
Minutes of the WADA Executive Committee Meeting

2 December 2001, Lausanne

The meeting began at 10 a.m.

1. Welcome

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the members to the meeting of WADA's Executive Committee.

2. Roll Call

THE CHAIRMAN noted that there were several new faces present. Mr Balfour was being represented by Mr Swigelaar; the new Minister for Art and Sport in Australia was Senator Kemp, whose parliamentary duties had kept him in Australia, therefore he was being represented by Mr Stretton. Mr Kishida was being represented by Mr Uehara.

DR VEREEN informed the members that the official White House representative to WADA would be Ms Kate Malliarakis.

THE PRINCE DE MERODE apologised for not having replied to the letter that had been sent out by WADA regarding elections.

3. Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting in Tallinn on 20 August 2001

THE CHAIRMAN asked if anyone had any comments to make regarding the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting in Tallinn on 20 August 2001.

Unless, by the end of the meeting, anyone wished to make any comments or amendments, he would consider the minutes approved.

DECISION

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting on
20 August 2001 approved and duly signed.

4. Observers

THE CHAIRMAN invited any observers to make their presence known for official purposes.

5. Staffing

THE CHAIRMAN said that, in the process of moving to Montreal and in the recruitment of WADA staff, it had been clear that WADA needed to have a permanent CEO or secretary general in place, which was why the members of the Executive Committee had been sent a letter to approve the appointment of Mr Syväsalmi for a term as WADA's permanent director general. There had been an overwhelming response in favour of this proposal, therefore he had asked Mr Reddie negotiate an agreement with Mr Syväsalmi and, in the process, develop a template for other senior staff.

MR REEDIE said that advice had been sought from the recruitment division of Price WaterHouse Coopers, and advice had also been received on expatriate packages from international companies, such as Nestlé, so a remuneration package had been agreed upon with Mr Syväsalmi on a contract basis which would be limited to a period of five years. The Finance Committee believed that the package was pitched at a level just below the median package for expatriates.

Price WaterHouse Coopers had also given advice on the kind of employment structure that WADA would like to have. There were two ways to approach recruitment, the first being to fast track people by using consultants in Canada, the second being applications from potential employees, for which Price WaterHouse Coopers would be used as a sounding board. Substantial progress had been made with a relatively small staff at WADA, and now it was time to move the process to a higher level. WADA should have approximately 28 employees in the Montreal offices by the end of 2002.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for a motion that Mr Syväsalmi be employed by WADA for the next five years as Director General.

MR CODERRE proposed the motion.

MR KOSS seconded the motion.

MR VERBRUGGEN offered his congratulations to Mr Syväsalmi.

MR KOSS noted that, in a corporate structure, it was usual to disclose the salary of a director general, and asked that the salary package for Mr Syväsalmi be disclosed.

WADA should have an open and transparent system for hiring new staff, and offer worldwide opportunities for application.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he had no objection to disclosing the salary levels, either in WADA's annual reports or on the website.

With regard to the process, anyone should be able to apply. Perhaps advertisements for positions should be posted on the website; if consultants were to be used for senior management levels, he did not want to spend a fortune doing so, although press releases could certainly be issued. The aim was to have an international organisation and that it be perceived as such.

MR REEDIE said that the legal requirements regarding disclosure would be determined and applied.

Price WaterHouse Coopers had already provided a quotation for the recruitment work which was rather expensive. It might be possible to use the Price WaterHouse Coopers website to advertise posts.

MR SYVÄSALMI wished to thank the members for their trust in him. He had been given a real challenge, but it was an honour and a pleasure to work with the members. He was proud and humble, but he was sure that, with his colleagues, he would try to achieve success in the fight against doping all over the world.

He gave a presentation on WADA's corporate structure (Annex), which was an update on the report he had given in Tallinn. The structure was based on the Strategic Plan.

The 2001 staffing level (annualised) involved 14 staff, at a cost of US\$ 1.1 million.

The 2002 projected staffing level was to employ at least 28 staff, including approximately eight people from the 2001 team (i.e. not all staff moving to Montreal) plus new recruits. In Montreal, there would be a CEO, six directors, 11 managers and 10 assistants. There would also be one regional director and regional staff, and the Code team. The projected cost would be US\$ 2.9 million.

There was a need to fast track recruiting, with immediate action. WADA would use its own network to gather candidates according to a structured tender process (outsourcing to expert recruitment services, advertising, etc.).

The basic recruitment criteria were that employees should fit in with the culture and values, such as love of sport, and have a known expertise.

The intention was for WADA to be a multi-cultural agency. It currently employed 14 staff from eight different countries.

Remuneration policies (salary and benefits, etc.) were based on two packages: one for expatriates, and one for non-expatriates.

Recruiting priorities involved directors for communication, science, education, standards and harmonisation, as well as managers for research, the testing programme, finance, MIS/new media and education.

A Code team was already in place and working productively, as the members would find out later in the meeting.

The question of regional representatives would be discussed later during the meeting.

The policy was to be approved on 3 December 2001 by the Foundation Board.

He hoped to inform the members of any recruitment very soon.

MS LINDÉN noted that WADA's administration was being built up rather quickly, and she hoped that it was not being built so quickly that WADA would end up with budget problems related to administration costs.

It was also necessary to think of a feasible way of buying services, in other words, not hiring staff.

With regard to Europe, it might be wise to wait until the first round of government payment had reached WADA before building up WADA's administration.

Finally, where the satellite offices were concerned, she thought that more exact costs needed to be provided. She cautioned against rushing into such matters.

THE CHAIRMAN said that WADA was trying to balance moving ahead with the criticisms that it was not doing anything, but this was due to a lack of staff. He appreciated her advice, but assured Ms Lindén that a huge organisation would not be created.

MR KOSS raised the issue of employing a COO due to the difficulty involved in managing new staff. WADA ought to have a COO to help out the Director General in such matters.

When recruiting, it would be a good idea to post positions on the WADA website, and also the process of selection should be shown to the world in order to avoid further criticism.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that, in principle, the process would vary according to the position.

MR SYVÄSALMI said that discussions on how to structure the process were still ongoing.

He was not familiar with the post of a COO, however he was working on creating a post for a special advisor. He hoped to discuss the matter with his colleagues, the directors.

WADA was already outsourcing work, and would continue to do so in the future.

He hoped to finalise the terms of reference for several directors with the relevant WADA members, for example, he would discuss the terms of reference for a director for science with Professor Ljungqvist.

He emphasised that, in all cases, WADA would use open, outsourced methods.

MR LARFAOUI referred to the issue of the budget. He had heard from the press that the EU was rather unwilling to pay its share of WADA's funds.

With regard to recruitment, he did not agree with Mr Koss on the selection criteria. WADA had a Director General and a number of experts, and these would be sufficient in the recruitment process.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the governments had agreed, and would find a way to contribute to WADA.

With regard to the process, he was sure that the Executive Committee did not want to be involved in every hire.

Openness and transparency should not be confused with the satisfaction of all those applying for positions.

Each member should know how WADA would be proceeding, however, and he hoped that any credible complaints about the process would be made known to the Director General.

MR CODERRE said that the issue of staff employment needed to be clarified. It appeared that some Foundation Board members wanted to become WADA employees. This could create a conflict of interest among other problems.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that, if the issue should arise, a member would remain a Foundation Board member until he or she became a candidate.

DECISIONS

1. Mr Syväsalmi appointed as Director General of WADA for a period of five years.
2. Foundation Board members to remain as such unless or until they become candidates for WADA staff posts.

6. Code

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the importance of the WADA Code should be clearly understood by all the members.

6.1 Update

MR WADE referred to the documents in the members' files (Annex). Good progress had been made so far, and the committee was heading in the right direction with the proposed approach, supported by the stakeholders consulted to date.

As outlined in the Strategic Plan, the development of the Code was perhaps the most important project that WADA would be undertaking.

He gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Code. The Anti-Doping Code Coordination Committee had been established in May 2001. The Project Plan for the Code had been approved by the Foundation Board in August 2001.

The Project Plan, which the members had in their files (Annex), had been modified according to the discussion at the Foundation Board meeting in August. The objective was to have the Code operational for the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens. A Project Team had done much of the work to facilitate the operational work on behalf of the Code Coordination Committee.

MR FIGVED gave an overview of the progress made, the consultation process to date and the framework for the code. He referred to the Project Plan, Version 1.5 (Annex). The timelines had been accelerated, as well as the timeline for the first draft of the Code content.

The main focus was on Milestone 1 for the Code, for which work was on schedule.

Three Project Team meetings had taken place, along with two meetings with the Project Owners, represented by Messrs Pound and Syväsalmi. There had been one meeting with the Steering Group for the Code project.

There had been presentations and discussions in all the WADA working committees, and initial consultation meetings had been held with the stakeholders, notably the Governments of France, China, Norway and Canada, and the following NADOs: ASDA, USADA, SAIDS and CCES, as well as the following IFs: FINA, the IAAF, the IWF, the IBU and the ATP Tour.

An invitation had been sent to the IOC for a consultation meeting on the draft framework.

A meeting had been held with the IICGADS Working Group, and finally presentations had been made to GAISF, the CAS and the Monitoring Group of the Council of Europe.

In general, the stakeholders' response had been very positive towards the Project Plan and the consultative approach, and they had supported the overall framework and agreed on the structure for the Code and the issues identified.

The challenges would arise in developing the content of the Code.

Future aims included broader formal consultation with all the stakeholders regarding the framework documents (Dec 2001 – January 2002) and developing the content of the Code (Dec 2001 – April 2002), with continued and expanded consultation with stakeholders and specific expert groups.

The main issue regarding the overall framework had been to develop and agree on the structure of the World Anti-Doping Code. There were two documents in the members' files to which he referred: the Explanatory Document on the World Anti-Doping Framework (Annex) and the draft outline for the World Anti-Doping Code (Annex).

MR YOUNG discussed the content and structure of the Code, and explained the draft outline for the World Anti-Doping Code. By analogy, if the Code were a shoe, WADA would need a shoe that

fitted the whole world, which meant that it had to have some flexibility but also needed to be rigid enough in the areas in which harmonisation was really necessary.

MR CODERRE noted that the UCI and the Government of Canada joint working group on harmonisation could be taken as a scenario.

He was concerned about WADA's legal status against how a Code could be applied, and the issues of private and public law. The application of treaties and agreements should also be considered.

WADA needed to work on do-ability, and focus more on the implementation and power to execute the Code. What would WADA do if a country did not wish to apply the Code?

Sanctions should focus to a greater extent on officials, suppliers of illegal substances and even countries. If a country cheated, WADA should not allow a world cup event to take place in that country.

With regard to the definition of sport, WADA would have to consider the notion of professional sports. He did not wish to exclude the USA in this respect. WADA needed a specific working group to consider the issue of professional sports.

With regard to revision of substances, a flexible way of doing things was necessary. WADA should be firm but not too rigid.

THE CHAIRMAN emphasised the need to get the Code right, as it was one of the major undertakings of WADA. There was a lot of work to be done. He hoped that, by April 2002, a first draft of the Code would have been produced.

The idea of a List Committee was very important for continual review.

The definition of sport was a social issue, and it would be most helpful if governments were prepared to include professional sports.

With regard to implementation, the primary focus had to be on the athlete, but WADA should also address the others responsible for doping.

Governments would need to think about what to do vis-à-vis countries responsible for cheating. This was a very delicate issue, but one that should be dealt with.

He did not know how the legal status of WADA affected what it was doing. WADA had no stake in the matter that depended on whether it was public, private or hybrid.

MR LARFAOUI congratulated the working group, which had covered all the aspects concerning the fight against doping.

He highlighted, however, the issue of young athletes who did not realise what was being done to them.

Also, the harmonisation of sanctions was going to be extremely difficult.

THE CHAIRMAN said that everybody should be encouraged to tell WADA how to go about achieving success in this area, and not to say that it was going to be difficult to achieve.

MR KOSS spoke about the acceptance of the Code and the process. He was sure that it would take some time, particularly with the governments. What would happen? Would there be conventions or negotiation for governments to apply the Code?

Also, if the governments did not ratify the Code, should the Code include that their respective countries would not be applicable to host the Games?

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that a clarification in the Code regarding the consequences on the athlete's entourage should be included, but this should be a matter for the governments, as WADA would not be able to punish a doctor guilty of cheating.

He hoped that it was the intention that, for all federations that would adopt the Code, the punishment of athletes would mean their disqualification from all sports and not just the sport in which they had been caught cheating. This was actually the case in his country.

MR CODERRE said that the challenge was to apply the Code in all countries.

There were two problems: not only would acceptance of the Code have to be ensured, but getting the Code implemented in the countries was also necessary. A harmonisation process was needed, and each country should find its own means of implementing the Code. In some countries, this would happen faster than in others.

At the IICGADS meeting the following year, the issue of do-ability would be discussed.

MR YOUNG said that it was exciting for him, as someone involved on the streets in dealing with doping cases, to see the governments, IFs and NADOs working together, because there was only so much that the IOC, IFs and governments could do separately, but together their work was much more far-reaching and effective.

He told Mr Koss that, in terms of timing, WADA might seem to be hurrying, but this was to give as much time as possible to the acceptance process. The group was trying to come up with different alternatives for governments to accept, and the goal was, on the one hand, to get as much strength to the acceptance process as possible, whilst at the same time not causing it to be an endless process.

He told Professor Ljungqvist that the issue of an across-sport ban was already on the list.

With regard to Mr Larfaoui's comment on the harmonisation of sanctions, he thought that harmonisation based on principle or minimums was possible without needing absolute uniformity.

MR WALKER said that this was a very positive discussion, and thought that a great deal had been done since the meeting in Tallinn. The richness of the documents showed the tremendous amount of work that had been carried out. What was really needed now was some feedback.

The consultation process could be self-defeating, but it was important that the members of the Executive Committee try to address some of the issues that were important to them as stakeholders.

Finally, regarding the four levels of approximation, conformity with principles, conformity with standards and uniformity, there were various ways in which the members, as stakeholders, might have different points of view on which levels they needed for their purposes.

In many meetings, a great deal of importance had been attached to the need for increased harmonisation with regard to government legislation. The Code group was in the process of drafting a list of what these common approaches could be.

At the Monitoring Group meeting ten days previously, the approach to the Code had been given a very enthusiastic endorsement. Many governments had hoped that the preventative side would be dealt with. Anti-doping education and information, as well as research, were considered extremely important.

With regard to the question of how governments would endorse the Code, there were numerous ways of doing this.

In conjunction with the IICGADS initiative, the Monitoring Group had agreed to develop a WADA protocol, or a protocol to the Anti-Doping Convention. The issue of how to acknowledge the Code had to be addressed.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that it was clear that, in a sense, the process was almost as important as the content.

The mere fact that certain constituents did not need a particular portion of the Code did not mean that it was not worthwhile.

It might take longer for individual countries to adopt valid legislation than to subscribe to a treaty or a declaration. WADA should make the process as easy as possible so that each country could buy into it, in accordance with their national and constitutional traditions.

He congratulated the Project Group on the excellent progress made in such a short period of time.

DECISIONS

1. Project Group to continue working on the Code, possibly to provide an interim report by the time of the Olympic Games in Salt Lake City.
2. Code update approved.

6.2 World Conference on Doping

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the World Conference on Doping would be taking place in 15 months' time, so there was a great deal of work to do. He wanted approval for WADA to go ahead and begin to organise the conference for February 2003. Mr Reddie had done a great deal of work to cut the costs, and he hoped to find a host country or city that might even cover some of the costs.

DECISION

World Conference on Doping to take place in February 2003. Report to be submitted at next WADA meeting regarding progress on plans for the conference.

7. EPO

7.1 Update

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, prior to the Olympic Games in Sydney, there had been general agreement within the scientific community on a combined EPO test. There had been a variation on this agreement for Salt Lake City, but also, the IFs and other organisations that would have to apply the test felt that the combination of the blood and urine tests was somewhat cumbersome and difficult to administer, so there had been an effort to try and develop a single test in the field, although there was no sufficient scientific consensus as yet.

Professor Saltin was present to discuss the matter with Professor Ljungqvist, and Dr Schamasch had come from the IOC. Sarah Lewis, the Secretary General of FIS, and Mr Salstrum from IDTM had also come to help out in the discussion.

PROFESSOR LJUNGVIST said that there had been activity to find a safe and reliable EPO test. He had given an update at the meeting in Tallinn in August, and would review what he had said then. Since Sydney, where not one case had been discovered, the committee had continued to try and develop methods for EPO detection along two lines: blood analysis and urine analysis. The test had been validated by a scientific group as a combined test for Sydney. The difference between the tests was that artificial EPO could not be detected through the blood analysis, but various blood parameters were analysed to see which parameters would clearly suggest an intake of EPO. However, there were other ways of changing the parameters, such as genetic variation, living at high altitude, using oxygen chambers, etc. The urine test allowed for the direct detection of artificial EPO. It would appear that the urine test could stand alone. Neither test, however, had been found before the Olympic Games to be scientifically safe enough to stand alone prior to the Olympic Games.

Since the WADA meeting in Tallinn, there had been further developments in the evaluation of a pattern coming up from the blood analysis and further analysis of the reliability of the urine test.

The Health, Medical and Research Committee had aimed to find out the blood aspect of the combined test and had convened interested federations to look through this.

The IOC had taken on a further elucidation of the urine test and performed an inter-laboratory study for the detection of EPO in urine alone.

At the meeting on 6 November 2001 of the Health, Medical and Research Committee, a fairly clear picture had been formed. The federations, meeting with the laboratory representatives, had agreed upon which blood parameters to look for, as well as reasonable cut-off levels.

The IOC project had also been reviewed by 16 scientists and the final outcome of both the meetings was that WADA was still not in a position to let one of the tests stand alone. It had been found that blood parameters were good indicators, however the confirmation of the urine test was necessary.

The entire procedure adopted for the EPO test was rather unusual in the scientific world. Usually, a method was published in a renowned scientific journal and subjected to a peer review system. An independent laboratory was then usually required to confirm the result of the study. He was somewhat disappointed that not much had happened with regard to publication of the test in question following the meeting in August 2000. He had thought that there would have been some progress made.

In conclusion, WADA would still have to proceed with the blood screening, followed by the urine test.

There had been some controversy with regard to terminology. The term should be *blood screening* (rather than *test*). The blood screening should be carried out prior to going ahead with more expensive urine tests.

PROFESSOR SALTIN gave a PowerPoint presentation on the scientific background to EPO testing.

He understood that the members were frustrated that no simple test had been found by the scientific community, however the matter was complicated. He gave the members a description of the background of the problems involved in EPO detection and the plans for the immediate and long-term future.

The urine EPO test definitely worked, but it was a difficult test and not all of the laboratories were able to perform it.

DR SCHAMASCH gave a presentation on the Salt Lake City EPO tests. All the endurance athletes would be tested for blood, based on haemoglobin and the percentage of reticulocytes, at least one day prior to their first competition.

A further 10% of athletes would then be selected by draw to be blood tested, again, on site, on the morning of the competition. If the blood analysis revealed abnormalities, urine would be collected and analysed at the IOC-accredited laboratory in Salt Lake City according to the French method. Sanctions would be imposed only if the blood was abnormal and the urine tested positive. If the blood results showed blood parameters above the limits admitted, the athlete would not be able to compete.

All urine samples sent to the laboratory based on the screening with blood would be accompanied by a second blood tube.

He noted that the aim of the meeting on 7 November had been to find criteria for judging the urine part of the test.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that the urine test was based on electrophoresis with a considerable overlap of non-artificial and artificial EPO. The reason for carrying out two parallel studies was because the IOC needed to have a clarification of what should be in place in Salt Lake City.

Dr Schamasch had said that if the blood parameters were abnormal, the athlete in question would be barred, rather than sanctioned, from competition for reasons of health. This was a competition regulation rather than a doping regulation.

MR KOSS mentioned that the effect of EPO could still be used when the haemoglobin and hematocrit counts were low, simply by introducing non-detectable plasma expanders into the blood. How would this issue be handled?

MS LINDÉN said that, in Finland, everyone had seen what could happen to the credibility of sport when doping occurred. She hoped that in Salt Lake City the situation would be different, because the credibility of Nordic skiing was extremely low.

Also, out-of-competition testing was very important in order to detect EPO.

MR VERBRUGGEN noted that it was always difficult to judge scientific presentations.

The UCI had been involved in five meetings organised with the IFs thanks to WADA's initiative. He read several of the comments from the meetings, which appeared to give conflicting views regarding scientific approaches to the EPO test.

He had huge problems because of all of the conflicting views and apparently rapid changes of opinion regarding the validity of the tests.

He insisted that WADA put a completely independent person in place to carry out the review of the validation of the EPO test.

Regarding the test itself, it was absolutely impracticable. Blood parameters could not be measured with portable equipment. The test did not appear to offer the possibility to test all the winners.

It was not easy to set limits for the normality of blood parameters, and blood screenings could be manipulated.

The UCI used the blood method only to declare an athlete unfit for competition. WADA proposed to use it as part of an anti-doping test, which could lead to suspension of athletes. The UCI would not dare to do this.

It was ambiguous to send only suspect urine samples to laboratories, as the laboratories risked losing all objectivity.

With regard to the issue of a B analysis, legal problems could easily arise. The test as it was proposed would cause huge problems for the IFs. He asked for rapid action from WADA to resolve the issue.

MR CODERRE was worried. If the tests were not adequate, why perform them in Salt Lake City? He was particularly worried about the legal aspect. He thought that a second opinion, reached through an independent study, was needed. The Legal Committee should look into the issue, and costs also needed to be examined.

MS LEWIS said that FIS had also been a part of the working group coordinated by WADA and had been extremely confident that the work undertaken was very serious and of a very high quality, and that the problems could be addressed immediately. Since the outcome of the meetings on 6 and 7 November, FIS had been placed in a very difficult situation and was in rather a dilemma.

FIS was working with IDTM, who were carrying out the entire blood screening procedure. FIS had also already undertaken blood screening analysis at events, although this could not be done at every event.

The outcome of a positive test would be in the hands of the lawyers, and FIS hoped that a very serious and rapid conclusion regarding the issue of EPO testing could be reached.

MR LARFAOUI said that he hoped that the members would leave the meeting with a proposal or a decision to do something. He had the impression that WADA was nowhere near a conclusion and needed some kind of reassurance from the scientists.

WADA needed to make an official declaration. Did it have a reliable test or not? Nobody seemed to understand the current situation regarding EPO.

THE PRINCE DE MERODE said that a different approach was needed. The blood test alone was not entirely reliable and the urine test was not quite perfect. It was, however, possible that a positive result could be detected. He recommended that the test, despite its drawbacks, be performed at Salt Lake City, as an athlete might be found positive, and WADA and the IOC would therefore show the world that they were doing something to combat doping.

It seemed to MR REEDIE that the worst of all possible situations would be to do nothing, therefore WADA needed to do something. It should congratulate the efforts made by FIS, back up the IOC in what it intended to do in Salt Lake City and encourage as much research as possible into a better urine test which, it seemed to him, would satisfy everybody.

THE PRINCE DE MERODE noted that scientific discovery was not simply a matter of money.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that WADA was not in anybody's camp; its job was to reach some conclusion on the basis of which reliable testing for EPO could go forward.

He had been a little disappointed to hear that some of the projects approved in June were now being regarded as of doubtful value.

As far as operating went, there were two levels of application of the test: the set piece event, for example the Olympic Games, at which the apparatus and infrastructure were in place for testing, with the budgetary resources set aside for that.

There were then the people out in the field (the IFs) on a day-to-day basis, who wanted to be able to catch the athletes using EPO, but the current test was too cumbersome and expensive in such a case.

He had always thought that the UCI and the FIS solution was both elegant and clever, in other words, saying that as a matter of health an athlete could not participate, as this could not be argued against in court.

He agreed that WADA could not recommend something that was not defensible, as it needed a very strong scientific approval.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST referred to difficulties at the IF level. It was true that EPO testing would be very difficult for the IFs to conduct, but WADA would have to accept the fact that this was what science required.

Scientists agreed as to the combined blood and urine test, and there was no disagreement with respect to this test standing in court. Diversity of opinion existed in whether the urine test could stand alone.

The Health, Medical and Research Committee was carrying out an impartial and independent review. It now faced the situation where the urine test might soon be obsolete due to the absence of markers in EPO, which was why research into blood analysis had to continue. The committee had already instituted some research, and this would go on. FIS had been very cooperative and he was extremely grateful to the federation. It was necessary to be aware that, in all likelihood, the area of blood analysis might be the direction to follow for the future of EPO testing.

With regard to out-of-competition testing, blood analysis was simple and cheap. By far the best place for EPO testing was in out-of-competition testing, although this did present certain difficulties from a practical point of view.

Mr Koss was right in saying that samples could be manipulated, and ways to prevent and detect this would need to be found. The issue of plasma expanders was also being addressed.

He recommended that the Executive Committee members recognise the decisions taken by the scientists at the meeting on 7 November 2001 that for the time being the combined blood and urine tests be performed for the detection of EPO.

MR VERBRUGGEN said that, from a legal standpoint, the combined blood and urine test might not stand. If the scientists all agreed upon the test, then it was strange that the comments he had previously read out were conflicting.

He agreed with Professor Ljungqvist that WADA should look into EPO tests for the future, but WADA needed to solve the problem with which it was confronted immediately.

He was confident that, if an independent panel were asked to study the urine test, it would be able to come up with a short-term solution for the test.

WADA would not succeed in getting all the scientists to agree. Sometimes one simply had to accept the risks involved and go ahead with the process.

MR BESSEBERG noted that certain federations were under stress, but the IFs were scared of a false negative. He asked Professor Saltin whether, if his federation used its own blood test seismic machine, the IF's own screening would be accepted, or if an accredited laboratory would have to perform the analysis. Transporting blood was problematic for reasons of time.

THE CHAIRMAN advised great caution with regard to comments made during meetings and individual opinions being taken as the official view of WADA, as these did not give the consensus or official view of the organisation.

If he were to be asked about the official view of WADA, he would say that WADA agreed that the combination of the blood and urine tests was reliable, and that a sanction could be imposed upon the basis of that combination. Also, WADA would encourage research on a priority basis into the development of simpler, easier-to-apply, cheaper and equally effective tests that could be used in practice by the IFs, and that it recognised that it had to deal with the recombinant EPO that was currently in use, and the equivalent to naturally-produced EPO, which might lead WADA away from urine analysis into the area of blood testing.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said, with regard to the blood analysis, that it was probably even more interesting to find those athletes who had been taking EPO but were not taking it at the time of the test. This was another reason as to why further studies on blood analysis should be made in the future.

MR HOWMAN noted that it was very important to understand that there was not one legal answer to the very complex issue of EPO testing. The Legal Committee had been looking at the issue for many months, and was insistent that the IFs have rules in place for the processes of sampling and analysis, as well as for sanctions.

The issue of whether a positive blood analysis could amount to a doping offence would require a little more discussion.

DECISION

EPO report approved.

7.2 Next Steps

THE CHAIRMAN said that he thought that WADA had reached a consensus on where it stood today with regard to the matter.

DECISION

WADA to continue to support the use of the combined EPO test.

8. Montreal Relocation

8.1 Update

THE CHAIRMAN noted the excellent degree of cooperation from everybody in Montreal. The premises should be ready for WADA to move in by the middle of March 2002.

MR SYVÄSALMI referred to the document in the members' files (Annex).

Montreal International had been working extremely hard to help WADA with its relocation. Representatives from Montreal International would be observing at the Foundation Board meeting the following day.

DECISION

WADA headquarters relocation update approved.

8.2 Regional Offices

THE CHAIRMAN said that he would like to focus on one principle and one action. The principle would be to have regional WADA offices in Europe, Africa and Asia or Oceania. With regard to the action, it would be practical to have the European liaison office in Lausanne. In anticipation of such a decision, arrangements had already been made to sub-lease half of the Lausanne office space. He thought that it was important that WADA be seen to exist and be active in all the major areas of the world, and not just be in Montreal or Lausanne. He would like the Executive Committee to be in a position to announce that this was its intention.

MS LINDÉN asked what the Chairman thought of the working objective for WADA's regional offices. In other words, what would the role of the regional offices be?

THE CHAIRMAN replied that, in Lausanne, the primary role of WADA would be to liaise with the IFs. Elsewhere, WADA should liaise with the national anti-doping agencies and continue to liaise with the governments. WADA's practical liaison with governments was rather weak, particularly outside Europe. Overall, WADA's mandate would vary depending on the area and the programmes in operation.

MR LARFAOUI brought up the issue of criteria for deciding on the location of the regional offices. He had no objections with regard to Lausanne, but what about elsewhere?

THE CHAIRMAN thought that WADA should be, in principle, in Africa and Asia or Oceania, but he would come back to the members with more information on the matter before an actual decision was taken.

MR CODERRE supported the notion of satellite offices as WADA needed to ensure the increasing presence of WADA. It was not for him to decide on the sites but he thought that it was important to support this principle. WADA needed to be clear and precise with regard to the budget, role and numbers of staff, however.

MR WALKER said that the Monitoring Group supported the creation of a regional office for Europe.

With regard to the comment made by Mr Larfaoui, the criteria should include WADA's needs for good air transport communication and telecommunications.

MR STRETTON asked whether the Chairman had a view in terms of when the regional offices might be established.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that, in one year's time, WADA should at least be in a position to move ahead with the establishment of the regional offices.

MR REEDIE noted that WADA should make use of its existing premises in Lausanne, and it should not lose contact with the IFs. He saw the Lausanne office as being a sports liaison office, into which other services could be built. WADA should also look at the idea of video-conferencing, which was expensive technology but had to be more effective and cheaper than flying back and forth to Montreal for meetings.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed, but noted that Mr Coderre was right: WADA should not have four head offices.

DECISION

Proposal to establish regional WADA offices in Europe (Lausanne), Africa and Asia/Oceania approved.

9. IICGADS

9.1 Government Funding Update

MR CODERRE said that, with regard to funding, on behalf of the Americas a process was in place, and options to apply the process were being decided upon.

Africa had a decision-making process in place, which could be seen in the document in the members' files (Annex).

He totally supported the fifty-fifty cut and assured the members that the governments would pay their share.

MS LINDÉN said that Europe was working on finding a way to contribute its share, although this would not happen in January 2002, however she was optimistic that it would be in 2002.

MR STRETTON said that everything was going well in Oceania with regard to government funding.

MR UEHARA informed the members about the situation in Japan. The budget deliberations would soon begin so that Japan and the other Asian countries would be able to contribute.

THE CHAIRMAN congratulated Africa on the great step forward with regard to contributions.

DECISION

Government funding update approved.

9.2 Next Meeting

MR CODERRE said that everything was going well within IICGADS and the next meeting would be held from 24 to 26 April 2002 in Kuala Lumpur.

DECISION

Next IICGADS meeting to be held from 24 to 26 April 2002 in Kuala Lumpur.

10. Finance and Administration Committee Report

10.1 Update

MR REEDIE said that the Finance and Administration Committee had met in Lausanne in October 2001, and referred to the minutes of the meeting (Annex). The committee members had looked principally at budgets, and this was the area of the report upon which he hoped to concentrate.

DECISION

Finance and Administration Committee update approved.

10.2 2001 Accounts

MR REEDIE referred to the balance sheet in the members' files and explained the contents of the document. He noted that neither the IADA nor the research funding should come under *meeting expenses*, and these would be taken out of the list and coded differently.

WADA had approximately US\$ 4.7 million of uncommitted funds in the bank as of 29 November 2001, but clearly there were major payments to be made before the end of the year.

DECISION

2001 Accounts approved.

10.3 Budget 2002

MR REEDIE said that the committee had tried to draft the budget in line with the Strategic Plan. He referred the members to the two documents in their files, the Draft Budget 2002 and the WADA Budget 2002 in relation with the Strategic Plan (Annex).

With regard to the draft budget for 2002, the committee thought that it would be advisable to take the tax-free status option in Montreal so the budget had been calculated on that basis.

Did the Executive Committee think that this looked like a decent costing of the programme to be operated in 2002?

MS LINDÉN said that the papers had improved, however she would like the two documents to be incorporated into one single document.

Also, the members should be given outlines for costs and explanations, as governments would want more details for their budgets, and if such explanations were not provided, WADA would be criticised for lacking in transparency.

She was glad to hear that rumours that the proposed budget would be higher than initially decided were untrue.

MR UEHARA said that justification for each figure was essential. The members would have to be able to provide answers for reasons of accountability.

MR KOSS referred to the Strategic Plan. The clearing-house did not seem to have an amount allocated in the budget.

WADA should also try to allocate some funds for elite athletes in the area of education, as one of the biggest priorities was to educate elite athletes.

MR CODERRE wished to reiterate Ms Lindén's comments. WADA would need to be very specific in order to justify its expenses. There was also a need to ensure that the members could offer their points of view on the amounts set.

With regard to consultation, what was the strategy regarding sub-contracting?

MS LINDÉN referred to the EU projects. Would these use EU money outside the budget or WADA's money? This was an important issue.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said, with regard to the payment of the 2001 research grants, that the reason for the delay was the need for a proper ethical review of many of the projects, since they

included research on human beings. It was foreseen that, by the end of December, at least 15 out of the 21 projects allocated funds would have been clarified.

DR VEREEN added that there were four projects that were now ready to proceed and had sent in their paperwork since the last meeting. The documents or assurances had not been asked for up-front.

THE CHAIRMAN said that this should be done at an earlier stage in the process in the future, as WADA did not look too efficient, having approved the projects six months previously and not spent a single penny.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that this would be included in the first step in the process in the future.

DR VEREEN said that this process usually took a year in the US government.

MR WALKER referred to the Finance and Administration Committee's recommendations for 11 committee members. The Standards and Harmonisation Committee had 14 members, three of which were concerned with laboratory issues, which was part of the committee's terms of reference, so perhaps there was some kind of scope for flexibility there.

The ALADIN project could also be called the proficiency testing project. This was the process by which a continuous quality control evaluation system could be introduced into laboratory work. Following the meeting of the Laboratory Committee, a need had been identified to be able to produce the proficiency testing samples on which the proficiency testing would then take place. Discussions were going on as to how and where to obtain these samples, which tended to come from volunteers at Cologne, and the Laboratory Committee wished to introduce more objectivity into this. He could not say yet, but figures were being discussed of approximately US\$ 50,000 for 12 PT samples, and 10 samples per laboratory. This might be over one year to 18 months, and was an important element in setting up this quality control and proficiency testing scheme. He did not know whether it would be able to come out of the US\$ 200,000 which was already allocated to the quality control project, but if there was a need for additional resources to obtain these samples, he would be glad if the Executive Committee would agree to allow him to navigate within the limits set down for the Standards and Harmonisation Committee's budget.

MR REEDIE agreed that the governments needed more information. The documents could be expanded, and if the members would accept the shape of the projects, then he would be able to get on with providing more detailed information and breaking down the budget.

The EU projects were subject to a binding agreement and the funds would be paid by the EU over a two-year period.

He told Mr Uehara that it would be possible to produce more details and historical figures to show what had been spent in the previous year.

With regard to Mr Koss's comments, he would need time to look at the figures that Mr Koss had given him, which seemed to be quite high. They had not been included in the budget. He hoped to discuss the matter with Mr Koss before referring the matter to the Foundation Board.

He told Mr Coderre that, yes, there would be more specificity regarding the budget.

Some of WADA's staff members were employed full-time, whilst others were remunerated on a consultancy basis. He thought that WADA would move towards employing staff full-time in the future, but WADA had used people of respected abilities as consultants up until then.

He told Mr Walker that it would be up to the Foundation Board to decide about the committee size. He would be perfectly happy to have a degree of flexibility.

With regard to the laboratory project, he thought that if Mr Walker strayed over the figure by a dollar or two to complete the project, there should not be any problems.

DECISION

Draft budget for 2002 approved for submission to the Foundation Board.

10.4 Budget Forecast 2003 – 2006

MR REEDIE referred to the two documents in the members' files (Annex), which were to give the governments some idea of future costs.

It was not up to the Finance and Administration Committee simply to sit down and produce some formula, which would limit the freedom of the Foundation Board to decide on the activities of the agency, but the committee clearly understood that it would be of use to governments in particular to have some idea of what costs might be in the future.

Using suggestions of a formula, the committee had operated on the formula set out in the first document (3% for inflation + 5% for projects – 1 % for efficiency).

The second document was an expansion of the first document, aiming to provide more information. As far as he was concerned, none of these figures were laid in tablets of stone, and the question now was which figure the members thought was most acceptable for their purposes. He hoped that the work was of sufficient interest to the governments and that it would help their budgeting processes.

MR CODERRE said that the subsidy from the Canadian Government was US\$ 840,000 per year for ten years and not US\$ 500,000.

MS LINDÉN said that the Foundation Board should decide on a budget ceiling so that the governments would know the maximum figures over the coming years for their own budgets.

She also asked for an explanation of the figures in the second document.

MR REEDIE told Mr Coderre that the committee had tried to show the effective saving rather than the total contribution from the Canadian Government, so he hoped that his figure was correct.

With regard to Ms Lindén's comments, he knew how the figures had got out into the public domain and where they had come from. The principal difference was that he had looked at things that seemed to him to be ongoing matters and substantial increase in the budget, and he had applied his own formula to these. He accepted that it was a totally unscientific process, but he had been asked for more information and had delivered such information.

In conclusion, he sought guidance from the members.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that it would be possible to tell the governments that they would not have to contribute more than their share of a certain amount. He was sorry that some governments were operating on the basis of a leaked document that had not been approved by the Executive Committee or Foundation Board, and perhaps this was a good lesson for everybody.

Governments could be assured that the total payments would not exceed the amounts stated in the documents.

MR STRETTON thought that, if they were looking at a 7% increase in expenditure each year for the following five years, the members should perhaps look at possible third sources of funding.

His government had put aside funds for four years, but if such an increase in expenditure was necessary, then other sources would have to be looked into.

MR UEHARA agreed with Mr Stretton. In Japan, a 10% reduction across the board was being discussed. It would be necessary to prioritise projects and review the budget after 2002.

THE CHAIRMAN said that WADA was a new organisation. The budget might increase by 7% (activity was going up by 30%, 40% or even 50%) and the numbers in the budget reflected the additional work being carried out.

MR REEDIE agreed with Mr Stretton, but it was also necessary to expect a much greater level of activity in the anti-doping field. For more things to happen, there had to be more resources.

The committee would bring a detailed budget to the Foundation Board each year for the following year so that, ultimately, the decision would be in the members' hands.

There were huge expectations of WADA. Substantial mountains had been moved to date, but there was still a great deal of work to be done, and he would have thought that the increases in the budget should be affordable.

He was aware of alternative methods of funding, such as the EU projects.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he had a certain amount of experience of raising money in the private sector, and he thought that it would be possible to do so once WADA could demonstrate that the public authorities and the sports side were working together.

MR CODERRE spoke about perception. WADA needed a process to send a clear message to the tax-payers, because it was their money after all.

MR LARFAOUI said that WADA had an action plan. The funds needed to be raised to support the plan.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that WADA had processes in place that provided a level of assurance regarding expenditure.

Once the budget had been approved, he agreed that the budget should not be increased.

DECISION

Budget forecast 2003-2006 to be submitted to the Foundation Board.

11. Legal Committee Report

11.1 Update

MR HOWMAN referred to the minutes from the latest meeting of the Legal Committee (Annex).

Because there were a number of documents emanating from the WADA office without proper sign-off or proper authorisation, the Legal Committee recommended that there be a proper policy in place to prevent this happening in the future, so that any document with legal, financial or policy implications should be authorised appropriately.

DECISION

Legal Committee update approved.

11.2 Future WADA Status

MR HOWMAN said that the committee had looked at the future of WADA's legal status, and had hired a firm of lawyers in Montreal, asking them to look at the issue immediately. He referred the members to the two documents in their files (Annex).

The committee asked that the Executive Committee confirm that the interim status of WADA remain as it was.

MR CODERRE said that he had been rather disappointed with the way in which WADA had asked for legal advice from Switzerland. It had been agreed that WADA was working on an interim basis and would look at its legal status again after it had chosen its headquarters.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the question appeared to have been misunderstood. The committee was asking whether a Swiss foundation could have its head office outside Switzerland. He understood that the substance of the Swiss opinion was that it was possible to have a Swiss foundation to have its head office outside Switzerland without losing its existence.

MR HOWMAN replied that the question had come from the briefing documents received from Montreal, as the committee had asked the bid group if it would be possible to be based in Montreal with Swiss status.

DECISION

Future WADA status to be confirmed.

11.3 Board Renewal (2003)

MR HOWMAN referred to the document in the members' files with regard to WADA's Foundation Board renewal. The committee recommended looking at a Foundation Board rotation policy in order to ensure an aspect of continuity.

He understood that Mr Pound was willing and able to remain as Chairman of the Foundation Board and he would like to suggest that this be adopted by the Executive Committee and followed the following day by the Foundation Board. This would get the ball rolling in terms of a rotation policy.

THE CHAIRMAN thought that the rotation policy would make good sense.

MS LINDÉN proposed that, if Article 6 were modified, the members consider a Foundation Board membership of two, rather than three, years.

She also noted that Europe was trying to figure out its own rotation and unfortunately the next EU meeting would be in September 2002.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether the members wanted the same Executive Committee to continue working during 2002.

MR KOSS said that he would have to withdraw after Salt Lake City as he would no longer be eligible as an athlete representative.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that this was not necessarily the case. WADA's rules stated that a majority of the Executive Committee members had to be members of the Foundation Board, but this did not mean all of the members.

Were the members content to recommend to the Foundation Board that WADA continue with the current Executive Committee?

MS LINDÉN asked whether the Executive Committee would deal with the size of the Foundation Board and also the issue of the Vice-Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that the question of a Vice-Chair had arisen in case of a conflict of interest, but in the end there had not been a conflict. A Vice-Chair could be elected if the members so desired. Article 11 of the WADA Statutes stated that the Executive Committee could appoint a Vice-Chair if it deemed it necessary to do so.

MS LINDÉN said that this would not be necessary immediately, but was something that should be considered for the next Executive Committee meeting, as there was pressure from the public authorities side for some kind of balance.

MR CODERRE wanted some clarification regarding the gentlemen's agreement that it would be the turn of the governments to have a chairman after the IOC representative's mandate. He had presumed that it was clear that the governments would be represented after the IOC, but now thought that the appointment of a Vice-Chair would make a good balance.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed, however there had been no such agreement. He would be reluctant to tie WADA into a formula that did not give its members the ability to pick the right person at the right time.

MR CODERRE asked that the Legal Committee look into the matter for future discussion.

MR HOWMAN noted that Articles 7 and 11 stated that there were two Chairs and two Vice-Chairs. The Executive Committee ought to be recommending to the Foundation Board the following day that Mr Pound be re-appointed as Chairman of the Foundation Board until the end of 2004. The Executive Committee appointed its own Chair, but this was a separate process.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the Chair of WADA ought to be appointed by the Foundation Board. Why there would be a separate chair of the Executive Committee he did not know.

DECISIONS

1. Executive Committee members to recommend to the Foundation Board that WADA continue with the current Executive Committee as an interim measure.
2. Executive Committee to think about the appointment of a Vice-Chair at the next meeting.

11.4 Working Committee Renewal

MR HOWMAN referred to the recommendation in the document in the members' files (Annex) regarding the composition and membership of the committees. The proposal had been put together as a discussion paper.

THE CHAIRMAN said that this was an issue that should be addressed so that the Executive Committee would be ready to deal with it at the next meeting.

MR CODERRE said that, in March, the Summit of the Americas would be held, so in April, Canada would be able to make its position clear.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed to ask Mr Howman to conduct an opinion sample. Was a recommendation required for the Foundation Board the following day?

MR HOWMAN said that this should be in place for the first Executive Committee meeting in 2002.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed.

DECISION

Issue of working committee renewal to be resolved for the first meeting of WADA in 2002.

12. Appointment of the Executive Committee and Executive Committee Chairman for 2002

MR HOWMAN suggested that the Executive Committee members propose that Mr Pound be re-elected as WADA's Chairman until the end of 2004.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he would be willing to stay on as the IOC representative until the completion of the WADA Code in 2004, and would also be willing to stay on as Chairman if the Foundation Board approved.

DECISION

Executive Committee to propose to Foundation Board that Mr Pound remain as Chairman of WADA until the end of 2004.

13. Updates and Reports

13.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee Report

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST referred to the report in the members' files (Annex), noting the issues that needed to be addressed.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was surprised that nobody had thought of overheads. WADA would need to make it clear that the grant included overheads, or state in future that its overhead contribution would be a certain percentage.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST noted the difference in overhead costs in different parts of the world. The costs were, however, negotiable.

MR STRETTON said that he found the matter of overheads rather confusing. He was not aware that there were any Australian government institutions involved in any of the research projects.

DECISION

Health, Medical and Research Committee report approved.

13.2 List Committee Report

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that the List Committee was really an ad hoc group working with the Health, Medical and Research Committee. It was composed of specialists knowledgeable in the field of list-related issues.

He referred the members to the document in their files (Annex).

The UCI and other federations had given some input regarding the list.

The principle was to have one doping list and to classify recreational drugs and non-performance enhancement drugs which presented health risks in a different class.

THE CHAIRMAN suggested that Professor Ljungqvist have some discussions with the Code group.

MR KOSS said that the List Committee should make this decision, and the issue should be put on the agenda for the next meeting, as a more thorough discussion was needed.

The Chairman should ask for an explanation in writing from the Health, Medical and Research Committee so that the members would have a substantial document in order to be able to discuss the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed. As to the idea of different classifications, he advised waiting to see what the list looked like before deciding on the matter. He did not think that WADA should state that marijuana, cocaine and heroin were fine for athletes simply because they were not performance-enhancing.

MR LARFAOUI said that one of the problems related to the requests for exemption and authorisation of use of prohibited substances.

THE CHAIRMAN stressed the need to make the matter clear.

MR VERBRUGGEN said that this was good news, but there were still problems where salbutamol and cortico-steroids were concerned. Would it be necessary to wait until 2003 before changing the list? Could the laboratories not be instructed as to declaration of levels as far as salbutamol was concerned?

THE CHAIRMAN recalled that WADA had agreed in 2001 that the current list would be used until 2003 for better or for worse. He was reluctant to make ad hoc changes.

THE PRINCE DE MERODE noted that salbutamol had varying effects depending on the amount taken. It was also very difficult to ban salbutamol because genuine asthma-sufferers had to be treated.

MR VERBRUGGEN wondered whether WADA could ask the laboratories not to mention the case if the salbutamol level was below 100 nanograms.

THE PRINCE DE MERODE thought that this was what the laboratories did.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that WADA could advise the laboratories not to report a case under 100 nanograms if it said so in the rule.

MR HOWMAN confirmed that this was indeed the rule.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that the committee was considering removing cortico-steroids from the list.

He pointed out that narcotics addicts were not often athletes, but the committee was contemplating dealing with such problems in a different way.

DECISIONS

1. Proposal to advise laboratories not to report a positive salbutamol case under 100 nanograms approved.
2. List Committee report approved.

13.3 Laboratory Accreditation Committee Report

MR WALKER referred to the report in the members' files (Annex).

DECISION

Laboratory Accreditation Committee report approved.

13.4 Standards and Harmonisation Committee Report

MR WALKER referred to the report in the members' files (Annex). He was rather disappointed as he had hoped to be in a position to present the results of the committee's deliberations on the test results management protocol, but this had not been finalised in time for the meeting. He hoped that, at the next meeting in May 2002, it would be possible to adopt a document on that topic which, he hoped, would also become part of the Code.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, the sooner that this could be done, the better, because this was important for Independent Observer missions. He would have no objection if the committee could get a document out early to be circulated informally among the members.

DECISION

Standards and Harmonisation Committee report approved.

13.5 Ethics and Education Committee Report

DR VEREEN wished to thank the WADA staff and Nikki Vance for their support of the committee. He referred to the report in the members' files (Annex).

THE CHAIRMAN advised caution as the issue of ethics could grow and lose focus, so it would have to be kept within WADA's mandate.

DECISION

Report by the Ethics and Education Committee approved.

13.6 Athletes' Passport

MR KOSS referred to the report in the members' files (Annex).

He went on to give a presentation on the electronic version of the passport.

With regard to the budget, he had come to an agreement with Mr Reddie.

MR REEDIE said that the expense issue was complex, as much of the project was funded by the EU. He thought that the passport concept was first-class, but questioned the phrase which said that athletes would receive core material at the Games which, in his view, was likely to go straight into the wastepaper basket and stay in Salt Lake City. The athletes were already educated before leaving their countries. At Games, the more athletes were given, the more they left behind.

MS LINDÉN said that perhaps education would eliminate arguments from athletes that they had not realised that they were taking banned substances.

She hoped that the IT technology would be compatible with other systems as well as WADA's system.

THE CHAIRMAN made known his concern regarding security. Who could make changes to these records? There was a whole range of issues that would need medical, ethical, legal and technological study, and he hoped that such issues were being addressed.

MR KOSS said that security was an essential issue.

The objective was for the passport to be voluntary as opposed to obligatory.

With regard to the core material, not all athletes attending the Olympic Games were informed, and he hoped that the material would be read.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, with regard to the distribution of material, WADA would have to get clearance from whoever was in charge of the event.

MR KOSS said that the matter had been cleared with SLOC but not with the IOC.

MR HOWMAN pointed out that Mr Koss should also obtain legal clearance, because any inconsistent material released would open WADA up to all sorts of legal claims.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he would like to see the project work.

DECISION

Further details to be provided on Athletes' Passport before final approval of project.

13.7 EU Projects

MR SYVÄSALMI referred to the documents in the members' files regarding the Independent Observers project and the E-learning project (Annex).

DECISION

EU projects update approved.

13.8 Youth Awareness

Issue to be dealt with during the Foundation Board meeting on 3 December 2001.

13.9 IADA / WADA

MR WADE said that things were progressing well and referred to the documents in the members' files (Annex).

DECISION

IADA / WADA update approved.

13.10 Salt Lake City Olympic Games and Paralympic Games

MR SYVÄSALMI referred to the report in the members' files (Annex).

DECISION

Salt Lake City Olympic Games and Paralympic Games update approved.

14. Out-of-Competition Testing Update

MR HOWMAN reported that the consortium had been negotiated with and had agreed to keep the price per test for the following year the same as it had been for 2001. The contract would be in force until 31 December 2002.

MR LARFAOUI noted, with regard to out-of-competition testing, that the consortium had made its intentions to perform out-of-competition testing known, therefore this could not be classed as out-of-competition testing.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed entirely that there was a problem regarding out-of-competition testing.

MR HOWMAN said that it had been agreed that the IOC would commence pre-competition testing on 29 January 2002, while WADA would continue with its testing programme elsewhere in the world and would not test during the period following the opening of the Olympic Village.

MR REEDIE referred to Mr Larfaoui's comments. There was a technical issue which would need to be discussed

As the consortium involved other national agencies in out-of-competition testing, there was an issue in finding out where the athletes were, and by flagging up too much in advance, there was an indication that a system of out-of-competition testing was about to start, therefore there was a risk that such testing would not be unannounced. This was something that would need to be sharpened up.

It was possible that a national agency might be asked to perform random out-of-competition testing in its country for athletes with which it had never previously dealt. The process of finding out where athletes were was a sensitive one, and he thanked Mr Larfaoui for pointing the matter out.

THE CHAIRMAN stressed the importance of knowing where the athletes are located at all times.

DR SCHAMASCH referred to the issue of testing all the athletes prior to 29 January 2002. The IOC had 78% of the athletes to be competing in the Olympic Games scheduled to be tested.

MR WALKER informed the members that the Monitoring Group had adopted a protocol to the convention 10 days previously and one of the main articles of this protocol was the agreement to recognise WADA's authority to undertake the out-of-competition controls.

A question had been raised as to the openness and transparency of the result management process, and the NADOs of those athletes tested should be able to receive copies of the test results in order to ensure compatibility between the national and the international levels. He asked that the group in charge of the programme see how this request could be taken into account.

DECISIONS

1. Issue of whether the NADOs of those athletes tested should be able to receive copies of the test results in order to ensure compatibility between the national and the international levels to be discussed.
2. Out-of-Competition testing update approved.

15. Other Business

– CONI

THE CHAIRMAN remarked that the CONI battle was still ongoing. CONI had invited WADA to go and look at all the material, therefore he suggested that a visit be made to Rome by some WADA representatives, along with an interpreter.

MR WALKER noted that a visit from WADA would be welcomed by the Italian side, as the Italians felt that the whole thing had been a misunderstanding and always maintained that they had reported on what had transpired, and that this was not a question of growth hormone doping but a question of parallel sorts of research into growth hormone.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the matter should be followed up.

DECISION

CONI issue to be followed up.

16. Next Meeting

THE CHAIRMAN said that there would be an informal Executive Committee meeting in Salt Lake City for those members present, and a formal meeting would take place in April 2002.

DECISION

An informal Executive Committee meeting to be held in Salt Lake City for those members attending the Olympic Games, and a formal meeting to take place in April 2002.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Executive Committee for the preparations they had made for the meeting, which had enabled them to get through a heavy agenda very effectively.

The meeting adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

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