
**Minutes of the WADA Executive Committee Meeting
24 November 2002, Montreal, Canada**

The meeting began at 9 a.m.

1. Welcome

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the members to the meeting of WADA's Executive Committee in Montreal. There would be a meeting of the Foundation Board the following day at 8.30 a.m. sharp in the Delta Hotel.

All of the members knew that one of the members of the Executive Committee, Prince Alexandre de Merode, had passed away on 20 November 2002, after a relatively brief illness. He could certainly say that, having known the Prince de Merode for 30 years, the Olympic Movement would not be anywhere near as far along the road to progress in the fight against doping in sport had it not been for the Prince's leadership of the IOC Medical Commission. He called for a moment of silence in memory of Prince Alexandre de Merode.

2. Roll Call

THE CHAIRMAN said that an attendance sheet would be circulated for those who were present in an official capacity (Annex).

3. Observers

THE CHAIRMAN asked any observers who wished for their names to be recorded to sign the attendance sheet which was being passed around (Annex).

4. Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of 1 October 2002 in Montreal

THE CHAIRMAN thanked those responsible for putting the minutes together. The minutes were a good and complete record of what had been discussed. The minutes would be considered approved as distributed unless, by midday, anybody wished to make any amendments.

MR LARFAOUI noted a problem with regard to the French translation of the minutes, asking that *le role crée-t'il l'organisme ou l'organisme crée-t'il le role* be replaced with *est-ce que c'est l'organe qui crée le fonction ou c'est la fonction qui crée l'organe?*

DR SCHAMASCH referred to page 33 of the minutes (the in-house testing and management update). He wanted the decision to state that WADA was tendering out-of-competition testing services for 2003 with the option of 2004.

THE CHAIRMAN asked Dr Schamasch and Mr Andersen to work together and provide an acceptable text for the decision.

DECISION

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of 1
October 2002 approved subject to amendments

proposed by Mr Larfaoui (French translation) and Dr Schamasch.

5. Strategic Plan

MR WADE said that he would provide the members with a brief background on the general approach and structure to the Strategic Plan, discuss the nature of the document and the subsequent need for regular review, summarise the key programme priorities that had been identified and added to the Strategic Plan, review the current status of the Strategic Plan, update the members on the recommended approach for the ongoing management of the Strategic Plan, and briefly review the performance measurement system.

All of the relevant documents were included in the files (Annex), and all of the changes he would address were indicated in italic bold text.

There were proposed working group terms of reference, and a discussion paper.

The Strategic Plan included the WADA vision, mission, organisational goals and key strategies and programme activities.

The Strategic Plan had been endorsed by the WADA Foundation Board in Cape Town in June 2001. It was a hybrid document which embodied the strategic direction, organisational goals and key priorities, the key strategies which identified programme activities over a five-year period, and benchmarking and programme activities.

As a living document, the plan required regular review. The WADA Management Team was responsible for this, and it needed to look at systems to monitor and update the process for change, based on emerging needs, demand and opportunity. Evaluating success was also important.

The Management Team met a few months prior to the meeting, and identified some additional programme priorities, including the development of a communication strategy, the development and implementation of a global clearing house, the revision of WADA's corporate structure, the development of an effective government communication and relations strategy, and a performance measurement system, which was critical to identifying the success of the organisation.

As for the current status of the Strategic Plan, the members would see seven years of activity in their documents: a review of the 2001-2002 activities, and a draft 2003-2007 rolling five-year plan. The Communications Strategy was complete, and a 2003-2007 five-year plan was to be completed, involving the new directors.

A Strategic Planning and Evaluation Working Group was proposed, involving a COO, a Director of Finance and Administration, a Director of Special Projects, a WADA Finance and Administration Committee representative, and one to two experts. The role of the working group would be to review the format (presentation and working tools) and the five-year activity plan. The administrative process would integrate the Strategic Plan with WADA's annual planning/budgeting process. Finally, the working group would recommend the Performance Measurement System and oversee the conduct of evaluation activities.

With regard to the Performance Measurement System, its development would involve achieving benchmarks, achieving objectives, establishing direct and indirect performance indicators (an example of an indirect performance indicator would be the athletes' confidence in what WADA was doing), establishing measurement tools (typical tools would be surveys or questionnaires), and measuring the impact on achieving objectives.

That, in a nutshell, was an overview of the Strategic Plan.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether anybody had any comments or questions.

DR SCHAMASCH thanked Mr Wade for all of his assistance.

On page 2 of the Strategic Plan, one of the goals was to *coordinate a worldwide programme for in- and out-of-competition testing*. He had thought that WADA's role was out-of-competition testing and that

WADA would perform in-competition testing at the request of the IFs. He could understand such in-competition testing, but he thought it necessary to ensure that the mission statement and the financing were in accordance with WADA's mission statement.

His second question regarded the Memorandum of Understanding to be discussed in Moscow. Could the members of the Executive Committee have a draft of this document?

MR WADE replied that, with regard to the testing programme, the aim was to ensure that the language was consistent.

With regard to the conduct of activities, things should be done in a way that made sense. Some things would be done in-house, whilst others would be done in coordination with partners. WADA wanted to coordinate the activities and, in many cases, conduct them.

The draft Memorandum of Understanding was perhaps more linked to the Code.

DR SCHAMASCH said that it had been referred to in the Strategic Plan.

As for out-of-competition testing, in the goals, he would like to be sure that the mission would be supported by the relevant budget. For the moment, in-competition testing by WADA was not as clear as out-of-competition testing.

THE CHAIRMAN said that one of the difficulties in getting consensus on the Code was linked to what Mr Verbruggen had often described, which was that, if one started a race somewhere, athletes could be subjected to five or six different testing regimes. In-competition testing was carried out at the request of the IFs and on a fee-for-service basis so, budget-wise, it was essentially neutral.

The following day, the Executive Committee wanted the Foundation Board to approve the Strategic Plan. Did the members agree with it as it was?

MR WALKER said that he had had great difficulty getting the document out of his computer, and had been able to look at it only that morning. A very good discussion had been held on the draft revised Strategic Plan at the meeting in October, but he had not had time to look at the new changes in italics.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that, when the members received the documents in electronic format, they should try and open them straight away, in order to be able to notify the secretariat in good time if there were any problems.

DR STRETTON asked when the Performance Measurement System might be developed.

MR WADE replied that, with the new working group in place, this would be developed within six months for sure, but it would be done in incremental stages. It would easily be 12 to 18 months before the PMS was fully operational, but in six months' time, a game plan would certainly be in place.

DECISION

Strategic Plan approved for proposal to the Foundation Board the following day.

6. Finance and Administration

6.1 2002 consolidated accounts as of 30 September 2002

MR REEDIE noted that the information he would be providing would be relatively straightforward, as much had been discussed at the October meeting.

The first document contained information on income and expenditure for the first three quarters of the year (Annex). The committee had tried to put the accounts together in a more logical form, and there were four columns: *headquarters* referred to the Montreal costs; *Lausanne* was the regional office costs; *eliminations* meant the transfer of money from the headquarters to the Lausanne office; and the most important column was the *consolidated* one on the right-hand side. As always, WADA's assets and liabilities were declared on the balance sheet, and these liabilities still included the provision made for the research funding. They included the figure known as *fortune*, which was SFr 5 million, which was the

initial capital of WADA under Swiss law. Although that had been placed in WADA's accounts when it had been established, WADA had actually built up the money to support that capital over the two-and-a-half/three years of WADA's existence.

The profit and loss account dealt with the income and interest, and then went through all of the expenses, including the committee costs and all of the headings to which the members had become used.

MR REEDIE did not think that the accounts needed to be approved; he just thought that they needed to be noted.

DECISION

2002 consolidated accounts as of 30 September 2002
noted.

6.2 2002 government contributions

MR REEDIE said that the document in the members' files (Annex) showed the current state of play with regard to government contributions.

He was aware of the phrase: "strong assurances of payment being forthcoming in the next few weeks". This was a good assurance, but those people who had been dealing specifically with those countries concerned might be able to be more specific.

Major contributions were yet to be paid. The process was slow, and he would be happy to be updated.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that the governments had decided on their respective shares in 2001, in Cape Town. Since the last Executive Committee meeting on 1 October 2002, WADA had sent letters to all of the Executive Committee members regarding the situation, and he thanked them for their responses.

WADA had sent several invoices to the countries identified, which had not paid the exact invoice. There had been a lot of contacts made by many people. Results were beginning to come through, and there were written commitments to pay. These included the Americas' share, which would be 62.19%; the European share, which would be 91.49%; and Russia, Italy, Switzerland and Austria had also provided written commitments to pay their share for 2002. All of the countries that had been late in making their payments had also confirmed that arrangements had been made to pay their 2003 share of the funding, so this was good news.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was entirely confident that the USA would make its payment. There was a strange system in the USA that allowed Congress to be tied up, especially between elections and so forth, but by the third week in January the payment should be made.

He believed that, where WADA had a firm commitment in writing, it should recognise that revenue in 2002, which should trigger a corresponding payment from the Olympic Movement. These commitments should not be seen as contingencies. It was important not to reduce WADA's budget or allow some of the items to get pushed over into another year, and therefore cut back on anti-doping activities which everybody thought were important.

In the case of the USA, Austria, Belgium, Italy and Switzerland, he thought that WADA could be sure and, if all of the promises were kept, WADA would have US\$ 7.12 million out of the original budget.

MR MIKKELSEN said that there were many explanations, but only a few excuses, regarding the slow process in Europe and, on behalf of the European Commission, he expressed his regret. The hesitant progress did not reflect a lack of commitment to WADA. The European governments were generally very committed to WADA and its mission. Since the Danish Government had taken over the presidency, he had given the issue priority and put significant pressure on the slow payers. He expressed his gratitude to the Director General. Most of the governments had now paid their contributions, and others should follow within a few weeks. Furthermore, the necessary procedures should be in place to secure the financing for 2003. There had recently been a European Sports Ministers meeting, and all fifteen of the European

Union Member States were committed to paying, also for 2003. There was a good mood prevailing and the belief that a common effort should be made to secure all of the payments as soon as possible.

MR LARFAOUI asked what date would be set for payment of the 2002 funds. Would it be set for 2003? If so, there would then be the problem of the adoption of budgets for 2003. The budgets for 2002 should be paid before the end of December 2002.

MR DEVILLERS said that, with regard to the Americas, the information given was that the commitment of the USA was firm; it was simply a matter of internal processes being worked out.

With regard to the US\$ 865,000, a Summit of the Americas was to be held in Brazil from 13 to 15 December to deal precisely with the issue. There were no firm commitments for the balance, but this matter would be addressed at the summit.

As for Canada, the balance owed was simply a matter of formality in payment, and this should be forthcoming.

MR WALKER said that the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on Wednesday had agreed for the apportionment of the shares for the 48 individual European countries for the 2003 payments. At least the individual governments knew what their percentage share would be when the proportions of the contributions to the ordinary budget were decided at that week's meetings of the Committee of Ministers. The principle would be the same as for 2002, but the proportions or contributions to the ordinary budget were going to change.

MR TOKUSHIGE thanked the members for their efforts to make governments pay, and he hoped that the governments in particular would continue their efforts with regard to the budget. Reaching the target would constitute a major challenge. The Japanese Finance Ministry had strongly declared that, unless the other countries paid their shares of the 2002 budget, Japan would have to take that into account when it decided on how much it would be prepared to pay for 2003.

There were seven Asian countries currently paying contributions, and Japan felt that it might be necessary to create a system to enable Asian countries other than the seven countries currently paying to make fair and equitable contributions to WADA.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, as he went through the continents, it was disappointing to see that Africa had not managed to make its full contribution, despite having a small share to pay. He recognised the difficulties with getting payment, and that had been reflected in the very small portion allocated to Africa.

In America, he thought that the chances of getting the US\$ 865,000 out of the remaining countries in the Americas were practically nil.

He agreed with his Japanese colleague that only seven Asian countries paying did not seem very fair: it was very clear, looking at the numbers, that Japan had borne a disproportionate share of the expenses for 2002, and he fully understood the Japanese reluctance to continue on such a basis, particularly if other countries were not going to participate.

He thanked the European representatives for their efforts and comments. It was important to the success of WADA and the success of anti-doping programmes that the European contributions and support be there. Over 50% of all Olympic athletes came from Europe.

Oceania had paid its share in full, for which he was grateful.

He suspected that, over the next couple of years, WADA would need to spend quite a lot of time with the governments. He did not know if the Cape Town formula was right, and the governments would have to examine that. He hoped that the Memorandum of Understanding would ease the problem, but it was certainly a problem, and he thought that one of the main priorities of WADA would be to work with the governments to provide assistance in achieving the correct allocation between continents.

With regard to Mr Larfaoui's observation, he understood that there was a difference between a promise and cash, but it was important for WADA to take the promise as if it were going to get paid for the 2002 fiscal period even though it might not get the money until 2003, because he would like the programmes, especially the research, to be funded from the budget of 2002.

MR REEDIE thanked the Chairman. From a purely financial point of view, he thought that much progress had been made. He echoed the Chairman's request that the governments, presumably in Moscow, look carefully at how the allocation should be done and when the 2003 contributions should be made.

If the Executive Committee wished, he would strongly support a decision to accrue into the 2002 accounts the money which people, in writing, had said that they would pay. That would then trigger a similar payment from the Olympic Movement. The Olympic Movement had been extremely understanding and, in the absence of some of these payments, had been prepared to pre-fund in 2003, on a cash-flow basis, advance contributions from the Olympic Movement to help WADA. In his view, that might not be required, provided those government contributions were accrued and then paid, and provided there was a similar payment from the Olympic Movement. Everything was coming together, but rather slowly, and progress was being made.

DECISIONS

1. Proposal to recognise firm commitment to pay in writing as part of the 2002 contributions.
2. 2002 government contributions update approved.

6.3 2003 budget

MR REEDIE noted that one of the duties of the Foundation Board, in terms of its constitutional rules, was that it had to approve a budget for 2003. A draft had been put to the Executive Committee at its last meeting, and a number of changes had been made as a result of that meeting.

With regard to page 1 of the document in the members' files (Annex), the Finance and Administration Committee was of the view that it would like to operate on the basis of the previously notified maximum figures requested by the public authorities some years ago and allocate a division of contributions to governments on a figure of somewhere just in excess of US\$ 10 million.

Also, the Finance and Administration Committee had introduced a contingency for non-payment and, if payments were made, that contingency could be removed on an item-by-item basis.

The major changes since the figures seen by the Executive Committee in October were under *Special Projects*. The Finance and Administration Committee had increased these expenses by US\$ 184,000 for the information technology costs that it thought were likely to be met.

Under the *Standards and Harmonisation* section, the committee had increased the out-of-competition testing costs but, the combination of out-of-competition testing on a contract with WADA's outside provider, plus the laboratory analysis, was designed to be, for 2003, the figure that WADA knew it would be for 2002.

Under the heading of *General Director's Office*, the committee had included provision for a second Foundation Board meeting in 2003, in accordance with the Executive Committee's decision that the Foundation Board should meet at the time of the conference in Copenhagen and then later on in 2003, therefore there would be two Foundation Board meetings in 2003, and those costs had been taken into account.

The Finance and Administration Committee had slightly decreased the payments for research projects, as the budget had to be balanced somewhere, therefore the *Health, Medical and Research* heading had taken the "small hit".

With regard to telecommunications and *Operational costs*, the Finance and Administration Committee had tried to pull the whole thing together, rather than have separate items.

Finally, he had looked at the Lausanne salary figures and thought that they were rather too high. He suspected that WADA had moved from Swiss Francs to Canadian Dollars without necessarily making the appropriate conversion. He thought that the Lausanne costs were, as a result, on the high side.

The Finance and Administration Committee might need to make further changes as a result of the discussions that day.

The report was to be formally put to the Foundation Board for approval the following day.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if anybody wished to make any comments.

DR SCHAMASCH thanked Mr Reddie for his explanation. He regretted that the budget cuts had been made on research, which was one of the priorities of WADA in his opinion. There was a need to make cuts, and he trusted the financial experts, but he thought that these cuts could have been made elsewhere.

Also, he had been in Athens two days previously, where he had reviewed some EU-financed projects, and he had been told that the EU had no more funds for anti-doping projects. He wanted to know what was happening with regard to the projects currently being funded (he thought that there was US\$ 1.3 million involved).

Would WADA consult the projects already under way to avoid funding similar projects? A total of €2 million had been invested in research, and it would be regrettable to spend money on similar work, or duplicating research work. The projects should be reviewed in order to see where savings could be made.

DR RABIN said that one of his roles was to coordinate research projects. One of his next priorities would be to work with Dr Garnier and consult with the European Commission with regard to the coordination of activities in order to avoid funding the same projects twice.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he had received the same information on EU funding from the European Commission, that it would not be able to fund any more anti-doping projects. This had astonished him somewhat. Oral information had been received the previous Thursday, and when WADA received written notice, it would take further steps. When WADA had tried to find out the technical and legal reasons as to why the European Commission had been unable to finance WADA the previous year, the European Commission had been unable to answer, and he now understood why, because, obviously, the procedures were complicated. The EU had competence in the field of research and science, and there might be a possibility to receive funding. If so, WADA would seize that opportunity.

Dr Rabin and Dr Garnier would meet the person responsible for the research funds, and this was why it was also very important to acknowledge the proposal of the Finance and Administration Committee to have research as it was now. If and when WADA could obtain more money, it would enable WADA to use the contingency.

MR MIKKELSEN clarified that the European Commission was totally independent of the governments. There had been many discussions with the Commission, along with Ms Viviane Reding, and views did not always coincide with regard to priorities. The governments were using a lot of money, domestically, on research, and he hoped that the Commission would reconsider, take a strong stand and set some priorities with regard to research.

MR WALKER noted that he had only just discovered something regarding the 2003 budget in general. The members would remember that, at the Foundation Board meeting in December 2001 in Lausanne, there had been a discussion regarding the maximum levels of future budgets, and figures had been agreed for each of the years from 2003 to 2006. For 2003, the agreed maximum budget for WADA had been US\$ 20,235,000, which was not the figure that was currently before the members. The difference came from the contribution from Montreal International. This posed the question that, if this was income money, and if it was included in the budget, then the budget was US\$ 948,000 higher than the decision made by the Foundation Board. There seemed to be some kind of contradiction.

MR REEDIE asked the members to look at page 18 of the October minutes. The Finance and Administration Committee had come with its own list of 2003 priorities, which were: completion of the Code; the World Conference on Doping in Sport; the list of prohibited substances; laboratory accreditation; and the Out-of-Competition Testing Programme, and he did not remember anybody disagreeing with those priorities. The second priorities were: Youth Awareness; research; Independent Observers; and the development of national anti-doping agencies.

He absolutely agreed with Dr Schamasch that research was an essential part of the exercise. Certainly over the past 12 months, the Finance and Administration Committee had put in its budget those commitments that it had absolutely had to take on, such as moving staff to Montreal, taking on new

offices, etc. If new commitments were taken on, they would have to be absolute. As additional contributions were paid, he hoped that it would be possible to increase the amount of research money.

He thought that, technically, what Mr Walker was saying was correct, but one of the important parts of the original budget exercise, looking five or six years ahead, at the request of the governments, had been to know the maximum contribution to be made by the governments, and the answer was that the governments were not making any more than the maximum contributions that had been agreed a year ago. The fact that there were additional funds from Montreal International did not mean that the governments and the Olympic Movement should be allowed to reduce their contributions. He regarded the Montreal International contribution as being separate to the maximum contributions that governments would be asked to make.

If increased contributions came in from both of WADA's major supporters, then WADA would be able to fund much more research than it had to date, which would be a very good thing.

THE CHAIRMAN said that one of the primary roles of WADA was to coordinate activities, so it would be looking for ways not to duplicate things, and this certainly applied to research.

He shared Mr Reddie's view that research was a very important activity of WADA. On the other hand, not only from the perspective of not being reckless, but also from a legal perspective, WADA would not commit to spending more money than it had, and if research funding had to be cut back as a result of the failure of partners to make their agreed-upon contributions, then this was what would be done. WADA would have had a little more money to spend on research if all of the parties, including the Olympic Movement, had observed the provisions of the Statutes, which were to provide their contributions in advance of the year. The Olympic Movement had decided not to do that, for its own reasons.

The only issue he had was that he would like the Finance and Administration Committee to restate what it had called its contingency. On the basis of the receipts since the document had been prepared and the promises to pay, he would like to get that out of the contingency and in as a receivable, so that the money in doubt was less than US\$ 6 million. He would also rather not call it a contingency.

DR SCHAMASCH thought that the problem of having a reserve or a contingency fund was important. The IOC had given it some thought. He asked Mr Reddie what the final position of the Executive Committee regarding the 2003 budget was. Would they be starting off with US\$ 21 million or US\$ 15 million?

THE CHAIRMAN replied that they would be starting off with US\$ 21 million.

MR TOKUSHIGE noted that, looking at the payment situation for 2002, he took issue with the increase by US\$ 1.5 million of the government contributions for 2003. The 2003 applications for budgetary allocations had already been closed in Japan, so this could not be changed. He urged that WADA try to find alternative sources of funding, other than the Olympic Movement and government contributions, and also that it set down a ceiling for other contributions.

With regard to the matter of contingency, this would cover an emergency situation if WADA did not have all of the contributions, but this might also constitute an acceptance of non-payment by some governments. Such a system penalised the honest members who paid.

With regard to item 6.3 and the list of priorities, he recognised the importance of research activities, but he believed that the establishment of the regional offices was crucial to the expansion of WADA's activities throughout the world so, in his view, the regional offices should be at the top of the priorities list.

MR MIKKELSEN said that, in 2001, an increase in the budget had been accepted, but some European governments had been complaining about the increases. His government supported such an increase, but not all governments did.

The European presidency supported the Japanese Government. The fight against doping was very important all over the world, and he thought that Asia should have a regional office, and that this office should be listed not on the contingency budget but on the ordinary budget.

MR DE VILLERS agreed that Asia should have a regional office, Japan having been a faithful contributor to the budgetary process, and supported Japan's position. He noted that Switzerland had not paid its share, despite having a regional office.

DR STRETTON supported the views of the previous three speakers.

THE CHAIRMAN said that everybody had agreed that WADA should look for alternative sources of revenue but, unless and until WADA could go to the public and say that the stakeholders believed sufficiently in this organisation and its work that they were paying what they had promised to pay, it was very hard to go to the private sector and ask for help because WADA's own stakeholders were not committed.

If WADA wanted to look for alternative sources of revenue, he thought that they should be incremental; in other words, whatever was raised from the private sector would allow WADA to do more, and not simply replace the stakeholders' contributions.

Those who did not pay should not be able to benefit from non-payment, and WADA had a mechanism in its statutes which allowed for the reduction of participation on the Foundation Board in the event of non-payment by a continent so, if there were continents that did not pay, they would lose representation on WADA.

Everybody agreed with regard to the regional offices. The five-year budget had been developed on the basis of a strategic plan, and the Asian payment structure and the disproportionate share that Japan was absorbing clearly showed that WADA needed a regional office there to deal with the governments in particular, as well as the sports community, to make sure that they understood the importance of paying.

WADA simply could not undertake any obligation unless it had the money to do so. WADA could not be run on a deficit basis.

MR REEDIE said, with regard to additional and outside resources, that it was always easy to say that a sponsor could be found, but there was no pot of gold out there.

He clearly understood the Japanese position, and he agreed with Mr Mikkelsen's comment regarding increases, but the public authorities had been the ones to request maximum figures for six years.

He thought that WADA could look, in light of what looked like increased contributions from the original projection in 2002, and apply that forward to 2003. That would allow WADA to have sufficient additional funding to satisfy a regional office in Asia, and it might allow WADA to satisfy demand for slightly higher research funding.

That year's contribution from the public authorities and the Olympic Movement had been US\$ 8.5 million for each. The next year's contribution would be US\$ 10.1 million. This was not an enormous increase. He knew that nobody wished to pay any more, and he understood that budgets were laid down and prepared well in advance, but this was a relatively modest increase. He would prefer to hold the basic format of the budget as it was, and he would find a different word for *contingency*. WADA could have a smaller reserve, allocate the money saved to the purposes indicated, and that would allow the Foundation Board to take a decision the following day.

He reiterated that an increase of US\$ 1.6 across the board was not hugely significant.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that WADA would go forward with the revised figures for approval by the Foundation Board.

DECISION

2003 budget to be submitted to the Foundation Board for approval.

6.4 IAS

MR REEDIE said that the Finance and Administration Committee had been asked to look at the adoption of International Accounting Standards for WADA. He had since found an opinion expressed by the Olympic Movement, in particular the IOC, which operated according to the IAS basis and, he thought,

would like an organisation which it funded to do the same. He was not convinced that WADA would derive any great improvement in the way it handled its money by accounting for it under a different standard. Nevertheless, if one of WADA's major funders wished it to be done this way, then he would be happy to do it, the difference being that the IOC operated on set contracts for income, so it knew pretty well where its income was coming from. WADA had no contractual relationship with anybody in terms of its income, and that made the operation of IAS a little bit more difficult, but it could be done, and if it was to be done, then he made a plea that WADA start monitoring it over 2003 and then keep its accounts according to IAS for 2004.

MR MIKKELSEN agreed with the recommendation, but it was important for him and some governments to secure full transparency, so would it be possible to implement those parts of the standards which would be relevant in order to secure transparency?

THE CHAIRMAN said that he did not know whether "half a loaf" was possible.

MR REEDIE said that WADA could not be selective. WADA would either have to sign up for IAS or not.

The Finance and Administration Committee recorded every cent received and every cent of expenditure so, in financial terms, he thought that WADA was very transparent.

He thought that he was going to have to fall back on the request from one of WADA's major funders that WADA operate according to IAS, and if the IOC was involved in IAS, then WADA should move to adopt it for 2004. The recommendation in the members' files had been made before he had received a very clear suggestion from the Olympic Movement that the Olympic Movement would prefer it to be done according to IAS. He did not think that the change would be hugely significant; it cost a little bit more, but he was not sure how well it would work.

MR DE VILLERS said that he would support the move to IAS if the cost was not significant.

THE CHAIRMAN said that IAS would cost at least US\$ 70,000 per year.

The term *transparency* was being overused. He thought that WADA was so transparent that it was beyond belief. If anybody had a specific problem, then WADA would address it. He did not think that WADA would be any more transparent with IAS, nor did he think that there was a single organisation around the table that used IAS, but this was up to the Executive Committee to decide.

MR REEDIE agreed that it was the Executive Committee that would have to decide.

THE CHAIRMAN asked all those in favour of implementing IAS to raise their hands. Since seven were in favour of IAS, and nobody opposed, as and from 2004, WADA would be using IAS.

DECISION

Proposal for WADA to operate by way of IAS as and from 2004 approved.

6.5 Staffing

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL referred the members to the staffing update in their files (Annex). Ten new staff members were listed, but unfortunately Mara Cornejo had been unable to take up the position offered, so the final point in the update should actually read *33 staff members from 11 different nationalities*.

The report also mentioned positions which were currently being advertised.

The position of COO had been tendered on the WADA website for one month, and the deadline for applications had been 6 November. There had been six applicants for the post, three of whom had not had an international sporting background, and had therefore been eliminated. The three remaining candidates had been interviewed by Mr Niggli and himself, and he was happy to note that all three candidates had possessed the necessary qualities. The interviewers' views had been presented to the President of WADA, who had accepted their recommendation to appoint Mr Howman, starting on 1 March 2003, as COO/Special Counsel, for two years plus a possible extension of one year, in other words, until

28 February 2005, with the possibility to extend the post for another year, with notification then to be received by 1 September 2004. He was delighted that Mr Howman had been able to accept the offer.

DR SCHAMASCH asked about the time period regarding the personnel for the World Conference on Doping in Sport. Would they be hired on a limited contract?

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL replied that WADA had not yet hired anybody, but if there were to be a time period, it would be four months.

DECISIONS

3. Mr Howman appointed COO/Special Counsel, starting from 1 March 2003, for a period of two plus one years.
4. Staffing update approved.

7. Information Technology strategy

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that the Information Technology strategy had been discussed at the previous Executive Committee meeting. This was a complex issue, and it was sometimes hard to predict the future. A huge internal process had taken place in order to find the best way to go ahead.

The IT system development covered the Athletes' Passport project, such as the whereabouts information, and should include a central doping control database, management of the out-of-competition testing and clearing house test coordination and result management.

Many possibilities had been investigated over the past few months, and the Foundation Board was now left with two alternatives. WADA could either develop a new system, or create a new system from the existing system. The document in the members' files (Annex) showed the options in greater detail.

He felt that there was a need to conduct an independent review, in spite of the tender, of the alternatives in order to make the final decision. This was a complex issue, and it was felt that WADA needed to rely on another independent review for the purpose of transparency.

WADA representatives had attended the GAISF meeting and had seen that there was a real demand for a clearing house by the IFs.

Mr Niggli, Ms Khadem, Mr Hoistad and Mr Andersen would be able to answer any questions that the members might have.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members whether they agreed to engage an independent consultant to advise WADA on the alternatives that were before the members.

MS ELWANI asked what the US\$ 300,000 was for. Why there was a sudden need for extra money?

MR NIGGLI replied that this sum would enable WADA to move faster and have something in place by the end of 2003. It was a question of investing earlier in the project rather than later.

DR STRETTON said that he had no problem with the recommendation of getting an external consultant to advise on the matter.

In terms of the option to develop a new system, had WADA discussed the matter with only one company?

With regard to the cost, he had thought that it would be US\$ 3 million. He was rather confused.

MR LARFAOUI asked, with regard to the test database, whether it would all be done in relation with the IFs and with their agreement.

MR WALKER observed that, after the Executive Committee meeting in October and the decision to consult with the Standards and Harmonisation Committee, this was a very important thing for WADA and he entirely agreed with the decision proposed.

He had three observations which should be included in the remit of the external consultant. The issue was extremely sensitive, and he requested the assurance that all possible measures for the protection of personal data would be taken. All possible security mechanisms should be in place. He was very sceptical about Oracle, partly because of its cost, and also because it was a system which was not generally available. He thought that an existing system should be used. It would also be more helpful for the partners that WADA would need to have to make the system work.

MR NIGGLI replied to Dr Stretton. The company that had been consulted, Oracle, had been the only one, due to the fact that it had been a long process to obtain an idea of costs from an independent company. If the recommendation were to move forward in the direction of creating something new, then it would certainly be possible to talk to other companies.

With regard to the cost, he could not give an answer straight away, but it had been agreed that it would be done within the next year's budget available for it, and this would be built upon year after year depending on the resources available.

MR ANDERSEN said that the system would provide support for the IFs so that they would be able to use the Passport and whereabouts information systems. In addition, it would provide service to the IFs in terms of the testing database so that the IFs could link up to the system and use it as their own database.

MR MIKKELSEN noted that, in many countries, this was the responsibility of the national anti-doping organisations, so why was it so important for WADA to do it?

DR SCHAMASCH said that he would like to know about the US\$ 51,000 that had been spent, and confirm that the clearing house and the budget for the moment were part of the consultation done with ASDA and Oracle.

MR ANDERSEN told Mr Mikkelsen that this was also a service for the NFs. Many national agencies had also requested WADA's services. A worldwide network in this respect was needed, so this was an answer to a request from national agencies to do this on a global basis and actually save money.

MR NIGGLI noted that the amount that figured in the 2002 accounts was not related to the exercise that had been done with Oracle; it was linked with some investment that had been made in relation to the Passport with ASDA.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether the members were in favour of hiring an independent consultant. He thought that WADA should find an independent consultant who would tell WADA not to invent its own system, as it would be ruinously expensive.

DECISION

Independent consultant to advise WADA on the direction to follow with regard to the IT strategy.

8. Conflict of interest (Re. voting)

MR HOWMAN noted that a conflict of interest policy had been introduced at the Foundation Board meeting in Lausanne in March 2000, and had emanated from the IICGADS meeting that the governments had held in Montreal just prior to the Lausanne Foundation Board meeting. Since that date, the members would recall the considerable discussions that had taken place on the meaning of conflict of interest. Despite the discussions, nothing had been done with regard to the policy; in Tallinn, it had simply been put to one side.

The Legal Committee had been asked to simplify or amend the policy, therefore it had attempted to do so in the document provided (Annex), a paper which could be discussed and debated, considered and perhaps accepted. This was therefore an attempt to simplify the current policy, and it ought to be presented to the Foundation Board for a decision the following day.

DR SCHAMASCH referred to the definition of *party*. Were staff members excluded from voting?

MR HOWMAN replied that the staff were not there as the current policy applied to the Executive Committee and Foundation Board members only, but there was no reason why this could not be extended.

DR STRETTON noted that the issue was problematic: how did one think about this? With out-of-competition testing, where ASDA was part of a consortium, and he had strong views on this issue, would he not be able to be involved in a discussion about, for example, bringing out-of-competition testing in-house? This was very important, but how it was implemented would come down to the Chairman's judgement, with which he felt comfortable. He was a little confused as to how it would all pay out.

THE CHAIRMAN answered that he did not know; it would all depend on the circumstances of each particular case.

MR HOWMAN noted that the policy was already there, so it was not a question of what would happen in the future. The aim had been to simplify the policy so that there was a little more understanding. He guessed that what the Chairman had said was accurate: each case would have to be determined on the basis of the information put before the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, in terms of simplification, the proposed amendment to Article 1 did not simplify the question at all.

DR STRETTON said that it could become very complicated, and he hoped that common sense would prevail in the end.

MR LARFAOUI noted that, the more they went into detail, the more complicated the matter became. The matter should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

MR HOWMAN said that the committee could now take the document back and look at it, but it should be discussed by the Foundation Board.

DECISION

Conflict of interest issue to be discussed at the Foundation Board meeting.

9. IPC representation and committee roles and structures

9.1 International Paralympic Committee representation on WADA Foundation Board

THE CHAIRMAN proposed that this item be raised the following day at the Foundation Board meeting. A representative of the IPC on the Foundation Board would constitute a very important addition. It would also mean that the governments would have to pick an additional representative in order to maintain the 50-50 balance and determine from which continental group the representative would come. He would leave it up to the government representatives to figure out how best to do that. The matter had been talked about for over a year now, and he was afraid that it was now time to act

DECISION

IPC representation on the WADA Foundation Board to be discussed at the Foundation Board meeting the following day.

9.2 Committee roles and structures

THE CHAIRMAN noted that this was a follow-up matter. Dr Stretton and Mr Reddie had put their heads together to recommend to the Foundation Board the following day how best to operate WADA, both from the perspective of the Executive Committee and the Foundation Board.

DR STRETTON said that this proposal followed on from the earlier paper which had been discussed briefly the previous time regarding the respective roles of the Foundation Board and the Executive Committee. This paper suggested that the Executive Committee should meet more frequently and that the Foundation Board could meet once a year. The proposal was, therefore, that the Foundation Board meet once a year, either in October or November, and that the Executive Committee meet three times a year, one of those times being the day before the Foundation Board meeting.

The secretariat or anybody around the table could ask for items to be put on the Executive Committee agenda; papers should be distributed at least two weeks in advance of the meetings so that everybody could come prepared; and it was also important that, as the performance indicators were developed, the management report on progress against those.

The proposal aimed to break the current link between the Foundation Board and the Executive Committee and set up a more sensible way forward.

MR REEDIE stated that Dr Stretton and he had thought that only two standing committees needed to be in place: the Finance and Administration Committee and the Health, Medical and Research Committee. Apart from that, the Executive Committee should establish project teams for specific jobs and, once the job was finished, the project team would go out of business.

DR SCHAMASCH thought that Article 3 of the document was rather restrictive, as Foundation Board members would have no right to submit items for the agenda, therefore he proposed amending the article. In general, however, he agreed with the proposals.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed with Dr Schamasch.

He observed that there were a number of issues for the Executive Committee to consider. WADA was a new organisation, the members were still getting used to the idea of working together, and the Foundation Board was really the constituent entity. The management was somewhat streamlined to allow the Executive Committee to do virtually all of the business of the organisation. The members, particularly those representing the public authorities, should consider whether or not it would be a good idea to have a Foundation Board meeting only once a year. The continuity aspect needed to be borne in mind.

The fewer the committees, the better, but one of the ways of keeping the "W" in WADA was involving as many people from as many countries as possible in the activities. Was this the best possible way to expand the mission and the commitment to an organisation of this nature?

He did think, however, that the Executive Committee should meet more often than twice a year, especially if the Code were going to be approved in March 2003, as there would be a lot of work to do.

He did not know if WADA should decide anything then and there, but the issues should be raised the following day as a matter of fairness.

MR REEDIE agreed. The Foundation Board could decide the following day as to the number of meetings per year. He had been more interested in streamlining the committee structure.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if Mr Reedie could give the Executive Committee an idea of how much money would be saved by not having committee meetings.

MR REEDIE replied that WADA would certainly save enough money to be able to pay for IAS.

DR SCHAMASCH asked whether the Foundation Board would define the method of appointing committees. Six was an ideal number for the number of committee members. Would precise guidelines be made?

THE CHAIRMAN said that the committees would be named on an annual basis by the Foundation Board at its single meeting. It was necessary to balance the efficiency of operations with the inclusive nature of what WADA was trying to accomplish.

DECISION

Proposal regarding committee roles and structures (including amendment proposed by Dr Schamasch to enable Foundation Board members to submit items for

the agenda) to be submitted to the Foundation Board the following day.

10. Out-of-competition testing

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the documents in the members' files were very clear.

MR ANDERSEN said that this item would be discussed the following day in detail. Unless there were any questions, he would let the members read the documents and would deal with the matter the following day.

10.1 Provider 2003

THE CHAIRMAN observed that a decision was requested of the Executive Committee to authorise the WADA management to negotiate the contract with the DFSC, and then there was a second paragraph which said that, should the negotiations not be satisfactory, the management of the testing programme should be brought in-house for 2003. He did not think that it would be possible for 2003, so he thought that, if a satisfactory deal could not be made with the DFSC, another deal should be made.

One of the disadvantages of being fully transparent was that the DFSC knew exactly how much WADA had budgeted for testing and, to the great surprise of absolutely nobody, their bid was exactly that amount. WADA should feel free to look elsewhere whilst still accomplishing what it was that it wanted to do. One of the prices that WADA paid for transparency was that it was transparent, and those doing business with WADA knew, one way or another, what it was that WADA had budgeted.

MR ANDERSEN agreed, but the DFSC was the only one to have provided feedback.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the DFSC was expanding, having got together with every one of the national anti-doping agencies, and there was nobody else in town, so WADA needed to be able to deal with this.

PROFESSOR DE ROSE wished to stress that out-of-competition testing could not be performed during competitions.

THE CHAIRMAN said that one of the reasons for coordination was to avoid five or six people showing up to test the same athletes on the same day.

PROFESSOR DE ROSE added that the question of authority was a problem. There should be an agreement or a communication with the medical commission in charge of the competition in question, so that the athletes knew who was controlling what.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that everybody agreed that there was a need for coordination.

MR LARFAOUI said that WADA was concerned with out-of-competition testing, and it was up to the organising committee and the IFs to perform testing in-competition.

DR SCHAMASCH said that WADA should be careful with regard to the IDTM communication on its website, which stated that it was the company performing tests for WADA. IDTM worked well, but tended to overstate its functions as if it held a monopoly.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed that this could be done.

Did the Executive Committee members wish to give that mandate to their management?

DECISION

Executive Committee to authorise WADA management to negotiate 2003 contract with the DFSC. Should negotiations not be satisfactory, another deal to be made.

10.2 Strategy 2003-2004

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the objective was to bring the testing programme in-house by 2004, pursuant to a decision taken more than a year ago. Did the members still wish to continue with this objective?

DR STRETTON asked whether he could take part in the discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that Dr Stretton could take part.

DR STRETTON said that he did not agree with this decision. He had asked a number of times for a detailed cost benefit analysis to be done, and he did not think that this had been done. He appreciated that the first seven supporting reasons in the document (Annex) were necessary in any out-of-competition testing programme carried out, but WADA could achieve all of these if it managed its contract well. His alternative would be that, instead of trying to bring the expertise into WADA, WADA could achieve the same objectives by bringing in expertise in terms of the contract management, and if WADA could achieve those objectives, then he would have thought that the key stakeholders would be comfortable with that outcome. He was not convinced that it was necessary to bring the testing in-house to achieve that outcome.

The costs and benefits were unclear to him, and he was worried because the outcomes could not be guaranteed. WADA had a process which worked well.

MR DE VILLERS pointed out that the role of WADA was one of coordination, and he wondered whether WADA needed to be doing the testing to accomplish its main goal. He understood that a decision had been made, but he shared Dr Stretton's concern.

MR REEDIE said that WADA had struggled with this issue, purely on the money side, since it had started. He understood that the long-term intention was to bring the overall management in-house. Part of WADA's job was to develop national anti-doping agencies. The agencies would be out in the field sample-collecting and would be the chain of custody to the laboratories. However, the overall management and development of the programme would be done by WADA, and where he disagreed with Dr Stretton was that he saw no great point in handing out management responsibility to an outside contractor when it would appear that there was only one outside contractor out there. If WADA had that management in-house, it might be able to develop a contractor situation. It seemed absolutely crucial that WADA do that, because if it was going to develop a clearing house and have overall control over who was being tested wherever in the world, it made no sense to have the out-of-competition testing management contracted out to somebody else. It seemed to him that it all fitted neatly in-house, and that WADA should be taking it on board.

MR TOKUSHIGE said that, with regard to out-of-competition testing, WADA did not need to do all of the aspects in-house. As for management, there already existed laboratories and organisations with expertise, so if it was financially to WADA's advantage then it should make good use of the existing organisations with expertise.

What was meant by in-house, exactly?

MS ELWANI asked whether they were talking about the management or the whole procedure.

THE CHAIRMAN informed Ms Elwani that only the management was being referred to. The testing would be done by outside agencies.

DR STRETTON referred to WADA's current situation, where it had a monopoly provider. Governments had faced such issues in a number of areas, and the fact that WADA had a monopoly provider was not necessarily an argument to bring the management in-house. The fact that there was a monopoly provider at that moment did not mean that there would always be one. The Chairman had said that the DFSC had brought all of the NADOs into its nest, but this would not necessarily be the case in the future, as competition would develop if the monopoly provider was starting to earn monopoly profits.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that this was a fair observation; the situation was more of an oligopoly at the moment, economically-speaking. One of the items of leverage with which the Executive Committee had

just provided its management was to see whether it might not pry apart some of the club to get better prices.

One of the principal sources of the request to take the programme in-house had been from the IFs, so that the duplications or gaps currently existing could be eliminated.

MR KOEHLER noted that WADA was not looking at forming a worldwide sample collection network to coordinate the testing. WADA had asked for the consortium to demonstrate how, as a service provider, it would promote and support national anti-doping agency development, which the consortium had correctly done in its tender.

To bring the programme in-house, WADA would continue to use the national anti-doping agencies and IDTM. It was WADA's goal to support national anti-doping agencies and to build capacity in order to be successful. The pure management of the testing programme was having the ability to plan independently the testing that would be performed worldwide and coordinating that with the domestic national anti-doping agencies.

He was also confident, having worked with the DFSC, that he could assure the members that WADA would be far better off, financially, by bringing the testing programme in-house, and would build more confidence within its stakeholders.

There had been meetings with over 25 IFs and the common message had been that WADA needed to start managing the testing programme by selecting athletes, deciding who would be tested, and working day-to-day to gain a better understanding of what was going on in the field. This was why it was important that WADA use the national anti-doping agencies, but use the management and the expertise in-house.

MR ANDERSEN added that the thinking behind it was to manage the laboratory contracts and negotiations in-house. There was an obvious advantage to doing this in-house.

DR SCHAMASCH pointed out that the market of the fight against doping represented some US\$ 70 million, for all of the in- and out-of-competition testing. This market should not become competitive, as it would be to the detriment of quality, so he advised that WADA be careful not to make this an open market. He thought that WADA should define the average cost of the tests so that all would be clear from the outset. Once a market became big, many people came knocking on the door. WADA should keep a hold over the market to avoid a downslide.

PROFESSOR DE ROSE supported the proposal, as WADA had many people who were capable of doing the work, and WADA should control the quality of that work because, in the end, WADA would be responsible for the results. The NOCs therefore supported the proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN said that WADA wanted to encourage the creation of national anti-doping agencies, and an expansion in the number of laboratories that were able to do the kind of work that WADA wanted, subject to meeting the standards that WADA decided were appropriate. He advised the members to remember one of the big criticisms of the old system of laboratories, which was that it had been a club, and the club members had decided who would get in and what the pricing structure should be. It had been very much an "old boys' network", and a matter of great criticism of the IOC system at the time, so the idea of there being some competition, subject to standards being observed, did not appear to him to be offensive, but he did agree that WADA had to make sure that the standards were properly met.

MR DE VILLERS asked about the issue of independence, and wondered whether there might be some danger.

THE CHAIRMAN did not think so. WADA was a mix of the Olympic Movement and the public authorities, and it was hard to imagine anything that would be more independent.

Ultimately, it was a coordination job, and a matter of keeping people from bumping into one another in the testing process. Who would be doing the sampling and analysis was an entirely different question.

MR REEDIE thought that there would also be a small public relations advantage. If WADA wanted to coordinate all of the efforts, then it seemed to him that to do it under WADA made sense. If WADA was to be effective, then it should take control.

DR STRETTON referred to the comment that this could save WADA money. He had asked for evidence on numerous occasions, and all that the members had were assertions. This was just not acceptable. He did not disagree with any of the comments regarding what WADA was trying to achieve; the governments wanted such a level of coordination too. He agreed 100%, but he did not agree at all that it was necessary to achieve that by bringing it in-house. What was required was proper contract management by WADA.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the members would do their best to make a believer out of Dr Stretton, but WADA would be moving in this direction.

DECISION

WADA to aim to bring the testing programme in-house by
1 January 2004.

11. Research report and recommended project funding

DR RABIN said that he had the hard task of presenting the research report to the members. The aim of his presentation was to inform the members about the projects that had been received for 2002 and as to the procedure of reviewing the projects.

With regard to background, he referred the members to the document in their files (Annex).

He hoped that the Executive Committee would make a final approval regarding the recommendations he was about to propose.

The group had wanted an objective opinion regarding the content of the projects, and it had wanted projects which would be able to provide WADA with short- and medium-term results. It had looked for a balance between current anti-doping procedures and new techniques, and had sought projects which looked at new substances and aimed for a better understanding of doping products.

Nine projects were proposed for WADA funding, and these were:

The effects of factors such as exercise and disease on the distribution of urinary erythropoietin isoforms. The Health, Medical and Research Committee requested proof that urine integrity would not be altered after long storage. The project would then be approvable pending financial resources.

The development of a proteomic technology platform for the generic detection of protein drugs in sport. The Health, Medical and Research Committee had thought that this was an interesting project which should be resubmitted to WADA with a very significantly revised budget, better task distribution and a shorter timeline. The proposal was of a maximum of US\$ 500,000 for one year with the emphasis to standardise or simplify EPO detection. It would also be necessary to define the distribution of intellectual property rights.

Mass spectrometry of peptide hormones. The Health, Medical and Research Committee recommended that this project was approvable for funding if the project could be reduced to two years and the budget divided by two.

A novel method to detect endogenous and pharmaceutical androgen based on two-dimensional isotopic fingerprinting against an endogenous internal standard. The Health, Medical and Research Committee thought that this project was approvable as a pilot study to demonstrate discrimination between endo and exo substances in urine. The proposal was for approximately US\$ 175,000 over two years.

Conversion of 4-norandrostenedione, 4-norandrostenediol and 5-norandrostenediol to nandrolone in human substances. This project had been approved by the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

Development of solution and urine matrix CRMs for the detection of steroid doping. The Health, Medical and Research Committee thought that this project could be approved if the budget were reduced (existing certified products and commercial benefit). The proposal was for US\$ 250,000.

Detection of doping with Ghrelin – determination of blood profiles and urinary excretion, and stimulation of GH release after intravenous injection in athletes. The recommendation was to develop urine detection only and divide the budget by two. There should be no human administration unless a human preparation could be made available; this was an ethical issue.

Chip technology for the detection of growth hormone abuse. The Health, Medical and Research Committee recommended that this project be funded, but thought that the budget should be reduced to a maximum of US\$ 650,000.

Investigation into the effects and the detection of finasteride, a substance that can be misused as a masking agent in doping control. The Health, Medical and Research Committee recommended that this project be approved.

DR RABIN wished to draw the members' attention to the project submitted by Professor Sonksen for 2001, to indirectly detect growth hormone abuse. This huge project had been subsidised by the European Commission and the IOC over a three-year period, but the team had been unable to continue with the project for various reasons, in particular because of the difference in ethnic backgrounds. The Health, Medical and Research Committee proposed subsidising a study on elite athletes during a major competition to see if there was any variation in results according to differing ethnic groups of elite athletes.

There were also talks regarding international cooperation with USADA, which would be funding other complementary studies, including a double blind study on athletes of different ethnic backgrounds, and another study on injury.

There were objectives to validate GH2000 methodology to allow the implementation of an indirect test by the time of the Olympic Games in Athens, if the information could be made available by the start of 2004.

The estimated cost for WADA would be US\$ 150,000 to US \$200,000 for 2003, and USADA was to contribute a similar amount. The project could, if necessary, be extended in 2004 only if it delivered successful results for the implementation of the GH abuse test.

He wanted to give the members an idea of the total research budget provisioned. In 2001, a total of US\$ 4.5 million was provisioned by WADA, and in 2002, this figure had dropped to US\$ 1.5 million. The total budget committed in 2001 had been US\$ 6.5 million. This had been seen as relatively logical at the time, as the decision had been taken based on the 2002 budget, planned to be in the order of US\$ 5 million.

The estimated budget for the 2002 research projects, for which he asked for Executive Committee approval, including the Sonksen project, came to US\$ 2.9 million. He thought that this was a relatively reasonable figure, given the work proposed.

Approximately US\$ 3.4 million were missing to fund accepted (2001) or acceptable (2002) research projects.

In the future, and if the budget allowed, he thought that WADA should call on specific research projects to cover identified research needs relevant to WADA's scientific strategy (such as MAb). The budget should be shared between competitive WADA grants and targeted WADA grants, responding to specific issues raised by WADA.

WADA should also try to set aside 10 to 15% of the research budget in order to be able to react to emerging issues in doping, such as Dynepo, which was a new form of EPO produced by human cells, which would probably arrive soon on the market.

If WADA really wanted a global scientific policy, then WADA would have to be proactive and reactive.

MR LARFAOUI asked what years 1, 2 and 3 referred to.

What would happen with regard to the property of the results? Who would own them?

DR SCHAMASCH said that some of the projects approved touched on some projects which were already in place under the European Commission, so perhaps Dr Rabin could look into this.

With regard to the Sonksen research project, he congratulated the group, but wished to note that, at the end of the previous Sonksen experiment, the IOC had continued to subsidise the project to the tune of US\$ 50,000, so that some ethnic research could be undertaken during the World Swimming Championships in Hong Kong, so it might be interesting to ask Professor Sonksen where his research was, because a number of samples had been taken in Hong Kong.

The IOC was ready to accept new methods, but WADA should not rush to put a test in place if there were likely to be legal and implementation problems. Such problems had occurred on two occasions, at the Olympic Games in Atlanta, following the request for high resolution in December 1995 by the IOC Executive Board, and in Sydney (and again in Salt Lake City) with the requests for blood testing.

With regard to growth hormone, he was the first person to want tests for this, but it was necessary to ensure that all of the necessary logistics were in place in order to avoid legal problems, in particular where indirect methods were concerned.

PROFESSOR DE ROSE noted that the Health, Medical and Research Committee was happy to have Dr Rabin as part of WADA. The committee truly believed that the proposals were in agreement with the Executive Committee decisions.

Nevertheless, the members needed to be able to see what was in the files and what was being recommended, as the document seemed to have printed badly.

MR TOKUSHIGE highlighted the need to target specific projects. He thought that WADA would approve any high quality and relevant research projects.

Had there been any proposals submitted by Asia, in particular Japan? If there had not been a great deal of reaction from the region, then public relations and communications in Asia would need to be reinforced. He saw that there was a mention under project number 5, but wondered if any more details could be given.

MR REEDIE referred to the Schanzer project on nandrolone. Might WADA get an expert opinion on what concentration of this particular steroid caused performance enhancement? While he agreed that WADA had a clear policy that athletes should not take any form of supplements, the reality was that they did.

He agreed with Professor de Rose and thought that it would make everybody's life a lot easier if he could sit down with Dr Rabin and actually write down which projects had been approved, what the current grant was, when the second instalment was, when the new projects had been approved, what the totals were, so that they would end up with a figure of what was currently being spent on research. Then it would be possible to have a second list of the projects that WADA would wish to support, be it in 2003 or 2004.

MR WALKER noted that two laboratories had made six proposals between them, and he was not quite sure what the final selection figure was. The question should be addressed in case there were problems in the future.

If this was going to be a continuing policy of WADA to fund research, he thought that it might be a good idea to develop some criteria as to how or when single institutes might have multiply-funded research projects by WADA, and this might also help Japan to encourage a wider global input for research projects.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the paper in the files was not the same as what had been in the presentation.

Could Dr Rabin tell the members about the international practice regarding peer review? Who were the experts who had been consulted? Was this generally known, if a project was sent out for peer review?

Were there major projects, it would be helpful for WADA to know who else was funding them.

It would be helpful to have the research put in some kind of context. What had been done so far, what was being done at the same time, and what was its particular application was to WADA's mandate?

There should be some assessment as to the value of the research as it related to WADA's mandate.

Most importantly, he wanted to know what he was approving.

DR RABIN replied to Mr Larfaoui. There was a one-year delay between the date of submission of a project and the start of the project work. The budget was usually taken from the 2002 figures, although the projects approved would begin in 2003.

As for the question regarding intellectual property, most of the laboratories involved were public, and WADA's goal was to publish the work just as any other international organisation would do. There were some universities which were private, where certain matters needed to be clarified with regard to intellectual property. There had been such a case with an American university, and it had been decided that anything linked to doping would be accessible freely by WADA and the accredited laboratories.

In response to Dr Schamasch, he had been able to do certain things with USADA, and had discussed coordinating efforts with the European Commission, as it was clear that there was a need to coordinate WADA's work with that done in the Americas, Europe and Oceania. He would be happy to hear about projects funded by different organisations.

With regard to Professor Sonksen's project, he had received additional information two days prior to the meeting, in particular with regard to what had been done in Hong Kong, and approximately 870 athletes had been tested. This was why the budget that he now proposed was lower than the amount initially discussed with Professor Sonksen.

With regard to the implementation of a test, he fully agreed that WADA should not be hasty, which was why the Sonksen test had not been used in 1999. However, having discussed the matter with legal experts and obtained additional information about applying the test, it might be possible to propose the implementation of a test. A consensus meeting would have to take place at the beginning of 2004 at the latest.

WADA should not react to pressure but, based on scientific results, could propose tests in order to reduce doping.

With regard to what Mr Tokushige had said, Professor Segura's project involved Mr Ueki. He did not know about other projects proposed by Asia.

In response to Mr Reddie, he was unable to give an answer offhand, but thought that Professor Schanzer's project had to do with the use, or misuse, of substances by athletes.

With regard to Mr Walker's comments on the two laboratories with six proposals, the evaluation of the projects included an independent peer review process. The peers were very experienced in the field of analysis of doping substances.

He apologised to the Chairman that the documents that the members had did not correspond with what he had presented. The procedure had not been finished when the papers had been produced for the files.

With regard to the independent peer review procedure, competent peers had been identified for the projects, but some of them had been concerned about their identity being made known to the public, as they felt uncomfortable about making comments which might be read by their colleagues. There was the option of giving the list of reviewers to the public and risking losing open criticism of the projects, or keeping their identity secret and gaining in confidence in the quality of the projects.

With regard to the issue of projects and finance, the group had tried to find out if the projects had already been funded by other organisations. WADA should systematically ask about additional funding.

Putting the research into context was desirable. Since he was relatively new, he had not been able to gain an overall vision of what was done elsewhere, but this was something that he would tackle shortly.

With regard to the approval of projects and establishing an order of priority, he could give the members the prevailing views on each project. There were US\$ 3 million available but, if this figure were

to be reduced suddenly, he would be able to give the members the priorities based on the interest for these projects. There had not been any validation by the Health, Medical and Research Committee, but information had been sent out.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the Executive Committee could approve, subject to funds being available, grants for the US\$ 3 million available, and Dr Rabin could provide the members with a list of priorities.

Intellectual property was always a complicated matter in research, but he insisted that the results needed to be made public and published.

Some of the substances were getting closer to natural ones, and so WADA would need to rely on indirect tests. This was going to be the only way of detecting substances, so these would have to be developed as well as possible in order to withstand any juridical attack.

MR NIGGLI said that, with regard to intellectual property rights, in all of the agreements that WADA had signed thus far, it had made sure that it would retain the right to use the outcome of the research. WADA did not own the intellectual property rights but it would have a perpetual free license to use the rights in order to benefit the whole anti-doping world.

DR RABIN said that the budget was for a total of US\$ 2.9 million.

DECISION

Proposal of envelope of US\$ 2.9 million approved for research projects, subject to availability of funds.

12. Lausanne office relocation

DR GARNIER referred the members to the documents in their files (Annex) related to the decision requested for WADA to continue the project undertaken to relocate the Lausanne office to the Maison du Sport International.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members whether they supported the proposal to move the Lausanne office to the Maison du Sport International. WADA would be visibly present and would also save money.

MR LARFAOUI replied that this was up to the President, the COO and the Lausanne office to decide.

DECISION

Proposal to relocate the Lausanne office to the Maison du Sport International approved.

13. Other business

– IICGADS

MR DE VILLERS said that all systems were go for the IICGADS meeting in Moscow on 9 and 10 December 2002. A draft Memorandum of Understanding had been circulated and he thanked the Australian co-Chairs for the work that they had done in producing the document.

He noted that the document was available, and a copy would be given to Dr Schamasch, who had requested one earlier.

The intent was to get the Memorandum of Understanding signed in order to formalise the government agreements.

There would also be discussions regarding the issue of government contributions; there would be confirmation of the continental divisions; and there would hopefully be a document to formalise the arrangement that would assist in collecting the contributions.

The intent was also to have a Copenhagen addendum, which would involve the adoption of the Code, if in fact that was going to be the result of the Copenhagen meeting.

– **Mission of regional offices**

MR LARFAOUI said that the issue of the regional offices had been discussed, and he had previously asked for a description of the mandate of the Lausanne office. This mandate had been described, and he thought that the Executive Committee should discuss this. WADA had decided to create regional offices, but the report had not responded to some of the questions he had asked.

With regard to the Executive Committee meeting, Mr Balfour had been unable to attend, but the Nigerian Minister of Sports and Social Development would be able to represent Mr Balfour, as Minister Akiga, President of the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa, supervised all of the sports activities in Africa.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that WADA should encourage Africa to send a representative.

As to the mandates of the regional offices, a job description could be made available for the Foundation Board meeting the following day.

– **Misunderstanding**

THE CHAIRMAN noted that there had been some misunderstanding arising from the Madrid Conference as to what list was applicable and what might be removed from the list. The only official list was the 2003 list. Nothing had been decided for 2004. There were many ongoing discussions and individual opinions, but no actual list.

DR SCHAMASCH said that WADA and the IOC had been involved in the matter. The IOC would take measures to avoid this happening again in the future. Members needed to keep such matters confidential.

– **Apology**

Before the conclusion of the meeting, DR SCHAMASCH wished to apologise for the anti-Anglo-Saxon sentiment in the speech he had made following Mr Walker's comment at the previous Executive Committee meeting. He had simply been trying to say that the "W" in WADA should be respected, and hoped that he had not offended anybody.

– **EPO**

DR STRETTON asked if there would be an EPO review.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that Dr Rabin was closing in on the matter.

DR RABIN said that a review would be presented at the Foundation Board meeting the following day. A preliminary report had been received from **Dr Peltre** [you will resolve the spelling] the previous day. The report on the urine test had been received, but the blood part had taken **Dr Peltre** much longer than anticipated, as some groups (in the USA and Australia) were about to publish results, so it had been considered that it would be better to wait and include those new comments and results as well. All of the documents should be available in December, early January at the latest.

DR SCHAMASCH asked whether there could be confidentiality on this report, as the IOC was in the middle of hearings on the EPO test performed in Salt Lake City.

DR RABIN said that WADA did not intend to release the information until it had a full and final report.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that he was uncomfortable about keeping a report confidential. Why did WADA not arrange to get the information after the decisions had been rendered? He did not want an organisation such as WADA to sit on a report and be accused of hiding anything that it knew. It would be better not to have the information at the time the decision was rendered.

14. Next meeting

THE CHAIRMAN said that, before the World Conference in Copenhagen, he thought that there should be an Executive Committee meeting. He hoped that the representatives of the constituencies would be out there making sure that their constituency got its nominations in. This was very important.

DECISION

Next meeting to be decided.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Executive Committee for their contribution to the meeting. He also thanked the interpreters and especially the staff, whose careful preparation of the meeting had made it possible to get through a great deal of work in a short amount of time. It made a big difference to be well prepared.

MR LARFAOUI thanked the Chairman.

The meeting adjourned at 1.15 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

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