

WADA Laboratory Subcommittee Meeting

March 17th 2003 (18h00 - 20h30 - Queens Hotel, Cologne)

Meeting Minutes

Agenda : Agenda items are listed below in order discussed during the meeting

Attendees : Christian AYOTTE (Anti-Doping Control Lab, INRS, Quebec)
David COWAN (Drug Control Centre, King's College, England)
Mats GARLE (Huddinge University Hospital, Doping Control Lab, Sweden)
John MILLER (European Directorate for the Quality of Medicines, France)
Liz OSPITAL (WADA, Canada)
Olivier RABIN (WADA, Canada)
Makoto UEKI (Mitsubishi Kagaku Bioclinical Dope Control Lab, Japan)
and **via telephone**, Sue NOLAN (Albert Science Center, New Zealand)

Apologies: Larry Bowers, Jordi Segura and Patrick Schamasch.

Agenda Item: Review feedback from World Conference on the "Code" and "The International Standard for Laboratories".

O. Rabin indicated that the Code has been accepted in Copenhagen with no changes. He also indicated that draft Version 2.0 of the WADA's International Standard for Laboratories (WISL) was presented during an information session in Copenhagen. The WISL is not yet finalized and remains open for minor comments through April 10, 2003 at the latest and will be approved thereafter by the WADA Executive Committee at the end of May/beginning of June 2003.

O. Rabin indicated that some technical concerns such as thresholds for steroids in the technical document on *Minimum Required Performance Limits* (MRPL) or reporting of uncertainty have been raised in Copenhagen.

C. Ayotte proposed that the laboratory directors who are part of the WADA Lab Subcommittee collect additional technical information from other accredited laboratories and make concrete proposals to revise these technical elements in the Standard for Laboratories by April 10th. All members present agreed to such a scheme. She further expressed the desire to adopt a common rule concerning quantitative measurements whatever method is applied, with also the wish to have a definition of precision around the threshold.

Agenda Item: Update on progress of IOC/WADA transition group for laboratory accreditation.

An agreement has been reached with the IOC concerning proficiency testing samples for 2003 which involves 4 series of 5 samples. According to the IOC's accreditation program, a once-yearly, 9-sample shipment is sent to the various accredited laboratories in October. During the transition period however, 2 of the 9 samples will be provided by the WADA.

Additionally, the WADA is working on financial issues concerning the transfer of the IOC "Educational Program" covering EPO and HES samples, for example.

Agenda Item: Laboratory accreditation during transition period.

M. Ueki raised the fact that his laboratory in Japan was contacted by the Doping Control Centre of the Sports Authority of India (SAI) in New Delhi with regards to their desire to become an accredited laboratory in time for the Afro-Asian Games in November 2003. It is clear that this laboratory will NOT be able to be accredited in time for the event according to the WADA/IOC accreditation program. The only solutions would be to have a satellite laboratory of an accredited laboratory established in New Delhi, or to have the samples shipped to an accredited laboratory. It was agreed that the Organizing Committee should be informed of this issue by the IOC. O.Rabin will bring this to the attention of Patrick Schamasch.

O. Rabin mentioned that several non-accredited laboratories have contacted the WADA and have expressed interest in learning more about what will need to be done to become accredited in accordance with the WADA's requirements.

OR's response is based on two options: a first option is to start the accreditation process under the IOC requirements for laboratories which would like to start the process immediately, knowing that the rest of the process will be continued under the WISL as of January 1st, 2004. A second option would be to wait until January 2004 when all accreditation responsibilities will have been transferred to the WADA, and that the accreditation process will fall under the full scope of the ISO 17025 and the WISL.

Agenda Item: Review proposal of future structure of working groups and committees for implementation of the International Standard for Laboratories.

There were no issues or comments concerning the legitimacy and/or composition of the **IOC-WADA Transition Working Group**. This is a temporary working group and it is anticipated to be phased-out in mid-2004.

Concerning the **WADA Proficiency Testing Working Group**, it was agreed that this Group should be integrated within the **WADA Laboratory Accreditation Committee** and that the Senior Technical Representative and WADA Doping Control Manager proposed in the *Proficiency Testing Working Group*, could be invited to participate in the combined group on an "as needed basis", i.e. when proficiency testing issues are to be discussed.

The need for an IOC representative in the **WADA Laboratory Accreditation Committee** was questioned by some. O.Rabin indicated that there was probably a sense to keep the IOC closely informed in the perspective of the Olympic Games every two years. This point was discussed, and O.Rabin indicated that this will be discussed internally at WADA before a final decision is made.

It was also agreed that there is no real need for a “pool” of independent experts as proposed for in the **WADA Field Expert Group**, as this activity should be covered by the National Accrediting Bodies. Furthermore, no accredited laboratory director should be considered in the role of “auditor” for control of compliance to the standards.

Therefore, and taking into account the above, the following three WADA committees/working groups were agreed upon: **IOC/WADA Transition Working Group, WADA Laboratory Accreditation Committee, and WISL Revision Committee.**

It was suggested to note the frequency upon which these committee/working groups meet as they become operational, in order to eventually establish more appropriate timetables for the committees/working groups to meet.

Agenda Item: Update on proficiency testing tender.

Three tenders were received as of the close of bidding March 14, 2003

It was inquired as to whether these laboratories were totally independent of currently-accredited laboratories which highlight an important point. It is clear that if any laboratory is known to have any link to an accredited lab, it will not be considered as an acceptable laboratory proficiency sample provider for obvious reasons of conflict of interest.

O. Rabin thanked the members of the Sub-Committee for their participation and closed the meeting.

March 24, 2003.