

Minutes of the WADA Executive Committee meeting,

13 November 2000, Oslo, Norway

The meeting began at 2 p.m.

1. Welcome

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the Executive Committee members to the meeting, along with those who were present to make sure that the Executive Committee did not make any mistakes.

It was a pleasure to be in Oslo for the meetings of the Executive Committee, the WADA Board and the Intergovernmental Committee that would be meeting following the WADA Board meeting.

They were there to review the 2000 programme of activities and the achievements reached in one year, which were remarkable for an international organization. They were an indication of how far WADA had come in such a short period of time.

They would also look forward to the activities in 2001, which would have an impact on the Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, and he hoped that some of the models developed in testing, results management and the Independent Observer programme would carry over to other sports.

2. Roll call

The roll call was circulated and signed by those members present (Annex).

3. Approval of the minutes of the Executive Committee conference call on 2 August 2000

THE CHAIRMAN said that if, by the end of the meeting, there had been no comments on the minutes, he would assume that they had been approved and would sign them accordingly.

DECISION

Minutes of the conference call of the WADA Executive Committee on 2 August 2000 in Lausanne approved.

4. Report on activities to date

THE CHAIRMAN noted that it was important to review all the activities to date. An enormous amount had been accomplished, and all the original members should be satisfied with these achievements.

MS VANSTONE said that Australia would like to see some time set aside during the meeting for some broad discussion. She did not see any discussion regarding where the Executive Committee wanted WADA to go, nor did the agenda indicate any strategy discussion. These were important issues. Post-Sydney, where they could be almost euphoric with the achievements that WADA had made over the past 12 months, they now needed a strategy to take them up to Salt Lake City, in addition to a long-term strategy.

It was also essential to discuss general management issues, one of which would be having a strategy. Australia very much wanted WADA to go from strength to strength, and she understood about the commitment for governments to put in money, but needed to know where the money went. Some financial accountability was necessary, and, upon achieving that, she felt confident that the governments would happily put money in.

Mr Syväsalmi needed sufficient staff, and someone was required to put the documents in a much shorter format for communication between meetings.

They also needed to discuss a replacement for the current Chairman, in the sense that either his term was going to expire, or he was going to move to what some would see as higher things, but in

any event he would not be with WADA for ever, and they should not be waiting until one or other of these happened before asking what they would do next.

WADA had to set a strategy, get the finances under control, and get a format of paperwork that governments could work happily with, otherwise they would keep having unnecessary tension.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed to include this issue as part of point 16 on the agenda. He noted the importance of the various committees in leading WADA. All the issues mentioned by Ms Vanstone were worth discussing, maybe after some kind of a retrospective on what they had done and where they had come from thus far.

MR MOYER did not accept the premise that the executive direction for WADA would really be the result of a set of committee recommendations. He thought that there was an essential role for the Executive Committee members to grapple with where they wanted to be five years on, and the direction that they would give to WADA had to come from that. Then the committees could begin to do the kind of work that they should do. He supported Ms Vanstone's proposal.

MR SYVÄSALMI gave a summary of WADA's activities to date (Annex).

The Corporate Plan could perhaps be taken into account where Ms Vanstone's proposal was concerned.

He believed that the operational part was also strategy-based. There were many issues in process, and he thought that the members would find that strategic discussion had been taking place in the working committees as well.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether anyone had any questions or comments to make on the document concerned, noting that it included operational and strategic decisions.

MR LARFAOUI congratulated Mr Syväsalmi on the work he had done in such a short space of time, as it had not been easy to achieve.

He stressed the need to go over the various issues in the committees and discuss the objectives before taking this up to executive level, so that the Executive Committee could then trace its future strategy.

They should also wait to fix a budget according to their means and objectives.

THE CHAIRMAN said that they had made a considerable amount of progress and should be happy with their achievements as a private organization in which the public authorities and the private sports movement each had a 50% role. It was a model that deserved a chance to work.

MS VANSTONE thanked Mr Syväsalmi and his team for their achievements in implementing the requests and decisions thus far.

DECISION

Report on activities to date approved.

5. Committee reports

– a) Ethics and Education

DR VEREEN thanked Mr Syväsalmi and his team for all their help. The Ethics and Education Committee was a group of 14, representing athletes and media as well as experts in education, ethics, social marketing and the behavioural sciences.

The Ethics and Education Committee had been aware that it was a very tough task to fashion a plan and a set of activities to satisfy this new private venture, but they had been fortunate to have a group that was able to articulate the need not to reinvent the wheel, to develop a short-term focus on elite athletes, recommend a set of activities for the present and develop a framework that looked beyond Salt Lake City and took into account research-based, comprehensive and long-term support programmes that would result in a decrease in doping.

He summarized the activities, meetings and projects of the Ethics and Education Committee (Annex). Every activity had been developed with the idea that it should be done in partnership with others, both for resources and expertise.

MS LINDEN said that it was important to hear what the committees were doing, but the Executive Committee had not yet appointed the committees, and she did not have the full picture of their framework, budget, size, and division of tasks between the various administrative organs. The committees seemed to be doing important foundation work, but the Executive Committee needed first of all to outline what it wanted.

The requested budget for the Ethics and Education Committee was US\$ 2.6 million. Were they also approving this budget?

She hoped that the Executive Committee would appoint the members of the committees, as it was very hard to explain to anyone outside WADA why the members had not yet been approved.

Also, the terms of reference of the Ethics and Education Committee had not been approved.

As regards membership, MS LINDEN thought that the Executive Committee was supposed to appoint the committee members, in accordance with WADA's statutes.

She hoped that these questions could be solved first, as she found it quite hard to continue with such a line of work.

First of all they needed a framework, a budget and common rules, and then they could start to work.

She proposed two new committee members: Dr Hass, from Germany, for the Legal Committee, and Dr Kuipers, from the Netherlands, for the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

Committee members should be appointed until the end of 2001, and then common rules could be made, starting from 2002.

MS VANSTONE expressed concern about the budget proposal of US\$ 2.6 million. As for the media forum and the web site, it seemed that everybody wanted a web site! The Ethics and Education Committee had gone away and done an excellent job without guidance, but what it needed, and what every committee was going to need, was clear guidance of its priorities. They were the Executive Committee, and they had a say in the decisions and strategy.

MR VERBRUGGEN observed that, with regard to the terms of reference, there was some overlapping of roles.

It was important that they continue to work and that the committees go ahead, as the research project 3.6 had the highest priority. It was of vital importance to learn more about doping motivation. There were four main groups of athletes: those who deliberately used doping substances; athletes who felt obliged to take banned substances; users of authorized medicine and substances for performance enhancement; and those who rejected anything medical. The Independent Observers had been struck by the variety, number and amount of medication consumed regularly by a large proportion of competitors, and a research project in these areas was needed.

Additionally, the space on the forms in which the athletes were requested to write which products they had taken was not big enough, and he could confirm that.

They should not stop work from going ahead, in spite of some procedures that had to be established.

MR KOSS agreed that they needed procedures about which the governments would feel comfortable. Nevertheless, those on the committees were the experts, which was why they had been given responsibility. Their reports were based on their expertise. They should value the work of the committees extremely highly.

He would not like to be too responsible for drawing detailed lines of where they should go, as his expertise was not there, and he could not use his expertise in relation to the professors and distinguished academic people who knew what the priorities were.

It was true that a strategy was needed, but they had to look at what the experts had decided, as the experts were really the bread and butter of the best they had in the world.

MS LINDEN said that of course the work of the committee members was respected, but she did not want them to do work that did not fit in the budget. The Executive Committee needed to underline the issues it would like the committees to take interest in. Basic decisions should be made before anything else. It was also necessary to know who was on the committees. She would be happy to approve the committee members, however the members had to be made known officially. Then they

could nominate committees (the members did not necessarily have to change) to begin work officially from 2002.

MS LINDEN really needed certain documents so that she could gain approval from her colleagues in Europe.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the terms of reference of the Ethics and Education Committee had to be approved at the meeting, and draft terms of reference had been prepared.

All the members of all the committees were to be appointed by the Executive Committee, which would ensure that the committees, in their membership, were reflective of the world at large.

The budget that was before them was what the committee would like in an ideal world. What WADA's resources would permit was a different figure.

The committees' work was twofold: as directed by the Executive Committee, and to deal with issues that may not have been referred to them by the Executive Committee.

The committees were the bulk of the WADA Board, not self-contained units that went off on their own, and they had to act on that basis.

The two recommendations from Ms Linden regarding the two new committee members had to be considered and decided upon. It would certainly be helpful to know more about them than their names.

With respect to the terms of reference, THE CHAIRMAN had some difficulty with the membership portion and the way in which it was expressed. The reporting structure should be to the Board, but through the Executive Committee.

The relationships with other organizations should also be approved by the Executive Committee.

He agreed that the structure and process were important, in that a mature WADA would have a structure within which all of this happened, but they should not totally stifle their entrepreneurial spirit.

There had been a lot of comments based on the assumption that the most effective form of organization was governmental, and that assumption had not yet been demonstrated to be universally true. They should try and take the best of both worlds.

MR SYVÄSALMI reminded members of decisions made at previous meetings regarding the issue of committee membership.

The proposal for a corporate model and strategy plan for WADA was useful, but also typical of such a stage in setting up an organization. The next step would certainly be to have a corporate model and strategic plan, however he wished to comment that they needed to discuss other areas such as how the proposals for the web site fitted into the overall strategy of communication and information. He did not think that they had the opportunity to take part of this to the overall communications strategy, which might be a better way, considering the entire corporate plan.

Discussions would continue regarding outside funding, in particular with the European Commission and the Ethics and Education Committee, for an e-learning web page. It seemed that WADA had the green light to receive 1.5 million Euros for the project.

As far as the terms of reference were concerned, MR VERBRUGGEN asked where the ethical issue was concerning blood testing.

MR VEREEN replied that this issue had been taken care of in the report.

MR VERBRUGGEN was satisfied, as long as the ethical aspect had been included.

DECISION

Ethics and Education Committee report approved.

– **b) Legal Committee**

MR HOWMAN said that the Legal Committee had effectively been a "coal-face" group over the past six months, and continued to work at the "coal-face".

Prior to Sydney, they had recommended a form of contract with the International Federations, which had been signed by 27 IFs, and the out-of-competition testing had been conducted with those

IFs and would continue until 31 December. This would therefore require renewal, and would be renewed with some suggested changes. At present, very few IFs had the power within their constitution to conduct EPO blood testing, and for WADA to continue any out-of-competition testing with any emphasis on EPO testing, it would need to make sure that the IFs had their rules in place first. Changes would have to continue to be made at IF level if EPO was to be tested for.

The group had made recommendations for WADA insurance.

They had reviewed the WADA Statutes and made some suggested changes, because WADA had the power to conduct only out-of-competition testing at present. One of the suggested amendments was for that to be expanded so that WADA could perform in-competition testing.

They had looked at the issues related to the permanent site for WADA. There would be some matters that they would wish to raise regarding major legal issues surrounding the site.

They were also looking at making approaches to governments so that they could have in place protocols and ways of proceeding to allow out-of-competition testing to take place without complication. They aimed to increase formal relationships with individual governments.

There were still conflicts linked to IF and national (governments and national organizations) rules, so there was a need to continue talks on harmonization.

The Legal Committee would like to set up legal research prizes of approximately US\$ 1,000 for research into legal issues relating to blood testing.

The Legal Committee was ready to help with the development of a WADA Code.

MS VANSTONE congratulated Mr Howman on a job well done.

MR KITAMI asked what had been considered with regard to expenses for testing.

MR HOWMAN replied that the group suggested legal research university-style prizes, with one prize per continent.

THE CHAIRMAN thought that Mr Kitami had inquired as to the cost per test. The figure of US\$ 1,000 per test included collection and analysis of the sample, a report on the sample, any assistance necessary should there be an appeal, and meetings with the federations to work out arrangements, as well as travel, if necessary, to collect the samples.

Regarding the terms of reference, MR VERBRUGGEN thought that, as far as the drafting of the Code was concerned, there was overlapping. It would be wise to avoid overlapping, so he suggested a clear division of work.

THE CHAIRMAN said that they were going to propose an ad hoc commission to coordinate the work.

MR VERBRUGGEN mentioned the need for quick action regarding harmonization, as the International Federations had serious problems with the NOCs and legislation (such as discrimination against foreigners in France). This matter had been included in a letter that he had addressed to the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that it was much less clear how the public authorities would be able to achieve this harmonization. It was easier to do so within the Olympic Movement, nevertheless it was a very pressing question

DECISION

Legal Committee report approved.

– **C) Health, Medical and Research Committee**

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST announced that he had fully supported the proposal for the EPO test in Sydney.

The Committee had held a meeting on 15 and 16 October in Lausanne, addressing the issues that they had been authorized to address in accordance with the terms of reference.

It had been decided that the list of banned substances would have to be included in a future WADA Code. A list did exist within the Olympic Movement, but this was an opportunity to completely review the list. It was a very important matter, and would take quite some time. It was recognized that

the existing list would prevail until WADA decided upon a new list. A sub-working group had been appointed to get the work started by reviewing the present list and coming up with some basic ideas. There would be another meeting in February to continue the work on the list.

With regard to research and funding in the field of anti-doping, particularly analytical methods, there were three priorities: research into analytical procedures for growth, oxygen-carrying factors and androgenic substances.

They also needed to be prepared for gene therapy and its possible misuse as a means for performance enhancement. A leading expert, Mr Friedmann, had recommended organizing a workshop for experts at the Banbury Centre outside New York in September 2001.

An ongoing problem was the possible risk of contaminated food supplements related to positive nandrolone tests, which had to be looked into. It had been decided to set aside money for information material on this matter, so that it could be circulated quickly, but the scientists needed time to do this work.

The Committee proposed the amendments listed on the terms of reference included in the files. The three proposed amendments read as follows:

- *Responsible for building result management capacity within WADA, particularly with respect to scientific expertise in reviewing laboratory test results.*
- *Organization of appropriate workshops and meetings.*
- *Liaison with other WADA committees and other scientific bodies relevant to our work.*

It was felt that Mr Vereen's committee would be better placed to deal with social sciences and social research.

As for the remark about membership, PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST understood that the members of the Health, Medical and Research Committee had already been accepted. He was rather confused regarding future committee members. How were they supposed to be nominated? Would anyone be able to nominate them? For the Health, Medical and Research Committee, he would not recommend gap-filling from a geographical point of view as a priority. He preferred the idea of gap-filling from a competence point of view. However, it was true that they did not have any members from Africa or Asia. They did have a proposal from Asia, but a coordinated method of proposing new members was needed, as the proposal was not for a gap that they would like to see filled. The Committee lacked an endocrinology expert, which was more important than the geographical factor. Both geographically-based and competent members were needed to fill the committees, but expertise and competence were the number one issue.

MR BALFOUR observed that Professor Ljungqvist was right about the need for competent members, as they needed the best, however geographical inclusion did not necessarily exclude competence. He believed that he would be able to come up with a name from Africa.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether the Executive Committee members wished to approve the inclusion of the three new amendments proposed by the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

As for nominations of members, he did not want to exclude any source, but perhaps all nominations should be referred to the chairperson of each committee, and then to the Executive Committee for a final decision.

MR MOYER suggested asking the chairpersons to bring the proposed slate of members to the Executive Committee meetings once a year to be approved. Then they could have discussions about balance. He would like it if they could agree on an item on the agenda at the next meeting for an approval of members for all committees.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that this was a good idea.

MS LINDEN pointed out that they had not yet approved any committee members.

MS VANSTONE suggested asking the Health, Medical and Research Committee to draw up a detailed plan to address what requirements needed to be fulfilled before they could implement worldwide EPO testing.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that he totally agreed with Mr Balfour's comment. The Committee's first priority was to find an endocrinology expert, preferably an African or Asian woman. It would be interesting to see the names and proposals.

With regard to EPO testing, the facts had to be known. The test finally agreed upon for use in Sydney had been a combination of a blood test and a urine test, both of which had to be positive for a positive result to be announced. The problem with this was that the urine test was based on a physiological chemical difference between the artificially-produced EPO in pharmaceuticals and the EPO produced by the body. One could say that this was a defect in the pharmaceutical production, as the ideal was to have total identity, which was easily achievable, so in all probability they would soon be facing a situation where the urine test no longer worked, as the EPO produced by the industry and the one produced by the body would be identical and it would be impossible to differentiate between the two. In the long run, they would therefore have to use the Australian-developed blood analysis only, which would have to be looked into from a logistical and legal point of view.

Soon the combination test would probably be obsolete, and this blood analysis could not stand alone at present, as it had not been scientifically validated. This was why research into this field (not just EPO) had been identified as one of the Committee's three priorities.

MR VERBRUGGEN reported that it was bad news as far as EPO was concerned. If the industry could make a product that was absolutely identical to the androgenic products he thought that it would require the new approval of the authorities. Why not put markers in?

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST replied that absolute identity was a fully correct and normal ambition by the industry, as the slightest deviation from the human hormone could result in adverse side-effects by the user. It was a must for the industry to try to produce identical substances.

Many people had asked the industry to put markers in, and he hoped that WADA would be able to convince the industry, which did not want to introduce something that might produce side effects or a slight deviation.

MR VERBRUGGEN wondered whether, if WADA sent the industry a strong message, the industry would really be able to say no.

MR KITAMI pointed out that, with regard to committee membership, he had already nominated a candidate and supplied a paper on the person.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that he had received and looked into the proposal, but wondered how large the Committee could be. They did not need another laboratory head, as they already had two. He was not rejecting this person as such, but it was a matter of how to compose an efficiently working committee.

THE CHAIRMAN proposed that, by the end of November 2000, all recommendations for committee members be collected for approval at the next Executive Committee meeting.

MR KITAMI asked whether he was required to nominate another candidate with expertise that would suit the requirements of the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN said that this would be a good idea, as the Health, Medical and Research Committee needed an endocrinologist.

DECISIONS

1. Amendments to the terms of reference of the Health, Medical and Research Committee approved.
2. All proposals for committee members to be submitted before the end of November 2000 for approval at the next Executive Committee meeting.
3. Report by the Health, Medical and Research Committee approved.

– **d) Standards and Harmonization**

MR WALKER spoke about the Committee's tasks. The Committee was already actively at work in considering the scope, purpose and possible content of the proposed WADA Code, which was probably one of the top priorities.

The second priority was to develop a system for WADA accreditation of laboratories.

The third task was to ensure that, wherever possible, high minimum standards were applied in anti-doping work. They were working with the national agencies to help with the propagation of the ISO/PAS standard 18,873, and with the two new working groups, IPT 3 and 4, to bring that standard to implementation over a much wider area. He also thought that that would depend upon what sort of lessons, from a standards point of view, could be learnt from the Independent Observer programme.

The fourth major area was the harmonization of rules and regulations, with a view to making proposals to ease the kind of situation correctly identified by Mr Verbruggen.

The task of bringing a final form to the test results management work was another aim, and the intention was to develop a text that would be applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, in all major international sports events.

With the possible exception of the ISO standards work, for which they would like some financing, approximately a quarter of a million dollars a year for the next two years, the work of the Standards and Harmonization Committee could be regarded as a job lot. Much of the work could be carried out in-house, so the only money requested was for the ISO work.

As for membership, they needed a combination of competence and geographical representation. The Standards and Harmonization Committee had experts from all fields: athletes, laboratory experts, representatives from the sports movement and public authorities, national agencies and IFs. Only an African representative was missing from their list of 13 members.

MR BALFOUR expressed a concern: they needed more than just one representative for the vast continent of Africa. He would like to follow up with Mr Walker on this issue.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the public authorities should comment as to how they proposed to achieve the harmonization of legislation, as it was not that difficult to achieve within the sports movement, but struck him as being very difficult and very time-consuming for public authorities. Without knowing certain details, they would be on parallel tracks that might never meet.

MR MOYER spoke about the setting-up of a strategic framework. The issue had to be discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN suggested moving the relevant point on the agenda forward.

MS LINDEN asked how and when they would appoint the committees. She repeated her proposal to appoint them until the end of 2001, and then begin a new period after that date.

When they appointed the committees, they would have to be transparent. She was not satisfied with the working process as it was. It was quite impossible for her, as a representative of the European Union, to report back to her colleagues.

MR BALFOUR noted that they seemed to be going around the same point. The work of the committees was important, and he did not believe that it should cease, however the work should be informed by a broader strategy framework, so that when committee members came with shopping lists, those lists would be informed by the broader framework. They would therefore be able to make choices based exactly on that framework. He wished to support the idea of having a sort of brainstorm regarding this broader framework.

On the question of committees, THE CHAIRMAN said that they had two options. They could either approve immediately those members who had been working for the past year, and then add others as necessary to achieve whatever balance they wanted, or they could wait until the next meeting and approve the entire committee membership.

MS LINDEN thought that they should appoint the committees immediately, and hoped they could approve the two candidates she had proposed, so that she could satisfy the wishes of her colleagues.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that they already had a German lawyer on the Legal Committee, as well as a German expert on the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

MS LINDEN said that her proposals were from the German government and that of the Netherlands. It made a difference where the proposals came from, and those names mentioned by the Chairman were not on the list. How were they to know if members were not included on the list?

THE CHAIRMAN suggested that they approve the names that had already been appointed *de facto*, and then if any names needed to be added, they could approve them at the next meeting. These would all go through until 2001, so that the same discussion did not take place at every meeting.

MR SYVÄSALMI said that the need to have an athlete representative on each committee had only been recently approved, which was why the German female lawyer had been added at such short notice.

MS VANSTONE apologized if she had not been paying sufficient attention, but she was not quite sure whether there had been a conclusion to Mr Moyer's proposal that Mr Syväsalmi's proposal be dealt with sooner rather than later. Perhaps she had been living on another planet and did not understand, but it had always been the case that boards and executive committees set the strategic directions. Money did not grow on trees, and the Australian government constantly reminded her that every dollar spent came from a woman who cut tomato sandwiches and would be taxed. They were spending public money and they needed to decide on a strategy. They could all read papers, and the first thing that should be seen on a report was what action was requested, because if no action was requested, it was for noting, and she did not want to talk about it. In short, she supported Mr Moyer. Paper 16 was a good one, and with a bit of modification it could be dealt with promptly.

MR LARFAOUI suggested that they approve the committees as they were. The committee members had done a great job and should be trusted to continue in their jobs.

DECISIONS

1. Decision to approve the names of the current committee members already appointed *de facto*, with any additional nominations to be approved at the next meeting. All members to remain on the committees until the end of 2001.
2. Report by the Standards and Harmonization Committee approved.

6. Preliminary report of the Independent Observer

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the Independent Observer programme in Sydney had been very successful, despite being a large undertaking. Mr Syväsalmi had been appointed Chairman of the programme, with Messrs Howman and Walker as Deputy Chairmen.

MR SYVÄSALMI thanked everyone for entrusting him with the task of being Chairman of the Office of the Independent Observer, along with all those who had contributed to the efficient functioning of the Office. This had been the best team ever.

The reports were in the files for everyone to read. He agreed with the comments that the Sydney Games had been great. The doping controls had been very professional and efficient, and they had not heard any accusations towards the IOC or its Medical Commission, therefore it had been in many ways a useful exercise.

The recommendations for consideration were meant to be positive recommendations, or at least constructive criticism, and were contained in the Executive Summary report (Annex).

The Board had made the right decision in setting up the Independent Observer team, and he thanked everyone for their trust in such a huge, but very interesting mission.

MS VANSTONE asked whether the IOC was going to produce a final report on its doping control programme. If this was the case, she suggested that the WADA report come out after the IOC one, as the WADA report should comment on the whole process, including the IOC report.

Were the unusual tests referred to in the report? It was important that the report deal with the handling of unusual results.

They also needed some finalized costs on the Independent Observer task in Sydney so that in the future they could ascertain the degree to which they wanted an Independent Observer scheme.

MR SYVÄSALMI replied that they had asked for the IOC report, but there did not seem to be one being produced.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he saw no reason for WADA to wait regarding the release of its own report, and he was not sure that the IOC Medical Commission produced a report as such on the Games.

MS VANSTONE pointed out that in April the IOC had agreed to put out a final report.

MR KOSS agreed that there had been an agreement regarding the matter. He thought that the IOC Medical Commission had already received the relevant information from the Sydney Organizing Committee in order to be able to produce the report.

THE CHAIRMAN suggested that they ask the Prince de Merode the following day.

MS VANSTONE said that the Independent Observers should comment on the whole process, including the IOC report.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that, to his knowledge, there had been no IOC Medical Commission report following the Olympic Games, however a report had already been sent, but only to the members of the IOC Medical Commission.

MR HOWMAN pointed out a conflict, because there was mention of a post-Games report in the Sydney Guide.

MR BALFOUR hoped that he was not throwing the cat among the pigeons, but was it not an anomaly that the IOC Medical Commission had never produced a report?

THE CHAIRMAN repeated that they would find out what the state of play was from the Prince de Merode the following day.

MR MOYER offered his congratulations on the Independent Observer process. He thought that, as a Board, they needed a deeper set of recommendations to be considered over time.

The public was going to be rather surprised at how technical the report was, and at how little it had to say about the state of drug abuse in sport. He would suggest a preamble to the report that talked not about whether or not they had run a good testing process in Sydney, but the general concern that the Board had about the continued issues would put it in a better public context as the report became a public document.

THE CHAIRMAN said that they needed to decide whether it was part of the report on a specific mandate or whether it was part of a larger view they took of doping in sport.

He hesitated to expand too much, as the mission had been specifically and fairly narrowly defined, but having had the experience, they could certainly build on it.

MR MOYER suggested that a press release be issued, containing some of the broader context.

THE CHAIRMAN said that Mr Walker's committee was already working on a generic process of this nature.

MR WALKER observed that they had had specific terms of reference and had not wanted to go beyond what their job was, but inevitably, having such a global view of what went on, they had been led to reflect. Obviously, their terms of reference had not allowed them to answer that question, but there was material there which the Board could use as a basis for some thoughts and ideas on the problem.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the costs of the mission would be part of the financial report.

He thought that the EPO tests had been covered in some of the detailed reports.

MS VANSTONE said that they had been referred to, but not the handling of the unusual results. She was referring to the omission of the EPO tests, where they had not necessarily been good enough for a statistical result, but where they had had such a variable pattern that they had invited further investigation.

THE CHAIRMAN said that there had been one issue regarding whether blood test results would be referred back to the individual or doctors for regular health purposes.

In an attempt to clarify the situation, MR KOSS said that the agreement had been that the abnormal results, which included a positive urine and a negative blood test, or vice versa, were to be reported to the IFs to be dealt with by them. This had been done by the IOC, and he did not believe that it should be covered by their report.

There had been one positive result on the *on* model, which had not been confirmed by the urine test, and then six, seven or eight *off* positive results.

WADA should follow this up by asking the IFs what they had done. The IFs had no rules, however, on dealing with this information.

THE CHAIRMAN said that that had not been a part of the Independent Observer mission as he understood it.

DECISION

Report by the Office of the Independent Observer approved.

7. Update report on the Out-of-Competition Testing Programme

MR SYVÄSALMI said that a contract with four Olympic Winter Sports Federations had been signed, and the other three federations would be signing in a couple of weeks' time.

Of the 23 positive laboratory results, approximately 10 would probably result in sanctions, and these results were not the same as a positive doping test.

With regard to the 10 positive cases, MR KOSS asked whether the athletes concerned were eligible to compete at present, and if they had competed at the Games in Sydney.

MR SYVÄSALMI replied that the athletes concerned had not competed in Sydney, and the answer to the first question was likely to be no.

THE CHAIRMAN commented that it was a frustrating situation when no decision was reached by the time of the Olympic Games, even when the ultimate answer was known.

The programme had been a great success. It had been done efficiently and professionally, and had been an eye-opener for almost everybody involved.

DECISION

Update report on the Out-of-Competition Testing Programme approved.

8. WADA insurance

MR NIGGLI told the members that WADA had been covered by a provisional insurance policy for third party civil liability since 1 August 2000, by a French company called CGU. The maximum cover was SFr 16 million worldwide, and the annual premium was SFr 98,000. WADA's advisors were currently in the process of finalizing the wording of the policy with the insurance company. The final document should be signed within the next two or three weeks.

THE CHAIRMAN said that Mr Niggli had been very helpful in negotiating the terms of a very broadly worded insurance policy. The amount of insurance was SFr 16 million. Should they be thinking of SFr 30 million? Obviously, the premium would be higher. This was something that could be decided later on.

The existence of the insurance should be a matter of great relief to those IFs that might impose sanctions on the basis of a positive doping test, behind which WADA would stand. They had deep pockets as a result of the insurance.

He advised members to be relatively discreet about the terms of the policy, particularly since there was a semi-confidentiality provision in the policy, therefore the details should be confidential.

MR LARFAOUI asked about civil liability coverage.

MR NIGGLI replied that the policy covered physical and material damages, punitive damages and court case costs for WADA activities, as well as IF activities should WADA be involved.

THE CHAIRMAN said that their risk was that, if WADA made a mistake regarding test results, it would have to stand behind the IF concerned.

MR VERBRUGGEN thought that, for the time being, the SFr 16 million figure was ample, as the risk was currently fairly limited.

MR NIGGLI replied that the insurance company had to be informed on WADA's activities, and now the company knew the entire scope of its activities, so if WADA carried out in-competition testing, it would have to inform the company, which might change the premium.

MR VERBRUGGEN thought the IFs should be given a copy of this.

MR NIGGLI said that this should not be a problem, as he thought that they had the right to disclose this to WADA members.

DECISION

WADA insurance report approved.

9. 2001 Out-of-Competition Testing Programme and tender process

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, exceptionally, a tender process had not been carried out for 2000, but one would be required for subsequent programmes. The Irish Sports Council process had been included in the files as a model for members to look at and comment on. There was a need to finish this package within the next few weeks, as the WADA contract with the Consortium would end on 31 December.

The process would be far more comprehensive than simple sample-collection. It would involve negotiation and work with the IFs; obtaining a better database system; a better process for selecting the athletes subject to the tests; putting a comprehensive, worldwide sample-collection mechanism in place; contracts with the various laboratories; and provision of whatever assistance was required in the event of proceedings involving those tests. Therefore it would be an interesting challenge for whoever wished to take it up.

The aim was to get the bid packages circulated by early the following month, with submissions due in early January 2001. Did any members have any questions concerning the draft document?

MR HOWMAN said that a few modifications would be suggested within the next few days. He would also suggest that it be accompanied by the present contract for drug testing services that was out there, signed by the Consortium, so that the bidding people could see the style of document expected of them.

The model was fine, he simply suggested adding several legal aspects to make sure that the whole thing would be more explicit.

MR MOYER asked whether the outcome would be a single contract or not.

There was also the issue of worldwide coverage, capacity and credibility to be considered. The choice had to reflect the W in WADA.

THE CHAIRMAN acknowledged that this was a good point.

MR MOYER suggested making the point explicit.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether they should be looking for a worldwide service.

GENERAL McCAFFREY replied that in the US, it had been made quite explicit in many contracts that the formation of coalitions was encouraged. The ability to put together some form of team approach had to be demonstrated.

THE CHAIRMAN wondered if they should say that they were looking for a proposal that covered the world and that it could be a consortium.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST spoke about the IFs. The IAAF had performed 16,000 tests in 1999. This was very important to the federation, which looked forward to WADA taking over its testing when it and WADA felt that WADA was ready to do so. The body conducting this work would have to be a totally independent one, free of any conflict of interests.

MS VANSTONE commented on what powers they had to handle any gap. Should they extend the existing contract until they resolved future activities?

With regard to different areas bidding, they could say that they wished to cover the world, and expected any bidder therefore to have formed coalitions. An alternative would be to divide the world up for different bids.

THE CHAIRMAN said that his main concern would be that there might be some parts of the world for which nobody would tender. If there were a gap, would they be content with the current Consortium carrying on for the period?

MR MOYER proposed that they extend the Consortium until February.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that this could be done, but until no later than 28 February.

MS VANSTONE asked whether the Chairman had meant to say no earlier than 28 February.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that a fixed date would be better.

DECISIONS

1. Contract with the Consortium to be extended until 28 February 2001. Detailed terms to be negotiated.
2. Basic model for tender process approved, subject to minor modifications, to be made within the next few days.
3. Bid packages to be circulated by early December, with submissions due in early January 2001.

10. Permanent headquarters process

– Recommendations of finalists

THE CHAIRMAN said that there had been a great response to the request for applications. The next steps would include how they would weight the criteria. Should they select candidate cities, in other words, reduce the number of applicants to a smaller number? They would also need a programme of visits to the cities, as well as bidding documents to be sent to the candidate cities.

With regard to evaluation criteria, the IOC had a license on a decision-making programme based on the concept of fuzzy logic. The technical department at the IOC could probably make it available to WADA.

There were 10 applications, some of which did not meet all the initial requirements.

MR MOYER thought that incomplete applications should not pass on to the next stage.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members whether, if all the documents requested had not been provided, notwithstanding all the other qualities of the city, they should decide not to allow those cities to move on to the next phase of the process. This would be a decision in principle.

MS LINDEN asked what kind of papers had been requested. Why had a city not supplied a certain document? She did not know the bidding process very well.

MR SYVÄSALMI explained that they had asked the applicant cities to show proof of NOC, national and regional government, and city approval. Those cities missing one of the above were: Singapore (no NOC approval), Barcelona (no national government approval) and Madrid (No NOC approval).

THE CHAIRMAN concluded that, on the basis of the decision in principle, Barcelona, Madrid and Singapore would be eliminated.

MR KOSS supported the decision.

MS LINDEN also agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN said that a final check would be made just to make sure that that was the case, but on that assumption, the three cities could not be accepted. This left seven cities that had provided the necessary formal documentation. Did anyone have any comments to make?

MR MOYER mentioned that there was a rather amusing Eurocentric cast to the analysis, in which flight duration to Europe seemed to be an important criterion. There were other continents in the world. He wondered if the bias reflected in those comments might be removed. A good location in Europe was considered to be particularly fine, and in one case in the report, the flight duration to Europe was seen as an impediment. Why?

MS LINDEN observed that it was rather odd, politically-speaking, that France had proposed two cities.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether they should accept the other non-eliminated cities as candidate cities. Should there be no more winnowing-down at this stage?

MR MOYER said that he had thought that it was a two-phase process, with a short-list to be made at the meeting that day, and the final decision taken at the next meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN thought that they should wait until they had visited the cities before making any decisions.

MR MOYER asked whether any analysis had been done. Could they not compile a short-list?

MS LINDEN thought that they should discuss the evaluation criteria, however the applications were good and they needed good reasons for leaving a city out.

They should retain the seven cities, and then make a decision following some kind of evaluation.

The matter of conflict of interests should also be discussed.

MS VANSTONE stressed the need for a transparent and accountable process.

They needed an assessment which they could consider before eliminating a city from the remaining seven. There had to be a criteria by which cities would be rubbed out.

MR KOSS observed that a grading system would be useful. They would spend a fair amount in travel costs for the Evaluation Committee if the number of cities could not be reduced using some other criteria.

Funding support from local authorities should be one of the main criteria.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that this was a deliberate two-stage process, the first stage being to send out some fairly general criteria to countries, the next round being designed to separate the good from the bad.

The cities should, however, be given the chance to specify what they would do.

Regarding the weighting system, MS LINDEN underlined the need to know the tradition of the national doping policy in the country.

MR SYVÄSALMI said that the two-phase process had been approved, and the cities had been sent all the relevant information so that they would know what WADA was after. This would be a very comprehensive bid.

The proposal for the weighting system was a mathematical one, which included a political part concerning commitment and the relevant country's anti-doping policy.

The criteria had also been approved in principle by the Executive Committee, and could be seen in the files (Annex).

MS LINDEN asked why the benefits to the host country were so heavily weighted.

MR SYVÄSALMI replied that this showed the commitment of the host city and the country.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that there were some problems with the mathematics on the paper.

MR MOYER confessed that he was disappointed. He had assumed that they would be deciding on a short-list. Seven cities did not constitute a short-list. They could pretend that it was, but it was not.

If there were no other criteria that could be used to winnow down the list, he had several questions. WADA had made an important point regarding the visible and real separation of WADA from the IOC, and it seemed to him that the decision to locate the WADA headquarters in Lausanne was incompatible with the discussions that they had had around the table. Perhaps they could make a decision based on that item of principle?

Secondly, could the representatives from Europe tell him whether the Vienna candidature was in fact a serious candidature, given the status of the government of Austria?

MS LINDEN discussed the issue of conflict of interests. There was no reason why Vienna could not bid.

With reference to Lausanne, MR KOSS said that WADA had certainly proved its independence from the IOC, even with an office there.

MR VERBRUGGEN proposed that they stick with the initial decision from the conference call. Nevertheless, seven cities would constitute hard work.

How would the Evaluation Committee work?

With reference to Lausanne, he was somewhat disturbed, as an IOC member, by Mr Moyer's remark that WADA could not be too close to the IOC, but that the IOC and the IFs were good enough to pay US\$ 25 million up front. This was rather hurtful.

MR LARFAOUI said that the IOC and WADA were separate organizations in Lausanne, and Lausanne was a candidate city in its own right.

THE CHAIRMAN said that one of the difficulties was that they had not expected to receive 10 applications.

There could be a very transparent process if the members wished. The WADA Executive Committee could consider some formal shortcomings and decide to eliminate two other cities to get the number down to five. Alternatively, they could ask the Board to decide whether it wished to reduce the number from seven, but if the members were not prepared to pull the trigger right then, he did not think that there was any alternative but to go forward with seven cities.

MS VANSTONE wondered whether this evaluation principle, once the numbers had all been worked out, could be applied to the cities by the Secretariat to produce a ranking, with a decision to cut off the bottom two or three cities.

They could have some alternative objective criteria and task the Secretariat with applying these criteria, then agree by teleconference to nominate the top four to go ahead. Then people could be sent out for the various assessments to be made.

She was not comfortable with the remainder of the process being sorted out including people who had an interest.

With respect to Lausanne, everyone should consider that governments had expressed the view that it was important for them to see independence from the IOC.

MR BALFOUR explained that the point had been about WADA not being seen to be controlled specifically by the IOC. This was only about perceptions.

THE CHAIRMAN added that this was a perception that had been born in the middle of the worst crisis ever faced by the IOC.

The IOC did not control WADA. WADA had been set up, created and conceived so that it would not be controlled by the IOC.

MR VERBRUGGEN wondered why they had not decided to rub Lausanne out. They could not allow a city to bid and then reject it for the reasons stated.

MR MOYER admitted that he had thrown the Lausanne issue on the table. The knee-jerk reaction came from the fact that he understood clearly that they had agreed on an objective process, one which would allow all of them to deal with the task of making a short-list based on a review of criteria that had been clearly publicized, where candidate cities had been asked to respond in that context, and where they would end the meeting that day with four or five cities.

He now understood that an analysis had been carried out and five cities were clearly better than the others. He thought that they could make a decision based on the review if the Chairman would tell them the results of the review.

With regard to the issue of conflict of interests, there was an important matter that they had to deal with; it affected many of them, and they needed a policy on how to make the decision. He reminded the members that their solution to that had been to engage an objective and experienced set of advisors who were supposed to be there with the work done, so that they could be making the decision, not based on a knee-jerk reaction by any member, but on the basis of an analysis, that had apparently been done in part, yet not shared with the members. Were they going to have a chance to look at the assessment of the candidate cities?

MR VEREEN pointed out that they had adopted rules on conflicts of interest, and he would encourage everyone to review the rules and decide whether or not these applied to them.

MR KOSS said that they had to be more constructive.

MS LINDEN proposed that they decide to keep the seven cities and then propose the weighting system to the Board. This matter should be considered, and they should perhaps take a break and see who had problems regarding conflicts of interests. It was difficult to have a political discussion on the cities at this point, so the only way to continue would be to propose the seven cities to the Board the following day.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the cities had been told that there would be a two-stage process, therefore he would be uncomfortable about eliminating any of the seven cities at that point.

MS VANSTONE stated that they should do as Ms Linden had suggested. In the absence of any papers with criteria for cutting other cities out, she could not see that they had any other choice.

Without the paperwork, she thought that they would have to go ahead with the seven cities. She was sorry about that, as she would rather have had a shorter list, but as it was they would have to go ahead with the seven.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members to consider the weighting system.

MS VANSTONE asked if anybody really cared whether Nice was a good tourist area.

MR SYVÄSALMI pointed out the possible financial benefits to WADA. He suggested that Ms Vanstone read the actual bidding documents, which illustrated why this factor could be of benefit to WADA.

THE CHAIRMAN explained the weighting system which the members had before them (Annex).

MS VANSTONE asked whether this was what the group recommended. Were the errors on page 1 of the document merely typing errors? If so, she did not query the paper.

THE CHAIRMAN ascertained that the paper had been drawn up by the group, which had been hired for its skills rather than its typing.

MS VANSTONE said that, if the paper had been prepared by a body that was competent at this sort of thing, she had no basis on which to query any of it, as she was not a specialist in the field.

Having found the relevant point in the documents, MR SYVÄSALMI read out all the criteria regarding benefits to WADA, which included benefits to WADA staff and family.

MR BALFOUR said that he was not sure if they were doing justice to the paper or to themselves.

He did not think that they had been given exactly what they needed, but he was not blaming the members who had done the work on the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that if they did not agree with it, then they should change it.

They needed to be able to give guidance to the Board, so that when the evaluation was done, they would have a matrix against which they could assess it.

MS LINDEN proposed that they approve the weighting system as it was.

MR MOYER agreed with this proposal. He thought that the suggested weightings were a clear and effective way for them to go ahead.

MR LARFAOUI said that he did not understand why a country with two cities applying should be approved by the government and the NOC. Why did WADA have to choose between the two countries?

DECISIONS

1. Criteria for evaluation of candidate cities approved.
2. Proposed weighting system for evaluation of candidate cities approved.
3. Decision to propose the seven remaining cities (Nice, Vienna, Montreal, Lausanne, Lille, Bonn and Stockholm) to the Board the following day.

– **Evaluation Committee**

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that an Evaluation Committee would have to be formed, making sure that nobody forming part of it had any conflict of interest. The aim was to make recommendations in the spring, then the Board would have to decide so that they could be operating by 1 January 2002 in the new headquarters. The criteria to evaluate the candidates would also have to be decided upon.

MR SYVÄSALMI proposed an Evaluation Committee based on the experience of the various bodies that had been through similar processes. The Committee would comprise two members from the public sphere, two members from the Olympic Movement and one athlete. The WADA Secretary and the consultant would be non-voting members of that committee.

MR MOYER suggested choosing from Asia, Africa and Oceania. The proposal for the Evaluation Committee was a good one.

MR SYVÄSALMI proposed that Mr Howman be one of the Evaluation Committee members representing the public authorities. He hoped that the Executive Committee would choose the other public authorities member.

MS VANSTONE said that perhaps the public authorities could discuss the matter amongst themselves.

From the Olympic Movement, MR SYVÄSALMI proposed Mr Aján (Hungary) and Mr Besseberg (Norway).

As for the athlete member, perhaps Mr Ctvrtlik (USA) would be valuable, since he had been involved with the candidacy procedures for the 2008 Olympic bid.

MR KOSS said that he would discuss this with the athletes and propose an athlete the following day.

MR MOYER wanted to ensure that the areas with candidate cities would not be selected as IF or athlete representatives. Would there not be a perception of conflict of interests? These people were clearly identified with certain parts of the world. Perhaps they should have athlete and IF representatives from Asia, Africa and Oceania.

MR SYVÄSALMI replied that he had thought that both men, one representing summer sports, the other representing winter sports, had a clear world perspective, mainly because both were involved in the anti-doping policy.

THE CHAIRMAN asked what the actual problem was.

MR MOYER replied that other people would have to decide on the issue of conflict of interests. Returning to the first comment that he had made, the document they had received gave a clearly Eurocentric view of the criteria. He wanted to be sure that the people on the Committee would not have a similar point of view, so for the sake of transparency he recommended that the candidates be outside the two continents with cities on the short-list.

MS VANSTONE concluded that Mr Moyer was looking for some objectivity.

MR VEREEN suggested that they go back to their rules regarding conflict of interests and review them.

MR LARFAOUI asked why Mr Koss could not be on the Evaluation Committee, or athletes from Europe or the USA.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that that was the proposal.

MS VANSTONE stressed the need to resolve what was a conflict and what was an interest.

MR MOYER suggested that a subsection of the Executive Committee should be asked to consider that evening recommendations that it would make, and that subsection would exclude those people who might have a potential conflict of interests.

He wanted a process whereby the people deciding who would be on the committee and where the committee itself would not be vulnerable to any accusation. He therefore asked that the non-European and non-Americans be asked to make a proposal the following day.

DECISION

Final composition of the Evaluation Committee to be confirmed at the Board meeting.

11. WADA Statutes

- **Amendments**

- **Vote proposal**

To be discussed at the Board meeting on 14 November 2000.

12. Staffing of WADA – Secretary General’s report

To be discussed at the Board meeting on 14 November 2000.

13. Web site development

To be discussed at the Board meeting on 14 November 2000.

14. Requests for WADA action

- **Minister Vanstone – EPO tests**

- **State Secretary Coderre – Italian problem**

- **USA Track and Field**

- **IFs and other requests for testing**

- **UCI letters**

- **CONFESPORT letter**

- **The Quality Project: the ISDC and associated issues**

- **Johann Olav Koss letter**

To be discussed at the Board meeting on 14 November 2000.

15. a) Budget 2000 (revised)

b) Budget 2001

To be discussed at the Board meeting on 14 November 2000.

16. Future work programme

- **a) WADA corporate model**

MS VANSTONE thought that the paper (item 16) was exactly how she would hope all the papers could be, so she congratulated those responsible for putting it together, as it indicated in the beginning what the Executive Committee was being asked for, and provided some rationale and background.

She proposed that the recommendation for a WADA corporate model be approved, subject to a minor adjustment to the timelines. The model should be adopted immediately. They should invite all

Board and Executive Committee members to put in any ideas they wanted, submitting them to the ad hoc working group by 6 December. All ideas should be circulated by 15 December, with feedback and comments to be made by 15 January. A draft strategic plan could be put together and should be submitted to the Executive Committee by 15 February. Then, in March or April, they could endorse the plan and refer it to the Board.

A corporate plan should include the general finance management accountability processes; what the role of the Executive was compared to the Board, as the agendas for both certainly looked very similar; resolution of those finance and management accountability process issues; and a five-year goal.

If all of this could be achieved, she guaranteed that she would endorse item 16.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the two timetables were not very different. His concern was that between 15 December and 15 January, it was almost impossible to try to attract anyone's attention.

The hardest thing would be to elicit ideas and views, as usually what happened was that the invitation went out and was met by resounding silence.

MS VANSTONE suggested changing her proposed date of 15 January to 30 January.

GENERAL McCAFFREY echoed Ms Vanstone. There was so much to be grateful for. The Independent Observer team and the report had been monumental, as had the EPO test. The committee work was also very promising, if perhaps a little jerky.

Nevertheless, they lacked conceptual guidance for WADA. They also had to grapple with the issue of the Board of Directors: it either was the WADA governance or it was not, and he would suggest to a large extent that they were not acting like it. So, they needed to empower their own Executive Committee, they needed milestones (he heartily endorsed the healthy debate on the five-year plan), and had to focus on Salt Lake City. Sydney had driven events, but now they needed to know what they had learnt from Sydney and what should they try to achieve by Salt Lake City.

He hoped that the following day they could discuss whether or not to empower WADA to take over the administration and monitoring of the entire testing process. Could they tell WADA to produce a code prior to Salt Lake City? Could they tell WADA to produce active education programmes that would be up and running prior to Salt Lake City?

Finally, he would underscore his own endorsement: they had to act like a board of governance.

MR MOYER supported the process proposed by Ms Vanstone and General McCaffrey. Were they going to get in there and be responsible for the testing and administration of drug abuse in all sorts of competitions? He would certainly be willing to participate in this, and would suggest that the structure was a good idea.

Each different representative should be responsible for collecting the views of his or her colleagues around the table, thus ensuring that each view would be taken into account.

MR KOSS also supported Ms Vanstone's proposed amendments. This strategy needed to be communicated to the world. He was very happy to hear of the governments' strong support for the idea as well.

Coming from South Africa, MR BALFOUR admitted that he had a knack of saying things as he thought and saw them, and if it got a little bit rough, he expected people to swallow that.

He wished to endorse the proposals made. What he had picked up was the fact that Sydney had driven events, but if they were serious about WADA, from now on WADA should dictate events.

With regard to the beginning of the final paragraph on page 2 of the Final Report of the Office of the Independent Observer, he wanted to suggest something ludicrous. If they got their act correct as WADA, by putting their strategies in place, WADA would take over the role of the IOC Medical Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it might do so in terms of anti-doping, but not in terms of medicine generally. They should be careful what they wished for, as they might get it. If Mr Mitt Romney at Salt Lake City were able to hear the discussion, he would probably say that they could take over testing at Salt Lake City, and they could have the bill for it as well!

GENERAL McCAFFREY said that they were talking about the extent to which WADA could be the monitor, or the overseer of the process. He did not think this was impossible at all. It was another logical step forward. The question was, would the IOC or WADA be the oversight body?

THE CHAIRMAN replied that it was the obvious answer, but it would take a while to reach such a point. WADA had to demonstrate that it could be trusted to do the right thing.

He believed that the IOC was very happy about the Independent Observer process, and perhaps it would abandon its doping control role, but then again it might not.

MS VANSTONE said that there was bound to be some disagreement, but this motion allowed for them to discuss and sort out their priorities, and agree to head in the same direction.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed, but noted that no cohesiveness would be achieved by purporting to impose. This had to be worked out. Certainly those in the Olympic Movement were not able to impose anything on anybody, whereas governments were. The sport movement side was a little nervous about it. The matter reminded him of something that had once been said, that some day, in a perfect future, the lion would lie down with the lamb, but the lamb would probably not get much sleep. This was rather how the sport movement felt, so the matter had to be resolved.

MR VERBRUGGEN said that they needed to determine what they wanted WADA to do in the long run. They had to ask the following questions: Where am I? Where do I want to go? How am I going to go about doing it?

They had to decide whether WADA was going to take over the whole process of doping controls, including IF controls. He would be very willing to pay WADA the money spent by his IF on doping and health programmes elsewhere. The work done by WADA had taught them that this problem was complex. No IF would be able to resolve the problem alone, therefore an institute like WADA was needed, which went way over every border and all the competence and capacity of every IF. WADA had to take over the whole thing, and the IFs, which already spent a great deal of money, should turn to WADA. He would offer his federation the following day if WADA required a guinea-pig, and he was sure that the swimming federation would be there too. He would be very supportive of WADA taking over.

There was a need for a long-term plan. He reiterated that he was in favour of WADA taking over the entire testing process.

MR LARFAOUI said that he understood the concern of his colleague, but he did not agree that the role of the IFs was to deal with doping.

Tests were carried out not only by the IOC: National Federations tested, and controls were also carried out at regional and continental games. It would be wonderful if WADA took on the responsibility for all doping matters, but things were not as easy as some imagined. They needed to study the issue carefully.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that the problem was a complex one. How would governments achieve this harmonization? It would be wonderful if they could achieve this in five years' time, and he would like to take advantage of the momentum that they seemed to have built up, however he did have several concerns.

MR MOYER said that the problem should be divided into a couple of chunks. They had an agreement that by February they would make some statements about where they were going, in terms of whether or not WADA became the instrument for actually implementing doping policies in sport, and there were very good arguments on both sides. Nevertheless, they did not have to solve all the issues about whether the IOC would agree, or whether the UCI would agree: they had to decide amongst themselves where they wanted WADA to go.

Governments had dealt with harmonization in a lot of fields before. It took time, but it was not without precedent that governments agreed on harmonization processes for areas that they deemed to be critical. He therefore believed that they could be sceptical, but there was no reason to believe that it could not be achieved.

MR BALFOUR said that they had a will within the political heads who were actually talking amongst themselves about the kind of harmonization that they needed to get things moving. They definitely had that kind of will within the government section of WADA: people who were prepared to work very hard to drive the process.

MS LINDEN believed that WADA should also make some overall proposals regarding harmonization, so that all the governments could try to achieve this and begin to respond.

MR VERBRUGGEN suggested, perhaps rather naively, that WADA ask those governments without any laws on the matter to wait before bringing any in.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether the members approved the recommendation with a view to having something in their hands by the middle of February.

MR MOYER asked when they were going to strike the committee in terms of choosing the people on it?

THE CHAIRMAN thought that if they had a chance to do so in Oslo, they should do it and put the ad hoc working group for WADA's corporate model in place the following day.

GENERAL McCAFFREY asked whether they could also consider establishing a finance committee, so that the governments could come back in February and report on how they funded the operation.

THE CHAIRMAN said that if this could be done, then so much the better. He had been under the impression, from some of the comments, that the governments were not going to be able to get the buy-in required to spend the tomato-slicers' money until there was a long-range plan in place. Maybe they were in a chicken and egg situation.

MS VANSTONE thought that tomato-slicers might object to governments spending their money all round the world willy-nilly. It was right that the finance ministers would not give a tick-off until each of the ministers could go back and cogently argue what WADA was meant to achieve. This did not mean, however, that in the meantime they could not sort out amongst themselves how those contributions would be worked out.

GENERAL McCAFFREY said that they might have to sell the idea to the governments, but at least the delegates might have arrived at some conceptual agreement amongst themselves.

MR MOYER suggested that they work on the formula for government involvement straight away. They needed the other process in place before they could get governments to sign on, but they could do this on parallel tracks, which would come together. Therefore, the idea of having two working groups coming out of the session, with one focused on item 16, and the other focused on long-term financing, sounded like a good idea.

DECISIONS

1. Recommendation to establish an ad hoc working group to consider and make recommendations to the Executive Committee and WADA Foundation Board regarding a corporate model for WADA approved for submission to the WADA Board.
2. Proposal to have a draft strategic plan for a WADA corporate model submitted to the Executive Committee by mid-February approved.
3. Proposal to establish a finance committee for governments to report on their funding of the operation approved for submission to the WADA Board.

17. Any other business

To be discussed at the Board meeting on 14 November 2000.

18. Next meeting

To be discussed at the Board meeting on 14 November 2000.

The meeting adjourned at 7 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

MR RICHARD W. POUND, QC
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA