs to an APMU; he understood that but, at the end of the day, he could not emphasise enough that WADA would rather have fewer tests that made sense, tests that were strategic, than have lots of tests, and the passport was a way of achieving that.

WADA was still in the early stages. It had started on 1 January that year and, because there were several changes in the criteria, he could not make too many comparisons to 2013; nevertheless, the early indications showed that it seemed to be working as planned. There were fewer IRMS tests being done but WADA was still getting the same number of IRMS positives, so there appeared to be a certain degree of cost-effectiveness. There was still some work to be done; he had already discussed a number of times with stakeholders and was trying to make some adjustments in ADAMS, some of which were already due in September, and more adjustments would be made, and also WADA had to engage with the ADOs, which, as Mr Pound had mentioned, had certain responsibilities, including trying to get the doping control forms into ADAMS so that the steroidal module could be effective.

MR PARKINSON observed that the steroidal module was brilliant; he really liked it. Adjustments in ADAMS had been mentioned. Did they include anything about the ability of NADOs to see athletes under their jurisdiction when there was joint custody with an IF? He was aware that a number of NADOs had some challenges in that regard and was wondering if that was something on the list of things to adjust.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he always hesitated to ask a technical expert a question, but 14,000 responses seemed to him to be quite a good number. How long would it take until there was sufficient throughput to give a really valuable view of the system?

MR ESTANGUET stated that he thought that the passport was really effective for the athletes and they appreciated that. A lot of athletes were positive about the tool. He was just concerned about the number of ADOs using the passport. There did not appear to be enough. He was wondering how that might be developed to make sure that all athletes would receive equal access or the same constraints in their preparation. For clean athletes, the use of the Athlete Biological Passport was an additional constraint and they were fine about collaborating because they believed that it was a great tool in the fight against doping in sport, but it would be easier to make it acceptable to all athletes if equal access for all athletes could be guaranteed.

DR VERNEC responded to Mr Parkinson that the particular issue of sharing who the passport custodian was and who got read access had already been addressed. He

strongly suggested that the IFs and the NADOs get together and have some kind of a plan. The idea was one athlete, one passport, so it was a matter of who would be responsible. Nevertheless, there would be some changes, as the IF had initially been put in as a default and he understood that that had not been pleasing to everybody. There would still have to be discussions, and that was a good thing.

It was always difficult to say exactly what kinds of numbers were needed. He thought that 20,000 seemed like a lot of urine samples but, in actual fact, there were numerous urine samples unmatched with doping control forms, and WADA management and all of the stakeholders would have to get on to that to make sure that as many full numbers as possible could be entered into the system. Quite a lot of variables had changed from 2013 to 2014. It might be a little more challenging to see how things had changed from one year to another.

Regarding the comment about the low numbers of ADOs using the passport, for the steroidal module, if somebody had a urine sample, they were automatically part of the steroidal passport. Essentially, the whole world was doing the passport, again with the corollary that a doping control form had to go into ADAMS for ADAMS to work, otherwise they would just be random samples. The haematological module was different. ADOs had to essentially designate which athletes they wanted to be tested, as it was a very specific test. Most of the endurance sport IFs, skiing, cycling and athletics and so on, were all using the Athlete Biological Passport. The NADOs were slowly coming along. A lot of the bigger ones were already using it, and he expected there to be more and more. Doing things such as fixing ADAMS to give them a little bit more access would help encourage them in that respect. The Athlete Biological Passport manager in Lausanne was also assisting the NADOs, trying to get them up to speed and help them to implement the haematological passport.

DECISION

Athlete Biological Passport update
noted.

9. Science

- 9.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee Chair report

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

DR STEINACKER told the Executive Committee members that he had been a member of the Health, Medical and Research Committee for two years. He came from the sport of rowing, and was a member of FISA's sports medicine commission. He was based at Ulm University in southern Germany and was an internist.

Professor Ljungqvist was well and passed on his best wishes to everybody.

The draft of the 2015 List of Prohibited Substances and Methods was currently in the consultation phase, which would end on 8 July, and the comments of the stakeholders would be reviewed carefully by the List Expert Group at the end of August, after which the draft would go to the Health, Medical and Research Committee for further review, and then the Executive Committee would take a decision on it at the September meeting. Some changes had been proposed by the List Committee, and one of the changes had to do with noble gases, on which the members would be asked to reach a decision. Dr Rabin would explain that point.

The Health, Medical and Research Committee had also dealt with the research projects. They were a big success story. There had been many more applications than expected. WADA had received 116 projects that year, representing a 64% increase compared to two years previously. That created a greater burden on decisions and evaluation, and there was a certain amount of pressure. The Science Director had some comments to make and had to discuss how to manage the huge number of applications.

A lot were very well written, and most received good evaluation results, but money was limited and the capacity of the office was limited, as the projects had to be guided; therefore, a communication process was necessary.

The final very important point was that more than half the work resources of the Science Department were dedicated to the anti-doping laboratories. A number of technical documents had been developed for the laboratories, and there was an extensive programme to educate, guide and assist the new laboratories, to distribute knowledge and maintain the quality standards, and that entailed a lot of work. A lot of decisions had been taken the previous September by the Executive Committee in that regard.

Finally, the science conference to be held with the pharmaceutical industry had been postponed by three months. The Japanese authorities had done a lot of work to organise the conference, and he thanked them for their cooperation. The meeting would be very significant, as cooperation between WADA and the pharmaceutical industry was very important.

DECISION

Health, Medical and Research Committee
Chair report noted.

– 9.2 Prohibited List 2014 - Xenon

DR RABIN said that WADA had been asked earlier that year about the status of the noble gas vis-à-vis the List of Prohibited Substances and Methods, so the matter had been put on the agenda of the List Expert Group's mid-April meeting and the experts had clearly and unanimously reached the conclusion that xenon should be considered a prohibited substance. That decision had been reached after reviewing a lot of documentation, part of it in Russian, and extracting all the information available in published scientific literature. Moreover, the experts had enquired about the other noble gases with similar properties, and concluded that argon should also be prohibited. Interestingly, xenon was described in some literature as a HIF (hypoxia-inducible factor) activator and the current wording of the 2014 Prohibited List referred to the prohibition of HIF stabilisers; so, although the mechanism of action was clearly the same, the stabilisation of the HIF factor which led to the increase in EPO production and the increase in red blood cell production, there was a semantic nuance that had to be taken into account and could be the subject of potential legal discussion and of course consequences.

By way of a conclusion, the List Expert Group proposed changing the 2015 Prohibited List, and the draft document was currently under consultation with stakeholders, but also bearing in mind the fact that xenon was being used as he spoke, serious consideration needed to be given by the WADA authorities to amend the current 2014 Prohibited List, to modify the S2 section to include HIF activators and name xenon and argon as prohibited substances, and the members had the proposed wording on page 3 of the document under 9.2, which was the possibility to make that amendment and really ensure that xenon and argon were prohibited. That would require a slight modification as proposed in the document.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it seemed to him that the issue was straightforward. The List Committee had dealt with it in detail. It had to do with a reaction he had given in Sochi when the story had become public and there had been a degree of media interest that it would be dealt with at the first available opportunity by the List Committee. It had been and the options were either to do it immediately or wait until 1 January 2015. If WADA did it immediately, there would be a three-month effective period whereby WADA would give notice through UNESCO so that it would present the change to the Prohibited List to the governments of the world. An immediate decision would not be effective by the end of the meeting. Was that not the case?

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL replied that UNESCO needed to translate it into a number of different languages to send out to all states parties. They would have 45 days to respond and then another 45 days before it came into being.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the Executive Committee could either do nothing or, if the members decided to amend the Prohibited List, when would they want to amend it?

MR RICCI BITTI stated that he was in favour of amending the Prohibited List immediately, because all the stakeholders needed time to pass the issue through their respective decision-making bodies. At the end, if done immediately, everything would be in place more or less by 1 January. If the decision were to be implemented on 1 January, another year would go by, so the IFs in general were in favour of doing it immediately.

DR STEINACKER said that he had spoken to Professor Ljungqvist and had read the documents. Xenon and argon had the potential not only to increase EPO, but also HIF was one of the key molecular mechanisms for increasing a lot of growth and other hormones. He recommended changing it as early as possible, as there were a lot of other uses for xenon.

MR ESTANGUET stated that the athletes also supported changing the Prohibited List as soon as possible. Also, he had heard in Sochi that WADA had been unable to detect xenon, so WADA might have to be more aggressive in its communication and send out a message that it was currently able to detect the product and make sure that all the athletes knew that, if they tried to use it, there would be a problem.

MR PARKINSON said that the European perspective differed slightly. Just looking at the practical nature of implementing it, if three months were needed to take it through WADA, it would be the end of August, and then, if UNESCO were to need another three months, it would be November. Or were three months in total required? Also, the points made by some of the scientific people in Europe were that they were not convinced that the substance warranted a different way of looking at it. That said, he would be comfortable to take on board what was said at the Executive Committee meeting.

MR LOBOGNON said that Africa thought that, if there was any doubt about the use of xenon and argon, they should definitely be on the Prohibited List and WADA should not wait another day. That would just give extra odds to the cheats. It would be better to take a decision immediately and put the gases on the Prohibited List.

DR RABIN clarified that WADA had not yet launched the detection work to date. WADA had approached some scientific teams who had said that they could fairly easily detect xenon and, as soon as a decision was taken, WADA would go back to the teams and activate the work very quickly, and gain that capacity within a few months.

MR MOSES asked about the mechanism and what made xenon performance enhancing.

DR RABIN replied that HIF (hypoxia-inducible factor) existed in the body, and it was usually destroyed when exposed to normoxic conditions. There were currently some new concepts in the pharmaceutical industry to stabilise HIF, which would send a signal to the body that it was in hypoxic conditions and, when in hypoxic conditions, the body stabilised HIF. HIF stabilisation led to the production of EPO and then the production of red blood cells. It was well known that, when HIF stabilisers had been put on the List, that group of substances developed by the pharmaceutical industry was the next generation of EPO substances. WADA had not been aware that there were means other than chemical means of stabilising HIF, and that was basically what the two noble gases were doing. They were not substances but they (according to the literature) activated (but in fact stabilised) HIF and, in doing so, they triggered the cascade of EPO and red blood cell production. This was what WADA faced and it was semantic because the vast majority of scientific literature referred to HIF 'stabilisation' for the mechanism, except that, for the noble gas, there were some publications that referred to 'activation'; but, in the end, it was exactly the same mechanism that was involved.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that he got a clear sense that the majority view was to take the decision to put the gases on the Prohibited List immediately and go through the necessary three-month process with UNESCO. He certainly thought from a public relations point of view that that was exactly the right thing to do.

DECISION

Proposal to amend the Prohibited List
to include xenon and argon approved.

– 9.3 Technical documents

DR BARROSO said that the Laboratory Expert Group had recently revised six technical documents. He would not describe the documents, some of which were quite complicated, but would give a summary of the main changes in the new versions compared to the versions in effect to date. If approved that day, the documents would become effective on 1 September 2014.

9.3.1 TD2014 EPO

The first document was a new document on the detection of EPO and its analogues. The very first change was to the title of the document. WADA referred no longer to EPO and its analogues, but actually had changed the title to apply to the broader category of substances, which were called erythropoiesis-stimulating agents, and of course that included EPO and its analogues, as well as HIF stabilisers, and so on: everything that led to the increased production of red blood cells. In the initial testing procedure, the first change was that the same methods would be applied to urine and blood. Before, there had been some differences, but currently the same methods could be applied in both matrices. There was a differentiation between EPO-like and EPO-unlike molecules from a structural point of view, and that was important because, depending on the structure of the molecule, the method used for its detection would be different.

The next point had to do with the detection of recombinant EPO. There had been a major change, to which he would refer in greater detail later on. Then there was the so-called peginesatide, which was a very small molecule that was not related structurally to EPO but had the same effect, and there were two specific methods for the detection of that molecule. It had been discontinued from the market because there had been serious adverse effects once it had been approved for the treatment of chronic kidney disease patients. Some patients had died and the substance had had to be discontinued. The company was working on finding out what had gone wrong, but it was very easy to synthesise, it was a small peptide, and WADA could not ignore the fact that it could be abused by some athletes.

For the confirmation procedures, unlike in the previous version, there would be only one method applied, as opposed to a combination of methods, so there was a specification for each kind of EPO and the confirmation methods to be used. The important point, which was highlighted in red, was that the IEF method that had been used since 2000 would no longer be used for the confirmation of recombinant EPOs. For a procedure called immunoblotting, there was also an important change, which was the use of the antibody. Before, the laboratories had been able to use only one specific antibody; currently, there was flexibility to use antibodies with similar performance characteristics. There was a specification that double blotting, which was also important in the method, and this was a technical issue, had to be mandatory for the confirmation of all samples except urine samples.

He explained why the IEF method was no longer necessary for the confirmation of recombinant EPOs. The members would see on the screen a typical gel image of an IEF (isoelectrofocusing) method for the detection of EPO. Looking at the left-hand side, the members would see the region of recombinant EPO. When going to the confirmation test, what happened to that region, known as the basic region, was that, as a result of microbial contamination, endogenous EPO sometimes emigrated into that region, so the result could be mistakenly interpreted as a positive result. In order to resolve that, the

laboratories usually had to do a stability test, which would no longer be needed because the method being implemented for confirmation, the SAR-PAGE (or SDS-PAGE) method, solved the problem. Briefly, the region in the green rectangle was what was called the endogenous EPO, the normally produced EPO. The members would see in the blue circles where the recombinant doping EPO would fall. That active, or contaminated, urine would fall in a region that could be easily differentiated from endogenous EPO, so there was no chance of the laboratory mistakenly interpreting the result. It was very easy to determine whether it was recombinant or endogenous. That was one of the main changes to the document. For the evaluation and interpretation of results, of course there was no longer any possibility of an atypical finding, as there would be only one confirmation method. Before, there could have been an atypical finding if two methods were applied and one was positive and the other negative or inconclusive. The result would be straightforward. For the IEF method, which could not be used for confirmation, there would no longer be criteria for recombinant EPO; however, there would be criteria if the method were used for the screening, by way of orientation for the laboratories to continue with the confirmation procedure. For NESP, which was another EPO analogue, there had been a small change to one of the criteria to account for the appearance of different drugs or products similar to the one on the market. Those were the main changes to the EPO technical document. The main change was that the IEF method would no longer be applied for the confirmation of recombinant EPO.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if anybody was brave enough to ask any questions. He was always interested that science used words differently. In this case, 'stimulating' was seriously bad news. He congratulated Mr Barroso on the explanation. Did the members wish to approve the document?

DECISION

TD2014 EPO approved.

9.3.2 TD2014 EAAS

DR BARROSO said that the second document was on steroid profiling, to which Dr Verneq had referred previously. It was a very important document in the framework of the steroid module of the Athlete Biological Passport. The document had come into effect on 1 January that year but, after five months of experience, some minor changes were needed to clarify certain situations. The first was something that had not been included in the members' files as it had been a last-minute change, and it actually referred to the 'all' in the text. It was a very small change, but it was very important. It meant that, when applying criteria for the determination of testosterone and epitestosterone, testosterone and epitestosterone were not looked at at the same time; but, if that criterion were met by any one of them, that particular situation would apply, so it had been necessary to include the 'all' beside the 'and' to make sure that both could be evaluated separately. The second was the reporting of actual steroid profile values. The laboratories had been requested to express each of the values to two significant figures. It meant that it had created a lot of problems for the laboratories, as they had had to alter their resource to meet the criterion before reporting in ADAMS; so, from 1 September, that would be taken care of automatically by ADAMS, so the laboratories would report the values as measured and ADAMS would do the automatic approximation to two significant figures, which was important for the adaptive model and the building up of the steroid profile.

The next set of changes referred to the validity of the sample. When the laboratories determined the steroid profile of every urine sample, they had to report whether that profile was considered valid or not. Apparently, the way in which it had been written in the current technical document had not been clear enough, so clarifications were necessary to make sure that the main marker of the steroid profile being looked at was the T/E ratio. So, basically, the changes were that, if one could not measure the T/E ratio in the sample, that sample was not valid; even if one could measure almost everything else, if the T/E ratio could not be measured, the sample would not be considered valid

because the T/E ratio was being followed up longitudinally. If the T/E ratio was measurable, the sample was valid, even if some of the other markers could not be measured, and the laboratories had a way of being able to determine the T/E ratio even if some of the markers were not quantifiable.

The next set of changes referred to what triggered a confirmation IRMS analysis. There had been doubts among the laboratories and the testing authorities about when a sample should be subjected to IRMS confirmation analysis and who would pay for it. There were two main changes in the document. The laboratories would receive two kinds of automatic notification from ADAMS, the first kind being the atypical passport finding confirmation procedure request, and that was the easy one because, once the laboratories received that automatic notification, which was immediately after reporting, if the finding was atypical, they knew that they had to perform IRMS analysis and did not have to consult anybody. In terms of when they received the notification, first, the sample had to be matched to a doping control form in ADAMS but, in addition, there had to be an already existing longitudinal profile, so that sample had to be at least the second sample for that athlete because one could not build a profile on one sample alone. At least two samples were needed to start building a profile. Of course, the sample's T/E ratio had to be abnormal to be considered atypical within that profile. In addition, if the sample met any of the two concentration criteria, that would also trigger the atypical passport finding notification. The main thing was that the sample had to be matched to a doping control form in ADAMS. Situations could arise when samples were not matched to a doping control form in ADAMS simply because the testing authority was not using ADAMS or because it had been late in reporting the doping control form. In that case, the adaptive model in ADAMS could not be applied and a steroid profile or longitudinal profile could not be built for an athlete. There would be only the values for that particular sample. Also, if the sample was matched but it was the first sample, one could not build a longitudinal profile either, as more data points were necessary; so, in those two situations, when the sample was matched but there was not yet a longitudinal profile or when the sample was not matched and it met any of the criteria, the laboratory would receive that notification. One of the criteria involved there was the T/E ratio above 4. When Dr Vernec had made his presentation, the T/E above 4 was a population-based criterion that was not as discriminative as an individual criterion, so that would trigger more IRMS analysis than when a sample could be incorporated in the ADAMS steroid profile. That was probably the most important change to the document.

THE CHAIRMAN said that quite clearly the members would see the connection between the discussion held earlier that day about the steroid module and what the laboratories then had to do to make it work. Were the members happy to approve it?

DECISION

TD2014 EAAS approved.

9.3.3 TD2014 IRMS

DR BARROSO informed the members that the document was the twin brother of the document he had just presented, as it was the document related to the confirmation analysis by IRMS, and it was the first specific document for IRMS analysis produced as a technical document. That document, based on the guidelines recently published by WADA in January that year, specified when confirmation analysis by IRMS had to be performed on urine samples. All atypical passport findings had to be confirmed and, for suspicious findings, the laboratories would first have to contact the testing authority to find out whether IRMS analysis was really necessary. This was because there were testing authorities that did not use ADAMS but had their own steroid profile programmes, and those ADOs might have values and a profile for an athlete to which WADA had no access in ADAMS but which showed that the values for the athlete in question were normal. In those cases, the IRMS would not be necessary but the testing authority would have to justify in writing to the laboratory why the confirmation analysis was not necessary. The technical document dealt with a series of instructions on the confirmation of formestane

and bolded findings, which were not part of the steroid profiling, and a series of instructions and clarifications regarding the technical specifications that the laboratories had to meet when applying the method, and that had been done to harmonise the application of the method and of course the interpretation of the results. One important part to which he drew the members' attention was how the results would be interpreted and reported and what that meant in terms of result management. There were specific criteria provided for the interpretation of IRMS results as positive, inconclusive or negative. The criteria were based on four different elements. They were stricter criteria. The first element was that the laboratory had to have its own reference population ranges and only if the result was above the mean plus three standard deviations of those ranges could the laboratory start considering the results as positive. Then there were specific criteria for the different markers of the steroid profile which could be looked at individually or in combination with other analytes. Finally, before reporting an adverse analytical finding for IRMS, the laboratory should seek a second opinion from another WADA-accredited laboratory. This was similar to what was currently being done for the reporting of EPO findings, so it was a way (especially for those results that were less clear) for the laboratory to obtain a second opinion from an independent expert. The criteria were in the document. In terms of how the results would be reported, if positive, they would be reported as adverse analytical findings, if inconclusive, they would be reported as atypical findings and, if negative, there was the long paragraph in the document that the laboratories had to use to report the negative result which was in line with the ISL wording. Straight away, the APMU would have to consider atypical and negative findings for further testing or investigations and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members would be happy to approve the document.

DECISION

TD2014 IRMS approved.

9.3.4 TD2014 MRPL

DR BARROSO said that the changes were very simple: this was the technical document for minimum performance levels for non-threshold substances. There were two main changes. The first was the change of the MRPL for formestane, because it had been brought into line with the document he had just mentioned, on IRMS, and any findings for formestane above 50 ng and below 150 ng would have to be subjected to IRMS analysis, meaning that the laboratories had to be able to measure formestane at 50 ng/mL; therefore, the MRPL for formestane had been reduced from 150 to 50 ng/mL.

The second change had to do with the detection of a particular glucocorticosteroid, which was budesonide. The document specified a metabolite that the laboratories had to look at to be able to differentiate between the permitted and non-permitted administration of budesonide. Glucocorticosteroids were allowed by inhalation or topical routes, but were prohibited by injection or any systemic route of administration. Looking at that particular metabolite, that discrimination could be made, so the laboratories had to focus on that particular metabolite.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that the presentation had been really straightforward.

DECISION

TD2014 MRPL approved.

9.3.5 TD2014 NA

DR BARROSO said that the technical document was on the determination of nandrolone, and the changes were also cosmetic, just to be consistent with the IRMS technical document. Some technical changes had been made regarding reporting and the estimation of uncertainty for that particular substance. They were really cosmetic changes.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members wished to approve the document.

DECISION

TD2014 NA approved.

9.3.6 TD2014 DL

DR BARROSO said that the final document was on the decision limits for the determination of threshold substances. The changes had been minimal. The first change was the decision limit for carboxy-THC from 175 to 180, and that was simply because, below the table, all decision limits had to be expressed to two significant figures, and there were three significant figures in 175. Technically speaking, the change was minimal and had no real consequences.

A more important change was the threshold and resulting decision limit for glycerol, which had been increased from 1.3 to 5.3 mg/mL. This was the result of a reference study carried out in Salt Lake City with about 1,000 samples, and in particular from some Paralympic cases that had shown that the 1.3 mg/mL could be attained in athletes using catheters in which glycerol was used as a lubricant.

The last minor change had to do with carboxy-THC and morphine, which had been removed from the list of substances that, if detected together with a diuretic, would have been reported as an adverse analytical finding at any concentration, and athletes would have had to present an approved TUE for those substances as well. The minor change had been made simply to bring the document into line with the List of Prohibited Substances, where in section S5 there was a note clarifying the situation and, in that note, only beta-2 agonists and stimulants on that table were considered as falling under that particular situation.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if everybody was clear. He thanked Mr Barroso. He had thought that Mr Barroso's electronic device might need a good shot of testosterone at one stage during the presentation.

DR RABIN said that he thought that the technical documents were in line with all the momentum that had been created with the revision of the Code and the ISL, and all the adjustments currently being made to the rules, reflecting the progress of science, some of which came directly from the research projects conducted over recent years. He thought that it was very helpful.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it was one of the advantages of being a member of the WADA Executive Committee. One became very knowledgeable about technical documents. Any member wishing to continue their studies should sit in at the back of the laboratory directors' meeting and would learn a lot more.

DECISION

TD2014 DL approved.

10. Education Committee Chair report

MR MOSES stated that it was a pleasure to be the chair of the Education Committee. It had held a very good meeting. Unfortunately, he was present that day because of the death of Mr Jurith, whom he had replaced. From his understanding, Mr Jurith had done an outstanding job and lots of people had enjoyed working with him. Were it not for that unfortunate circumstance, he would not be at the table. His heart went out to Mr Jurith's family and he was sure that the Executive Committee members all felt the same.

The Education Committee had met on 3 and 4 April in Montreal, and it had been his first ever meeting with WADA. He had spent a couple of days with Mr Koehler and the staff some weeks prior to the meeting to get up to speed and to talk to the people at the office. The interaction with the Education Committee had been outstanding, and a wide range of subjects had been discussed. All the members had been quite enthusiastic. The Education Committee had welcomed Mr Ben Sandford from the WADA Athlete Committee, and it had been very good to hear the perspective of the athletes and Mr

Sandford's take on things. One of the benefits of having athletes at the committee meeting was that people who were not from the world of athletics really appreciated hearing a different frank and honest perspective in terms of what the athletes' perceptions of doping were.

One of the outcomes of the meeting had been to ensure that the Athlete Committee and the Education Committee would share the agendas of their respective meetings. Mr Sandford had talked about the Athlete Committee agenda and brought a lot of additional input to the table. It had been agreed that such engagement would continue, as the athletes were really where the rubber met the road in the whole scope of what WADA did. The athletes were WADA's clients and constituents, and one got to hear a different perspective from athletes.

Another outcome of the meeting had been to ensure that education initiatives were both interesting and fun, and WADA should explore how to engage athletes. It had been recommended that WADA develop some basic principles to assist and guide ADOs on what type of activities athletes had been involved in and could be involved in and the Education Committee felt that being role models in clean sport had a lot to offer in terms of having the athletes involved directly and visibly for the sake of the other athletes and would be beneficial.

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

The Education Committee thanked the Education Partnership, which involved WADA, UNESCO, the IOC, the IPC, the International Fair Play Committee and the Council for Sport Science and Physical Education, for its commitment to work together to develop a resource kit for teachers, and he thought that was a great idea. The Education Committee wanted to make sure that major games signatories, be they at major games, such as the World Games and the Youth Games, were aware that they also had a responsibility to promote education and make sure that the younger athletes were educated and got to hear about and see the information, with booths set up and manned by people who could talk about fair play and playing true and all the positive things that the young people should absorb. The Education Committee would think some more about engaging world-class athletes as heroes and living legends who could influence younger athletes.

The Education Committee had reviewed all the educational tools developed by WADA such as Coach True, ALPHA, the ADO resource and the online sports physician tool kit. All this was great and, the more people WADA was able to touch, including trainers, doctors, and anybody around the athletes, the better. The Education Committee continued to encourage the department to continue to promote the tools and to continually look for ways of improving and updating them.

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

The Education Committee recommended for 2015 three social science research projects to focus on developing effective intervention programmes based on the knowledge base of research that was out there and had been reviewed. The Education Committee wanted to look at the effects that the legitimacy of anti-doping rules had among athletes; in other words, whether they really believed that the rules meant

something, and the Education Committee wanted to find out the athletes' perception as to what those rules meant and how they would be enforced, how they manipulated their attitudes, and what their attitudes were. What did it mean to have WADA rules and regulations? The Education Committee wanted to find out the psychology and what they actually believed, whether it was an actual deterrent or something that was out there and was simply a headache. The Education Committee wanted to find out more about deterrence measures for the athlete entourage, and their attitudes and specifically what the continuum theoretically could be to get athletes starting on vitamins, moving on to amino acids, then some type of supplement, and what affected those people and how they were then able to make suggestions and have athletes doing more than they probably should. The Education Committee had asked for research on that, as there was not a lot out there in that particular area. There had been a lot of talk among the members about the psychology, not just the fact that athletes theoretically wanted to take drugs because they wanted to win, earn money and be famous; the committee thought that there were some other elements out there and wanted to find out about the psychology with regard to the entourage.

Mr Koehler would give details about the other projects that had been recommended.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether there any questions for Mr Moses in relation to the Education Committee meeting.

He thanked Mr Moses for stepping into the breach. Everybody had fond memories of Mr Jurith, who had worked hard in that area. Having Mr Moses present seemed to him to send all the correct messages, so he thanked Mr Moses very much for his efforts.

DECISION

Education Committee Chair report noted.

11. Targeted social science research projects 2014

MR KOEHLER said that the two projects were in the members' files, so he would not go into too much detail. The first project looked at coaches and how to be more effective in ensuring that coaches were taking proactive steps with their athletes to deter and prevent the use of doping in sport, and that was being led by the International Council for Coaching Excellence at Leeds University. WADA had been working with them for over five years on their coaching framework and the project would take it further, developing a best-practice approach to coaching education and how anti-doping could be built as a part of everything a coach had to go through. Not only did it do the research, but it also produced an implementation strategy and tools for anti-doping coach education. That research project totalled 25,000 US dollars.

The second project was the result of initial discussions held with the IOC on creating one resource and all working together to ensure that resources were used in the best possible way to assist teachers. The school curricula were extremely heavy and it was very difficult to get in, so the project looked at supporting what teachers were already doing, supporting values-based messages in schools, and that was a partnership between WADA, the IOC, the IPC, UNESCO, the International Fair Play Committee and the Council for Sport Science and Physical Education. Through the project, WADA was looking at mapping out values globally to get a better understanding of the common values being taught and how to use the messages that WADA had through sport and anti-doping to support what they were already teaching. The project would develop the resource, do the research and carry out a pilot study with five continents to see if there was actually uptake, and that totalled 50,000 US dollars.

THE CHAIRMAN said that there were two specific proposals. Mr Koehler had managed to carry forward some money from a previous year with his normal skill. Were the members happy to support those two projects? How long would they take and when would there be a report?

MR KOEHLER replied that the first project, on coaching, would start that year and would take one year and the second project, on the resource kit for teachers, would take a year and a half.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if everybody was happy.

DECISION

Proposed targeted social science research projects 2014 approved.

12. Athlete Committee Chair report

MS SCOTT informed the members that there had been a meeting in Lausanne in March in conjunction with the anti-doping symposium held there as well. That had been done deliberately to allow the Athlete Committee members to learn from and take part in a lot of the presentations there and meet and network more with the anti-doping community. It had been very successful from that perspective. Several new members had been welcomed to the committee. She had been a member of the WADA Athlete Committee on and off since 2002 and it was at that point, she felt, one of the most engaged and interested and actively participating groups in which she had been involved, and she was not just saying that because she was the chairperson. There had been truly lively discussion and everybody had participated. The group was very diverse and dynamic, with varied representation in terms of sport and countries.

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

Following that, there had been a discussion about education, and the Athlete Committee had been liaising with Mr Moses and the Education Committee at WADA. That was a very productive partnership and she looked forward to continued collaboration and communication between the two groups, because the Athlete Committee was certainly very concerned about the education of athletes in particular and situations that arose through lack of education, so that was a big focus and area of interest. That more or less summed up the highlights; the notes were in the members' documents, and she would be available for any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he certainly backed Ms Scott up on the fact that having the Athlete Committee meeting at the time of the symposium had been a huge success for both parties; he thought that the ADOs had thoroughly enjoyed having the athletes there, not least Ms Scott's own presentation. It had reminded them that they were there to protect clean athletes. He really did think that the Athlete Committee system needed to be formalised; there ought to be a set of minutes from the Athlete Committee and recommendations if necessary so that they could be dealt with effectively.

DECISION

Athlete Committee Chair report noted.

13. International Federations

13.1 Anti-Doping Organisation Symposium report

THE CHAIRMAN said that Mr Donzé had run the symposium for some 340 people. It was a major event, and perhaps it was getting to the stage at which WADA could no longer handle it alone and might need to get somebody to handle it for WADA, as it was not just ADOs that wanted to join in: it was all sorts of other people with an interest and, again, WADA needed to think through how to do it and whether or not to extend it.

MR DONZÉ informed the members that he would address IFs the following day with the Foundation Board. He highlighted a few points regarding the WADA ADO symposium. The members all had a fairly detailed report in their files. This had been the tenth edition of the symposium, held in late March in Lausanne. He would not go into much detail, as he would provide a more detailed presentation on it the following day, but he thought it would be useful to provide a few snapshots and highlights of the event, which had become the biggest annual event and gathering for the anti-doping community. That year, once again, there had been a record number of participants: even more than the 340 mentioned by the Chairman, there had been 350 at the Palais de Beaulieu in Lausanne, representing more than 170 different ADOs as defined by the World Anti-Doping Code, namely IFs, national and regional ADOs, major event organisations and so on. He believed that the success was partly due to the timeliness and quality of the agenda.

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

More than the agenda, which was of course very important for participants to enhance their knowledge and expertise, as the majority of the participants were anti-doping practitioners, the symposium was a great opportunity for all participants to improve the sharing of experience and ultimately to increase trust between ADOs, NADOs, IFs and other types of ADO for the benefit of clean athletes. As every year, a survey had been sent to all the participants, and overwhelmingly positive feedback had been received, formally and informally, and that certainly confirmed the value of the symposium but, as mentioned by the Chairman, WADA needed to look ahead and see how to capitalise on the success of the symposium, and how to further expand it whilst keeping it manageable. It was a symposium that to date had been managed essentially in-house. He would look at ways and means of further expanding it and making it even more relevant for the anti-doping community. There would be an internal debriefing in the coming weeks in Montreal with all those involved, and he would provide more information in the coming weeks in terms of further symposium developments under the leadership of the European regional office. He would present a more comprehensive report on the symposium and IF relations the following day.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the documentation was in the iPads and not the files. It might be necessary to work out how to deal with the documentation issue under the item on any other business.

DECISION

International Federations update noted.

14. Any other business/future meetings

THE CHAIRMAN said that the next Executive Committee meeting would be in Lausanne on 20 September, and then the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings would be in Paris in November. Since it had been decided that WADA would spread its wings, all sorts of people had come forward and said that they would be pleased to host an Executive Committee or Foundation Board meeting, and he regarded that as very positive, as WADA was the *World Anti-Doping Agency* more than ever before.

It was worth discussing the technology. Currently, papers were distributed among the members electronically, in advance, and those who were fanatic about reading paper rather than computers could print them out if they wished. If not, the members would be given a file in Montreal. He suspected that a number of members would be quite happy to get information the night they arrived rather than an iPad when they sat down the following morning. Did the Executive Committee members like that idea and, if so, how should it be progressed? When the members arrived, did they want an iPad waiting for them in their hotel? It was easy in Montreal, but what would happen when they were meeting in places such as Lausanne and Paris?

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL stated that he hoped that WADA would be able to take the iPads when travelling and then have wifi capacity at the meeting rooms and hotels. That was the concept. The reality would depend on the host city and the people providing that, but that would be something that WADA would ask for.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the intention would be to have them available the night before the meeting rather than when it started. Was everybody comfortable with that? Did that make sense?

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL clarified that all the papers would be distributed electronically for the members to have three weeks in advance to print them and look at them if they wished. It would avoid the members having to carry all the documents and WADA having to print them all, so it would save a lot of resource from WADA's perspective.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that, at the end of the day, it was a question of comparing the cost of shipping iPads compared to the cost of printing all the documents, which must be thousands of dollars. There would then be a storage problem. The members would then have an iPad clever enough to e-mail the documentation to their home addresses and then print it out.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that there ways of keeping hard copies as opposed to electronic copies.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked everybody, including the interpreters, for all their efforts. He thanked everybody else and the staff who had helped the Executive Committee to have a successful meeting that day.

DECISION

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

SIR CRAIG REEDIE
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA