



## **Minutes of the WADA Executive Committee Meeting 20 September 2014, Lausanne, Switzerland**

The meeting began at 9.00 a.m.

### **1. Welcome, roll call and observers**

THE CHAIRMAN observed that it was a nice way to finish what had been a very exciting week for him. The Executive Committee members were in sunny Switzerland, and he had not been sure whether he was a member of a new Republic of Scotland or not, so normality had continued as far as he was concerned. The members were very welcome to the de Coubertin room in the Château de Vidy, the headquarters of the IOC. It was one of the most significant rooms in world sport. Many interesting discussions took place in that room, and he thought that the world of sport was much the better for those discussions and it was really very nice indeed to have the WADA Executive Committee meeting in that room. Arriving in Lausanne, the members had received a very nice letter from Mr Thomas Bach, who was currently in Incheon, at the Asian Games. He welcomed the members on behalf of the IOC but, in particular, he asked Mr Christophe De Kepper, the Director General of the IOC, to welcome the members as well.

MR DE KEPPEL assured the members that he would certainly not comment on the result of the Scottish referendum as a Belgian. On behalf of the IOC President and the IOC Executive Board, he welcomed the members to Lausanne, and thanked them for bringing the sun with them. He was particularly happy to welcome the WADA Executive Committee members, because it gave the opportunity to a stakeholder such as the IOC to underline the importance of WADA activities to its own objectives. WADA was extremely important to the IOC as well as the Olympic Movement, as its activities went to the heart of what the IOC stood for, namely the credibility of sport and the credibility of competition and ensuring that the athletes had a level playing field whenever they competed. As the members knew, there was a new IOC president, Mr Thomas Bach, and the IOC was in the middle of an important reform process, which was called the Olympic Agenda 2020, and the reform process encompassed all of the activities, including a reflection on the future of the organisation's reputation and position in terms of fighting corruption, match-fixing and doping, so that was an important part of the IOC's reflections, and certainly the fact that two funds had been set up in that area, one for enhancing anti-doping research to the tune of 10 million dollars, and another to enhance the fight against match-fixing, also for 10 million dollars, underlined how seriously the IOC took that. In the process of the Olympic Agenda, those core issues would be dealt with and certainly he wanted to tell the members that, if they had never been to the IOC headquarters, they were welcome, and the IOC would certainly want to welcome them there again on many more occasions. He wished the members luck in their proceedings, which he would be following from the backbenches, and he was happy to welcome them to Lausanne.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr De Kepper. It was really a pleasure to be in Lausanne.

There had been no apologies; he had been told that Mr Lobognon had been due to arrive at about 9:30 a.m., but he had found out that morning that Air France had left him in Addis Ababa, so he would not be with the Executive Committee at all that day, which was a regret

because it would be better to have the entire Executive Committee present.

He distributed the roll call and asked the members and observers to sign it so as to have a complete record of the meeting. There was one new face around the table that morning. He formally welcomed Mr Niwa, the new Minister from Japan, and congratulated him on his appointment, telling him how warmly WADA would welcome him because the IOC had decided that a future Olympic Games would be held in his country. Japan had a proud anti-doping record, and to have Mr Niwa on the Executive Committee boded well for the duties that JADA would have as an anti-doping organisation in the run-up to the Tokyo Olympic Games, and particularly to assist the IOC, which had a major anti-doping responsibility during the Olympic Games.

The following members attended the meeting: Sir Craig Reedie, President and Chairman of WADA; Rev. Dr Makhenkesi Stofile, WADA Vice-Chairman, South African Ambassador to Germany; Ms Beckie Scott, ANOC Representative; Mr Gian Franco Kasper, IOC Member and President of the FIS; Mr Francesco Ricci Bitti, President of the International Tennis Federation; Prof. Dr Ugur Erdener, IOC Member, President of World Archery; Mr Tony Estanguet, IOC Member and Member of the IOC Athletes' Commission; Mr Hideki Niwa, State Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan; Mr Godkin, representing Mr Peter Dutton, Minister for Sport, Australia; Ms Valérie Fourneyron, Member of Parliament, National Assembly, France; Mr Francisco Boza, President, Americas Sports Council (CADE), Peru; Professor Arne Ljungqvist, Health, Medical and Research Committee Chairman, Honorary IOC Member; Mr Edwin Moses, Education Committee Chairman, Board of Directors, USADA; Mr David Howman, WADA Director General; Mr Tim Ricketts, Standards and Harmonisation Director, WADA; Mr Frédéric Donzé, Director of the European Regional Office and IF Relations, WADA; Dr Olivier Rabin, Science Director, WADA; and Mr Olivier Niggli, Chief Operating Office and General Counsel, WADA.

The following observers signed the roll call: Mayumi Yamamoto, Shin Asakawa, Ichiro Kono, Naoko Hirayama, Michael Gottlieb, Yoko Omuka, Chika Hirai, Yuji Kakizawa, Ayako Ito, Peter Harcourt, Valérie Amant, Andy Parkinson, Sergey Khrychikov, Liene Kozlovskā, Françoise Dagouret, Andrew Ryan, Christian Thill, Howard Stupp and Richard Budgett.

– 1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any conflicts of interest on any item on the agenda. If there were none, he could proceed.

## **2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 17 May 2014 in Montreal**

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the minutes of the previous Executive Committee meeting. They had been circulated and he was sure that the members had all digested them. Were there any observations? Were they a true record of what had transpired on that day? If so, the members would approve them and move on.

### DECISION

Minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee on 17 May 2014 approved and duly signed.

## **3. Director General's Report**

THE CHAIRMAN said that the report was quite extensive because, at that meeting, particularly since the Executive Committee was meeting outside Montreal, not all of the members of staff were present, so the Director General would be dealing with a number of departmental issues rather than having the individual directors presenting their reports in person.

On behalf of the WADA management team, THE DIRECTOR GENERAL expressed his thanks to Mr De Kepper and his team in Lausanne for their hospitality, as well as for the preparation work done for the meeting. As somebody with a bit of a historical bent, he thought that it should be recorded that the first WADA Foundation Board meeting in March 2000 had actually been held in that room, and there were several members around the table who had been at that particular meeting, and it was quite significant to have that recorded.

As usual with the verbal update from his written report, he wanted to cover matters that were important within his report and also issues that had occurred since it had been distributed.

The first item was UNESCO, and he could tell the members that, since writing the report, two countries had completed the documentation required for ratification but had not yet had that approved in Paris: Madagascar and Kiribati. Hopefully, by November, they would have been accepted and WADA would reduce that number of 19 down to 17 countries remaining for ratification.

There would be a meeting of the UNESCO voluntary fund committee on 14 October, and there were some interesting projects up for ratification by that committee, including one in particular that he knew was of significant interest, and that related to legislation. UNESCO was putting up a pilot project in relation to legislation relating to countries' obligations under the convention. That was being developed by UNESCO staff in conjunction with assistance from WADA, and he would expect that, at the meeting in Paris in November, there would be a good update on that project from UNESCO itself.

The other matter to which he wished to draw the members' attention was that the biannual conference of parties for UNESCO was to be held in Paris on 5 and 6 November the following year. All government delegates were asked to note that date. As it would be the tenth anniversary of the convention, there were likely to be additional events, and he suggested that the members put down 4 to 7 November as dates for that meeting. It did not conflict with the WADA Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings in November; WADA had been liaising with UNESCO to ensure that that would not occur.

Regarding Interpol, he recorded WADA's grateful thanks to the French Government for the secondment of Captain Clément de Maillard as the replacement for Matthieu Holz, who had joined the WADA team and was present that day. It was significant that WADA continue its liaison and relationship with Interpol, and he looked forward to dealing with Captain Clément de Maillard accordingly.

Regarding the WCO, he had been hoping that the minister from Côte d'Ivoire would be present, as Côte d'Ivoire had offered a customs officer to go to Brussels and be seconded. He wanted to make sure that that occurred. WADA had had a recent letter from the WCO director general, who had indicated that the organisation would welcome the person and would be willing to be involved in anti-doping issues once WADA had somebody on the ground in Brussels.

The members would be aware that the management team was making a number of changes and movements to reflect the new mandate under the revised Code and standards. The team was busy gearing up for the new required practice of anti-doping organisations and the assistance they might need to achieve effective and efficient anti-doping programmes from 1 January. WADA would be committed to providing that assistance and help over the next couple of years, as it was the most important aspect of anti-doping work. It was one thing to have good rules, but it was more important to make sure those good rules were practised well. WADA would give assistance to all those needing it henceforth.

Regarding the legal team, the members would see the list of cases, both pending and resolved, and any questions in relation to those could be directed to Mr Niggli, who was

present. He emphasised the issue of investigations. There had been a meeting of several experts in New York, hosted by the Major League Baseball people at the end of August. WADA was developing the approach that he felt would ensure that all ADOs understood the basic role of gathering or receiving information, storing it and sharing it. That was an information-gathering exercise, not necessarily conducting investigations. WADA would prepare and develop a training course so that all those responsible in ADOs would have good protocols and models of practise to follow. He did not wish everybody to think that they had to hire former policemen or former investigating officers. Some would and had, but that was not the requirement that WADA saw as necessary under the revised Code and standard. In addition, WADA was rewriting the protocols that it had published in 2011, giving guidance to the ways in which information could be gathered and stored depending on the relationship of the two organisations. WADA knew, for example, that there were laws within a country that would preclude a national organisation sharing information internationally, so it was necessary to think of ways and means of how that could occur within the systems, and not break the law of that particular country.

Regarding NADO development, the members would note that the project was fully immersed in the department headed by Mr Koehler. In the future, the members would see the particular countries on which WADA was concentrating in Mr Koehler's report as opposed to his report. For the purposes of that day's exercise, the members would see a list of countries in which it was felt that WADA needed to help the national programme develop. Argentina was the first one, and WADA would be having very important meetings with the Argentinian Government and the NOC in October to enhance the NADO, to review the possibility of another RADO within Latin America, and to establish the way forward (an issue discussed for a while) for having an accredited laboratory in Buenos Aires. Everybody knew that more laboratories were needed in that continent, and Buenos Aires had indicated a desire to host one, but WADA wanted to make sure that that became reality. If not, WADA might have to search the continent for another spot, and he had some ideas in that regard. The final issue on the agenda of the Buenos Aires meeting was of course the preparation of the Youth Olympic Games in 2018.

WADA continued to give assistance to the ABCD, the Brazilian NADO, alongside participating in the IOC task force in preparation for Rio 2016. Mr Koehler represented WADA on that task force, and his understanding was that it was proceeding very satisfactorily with good meeting outcomes. There would be another meeting of that task force in November, shortly prior to the meetings in Paris.

It was very necessary for WADA to visit India and to update and speed up processes. Some of the problems in India related to the time lapse between an anti-doping rule violation and the result management process. It could take far longer than one year and sometimes longer than two years. He was hopeful that the meetings in October would address that in a practical way.

Matters were proceeding very satisfactorily in Jamaica, and WADA had to thank the CCES for its partnership with the Jamaican NADO. There would be a review of the processes in the next couple of months to ensure that the track upon which Jamaica had embarked was an appropriate one.

WADA still had problems in Kenya, regrettably. There was no communication with the Kenyan Government in relation to the task force completed in March that year. No action had been taken, and WADA was getting no response to requests for engagement. In addition to that, there was reticence with regard to the approaches made by the Chinese Government and the Norwegian Government, whereby funds were being made available to Kenya to help it in its anti-doping programme. Those funds could not yet be transferred and that was regrettable, as Kenya should really be advancing its programme. It had reached the stage whereby the management felt that it ought to report more formally to the

Executive Committee in November with strong recommendations as to what should happen in the future.

In Nigeria, there had been a letter two days previously from the Nigerian Sports Commission indicating some progress. WADA could not engage with the Nigerians at present because of the ebola problem in that country, but WADA had at least been communicating with Nigeria, and he was hopeful that the issue would progress in a satisfactory fashion.

Egypt had hosted a pan-Arab anti-doping forum at the beginning of September. The outcomes had been significant. It was the first time all the Arab countries had been asked to meet. With some in the Asian continent and some in the African continent, there had not been that rationale at inter-governmental level in the past. There were plans to host a second forum in 2015, probably shortly before the pan-Arab Games, to be hosted by Morocco.

The more important issue was the development of the NADO in Egypt. WADA was personally involved in the development through its African office because, if it did not develop appropriately, the laboratory, which had been put in the pre-probationary stage, would not be able to progress. Egypt needed to have an active NADO to produce the samples required for analysis, so WADA had projected meetings with the Egyptians over the next couple of weeks to ensure that it could advance and allow the laboratory to proceed towards accreditation.

The members would see the matters relating to the RADOs and education in his report. WADA had had very successful Play True Generation and Outreach programmes in Botswana, and the Vice-President of WADA and the African regional office director had been present, as well as in Nanjing for the Youth Olympic Games, and the reception received by the team at both events had been significant. The youth quiz, which had been redeveloped for those events, was currently available in 34 different languages, free of charge to all stakeholders.

He highlighted the Education Partnership Group, which was an initiative undertaken by Mr Koehler to involve the IOC, UNESCO, the IPC, the Council for Sport Science and Physical Education and the International Fair Play Committee to ensure that everybody could work together to produce programmes to ensure values education without repetition or duplication. The group continued to meet reasonably regularly to provide the sort of materials he had just outlined.

In terms of communication, WADA produced its annual report in PDF format only, and did not print it, although he did have a couple of printed copies for those members who would like one or who wished to read the report during the meeting. WADA had provided Outreach programmes at the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow and was currently involved in a similar programme at the Asian Games in Incheon.

One significant issue in communications was the development of a new website, and he urged all of the members to visit it if they had not done so already. They would find it much more user-friendly, and it provided much better information.

The other aspect in relation to communication was the Athlete Committee, and he asked the Chairman to invite Ms Scott to provide a short summary of one or two issues following the conclusion of his report.

There was an update on the Athlete Biological Passport in his written report. The major issue accentuated yet again was the need for all ADOs to ensure that the doping control forms were entered into ADAMS. He was actively encouraging action in that regard.

There was a full update on ADAMS in his written report. WADA continued to evolve the present system. It would cover the paperless project, which had been proceeding in a useful

fashion, and the sharing of passport information. WADA was improving the functionality of the whereabouts application, and ADAMS would be geared up to take account of the necessary changes to be put into place on 1 January.

There was parallel planning for a new ADAMS. WADA had completed a request for proposal programme, and had received responses to that. They were being scrutinised, with a decision hopefully to be made some time in October. The decision was a significant one and would be made only in consultation with the President, the Vice-President and the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee to ensure that the recommendations made by the WADA management were appropriate.

There were some notable activities at each of the WADA regional offices and they could be seen in his report. In Africa, a ministers' meeting had been scheduled for October, and he understood that the Vice-President would be attending that with the African regional office director. There had been a very successful Asian intergovernmental meeting in Korea in June, the largest gathering of governments to date in relation to anti-doping. In Europe, there had been a significant meeting the previous day in Lausanne, with a debrief of the Olympic Winter Games programme and the Independent Observer report chaired by Dr Budgett, and Mr Donzé had been involved in that. He had heard from all participants that it had been a significant meeting and that the outcome had been much appreciated by everybody. It had involved not only those winter IFs at Sochi but also the organising committees of future Olympic Games and some NADOs that would be involved in planning for major events. He thanked the IOC for convening that particular meeting.

The annual ADO symposium was scheduled to take place from 24 to 26 March 2015. It was being expanded from two to three days to ensure that the numbers of participants would probably reach around 450/500. WADA saw this as a very significant item on the annual calendar and was devoting resources to it accordingly. WADA was in the midst of completing a draft agenda for that meeting and he could tell the members that it was going to be of great use and interest to all participants.

He had mentioned the importance of the meeting to take place with Argentina in October. There had been a meeting of Latin American lawyers hosted recently by Uruguay in relation to result management, and their intergovernmental meeting would be held in Puerto Rico in early February.

The members would see that WADA had issued a reminder to all stakeholders to make nominations for the standing committees. WADA needed to have those in early October, so that it could work with the President and the chairs of the relevant committees to ensure that those committee vacancies were filled with regard to the constitutional mandate. There was a legal ad hoc group that would meet in Montreal in October and look at relevant legal issues in respect of the revised Code and standards, including the protocols that needed to be discussed about consideration of substantial assistance cases.

There continued to be an issue in relation to food contamination, and it was one that was being studied in Mexico in relation to clenbuterol in beef and other animals. There seemed to be some other issues in relation to food contamination in other parts of the world, and WADA would address those and report more fully in November.

Regarding Hgh testing, the members would see that WADA had at last been able to resume testing for Hgh. The requirements set out by the CAS in the Veerpalu case had been satisfied and the research that WADA had had to conduct had been completed and published, so testing could be and had been resumed.

One final matter stemmed from the meeting in May. There had been an amendment passed to the constitution allowing the Foundation Board to vote in extraordinary circumstances on issues by electronic means. No time period had been put in that. The

WADA management would suggest that that be 15 working days, and that would be on the agenda in November for approval by the Foundation Board.

That covered the issues he had wanted to raise as a result of his report.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the report was very wide ranging and he was sure that there would be lots of comments and observations. He was happy to open the floor and seek comments on any of the issues raised by Mr Howman. He would then invite Ms Scott to talk about the athletes and the new athlete guide.

MR RICCI BITTI thanked Mr Howman for the very interesting and extensive report. Speaking on behalf of the sport representatives, he referred to the UNESCO convention and general development of NADOs. He strongly believed that the cooperation between the two major players (the IFs and the NADOs) in the practical fight against doping in sport should be greater, and that depended on the level of development of the NADOs. Obviously, it was necessary to improve cooperation where NADOs were effective, and that was the case in at least 15 major countries, but there was still a lot to do so as not to waste energy. It was not a judgement. He thought that the investigation and report at the beginning of each meeting should be extended not to UNESCO and the countries that were still pending, as they were not very relevant, with all due respect, but to the legislation in place, the level of legislation, the institution of NADOs or RADOs in the country and, perhaps for the major countries, sanction management, capability and independence. This was a matter of expanding and supporting development. There were many countries that were in a critical situation, and WADA was working hard to resolve that.

On ADAMS, he was concerned from a financial point of view. He would present the proposals of the Finance and Administration Committee to the Executive Committee later on for one of the activities that was unavoidable, the development of ADAMS, but he was also concerned from a political point of view. Having noted the existence of alternative systems, he believed that the effectiveness of the general system was based on the unity of the operation in terms of information exchange interface. He did not know if ADAMS could be imposed as a system. If that was not the case, as perhaps that would be too difficult from a political point of view, he thought that the interface between the systems required and the cost of the development should be discussed, because he did not think it was WADA that had to accommodate everybody; perhaps it was the opposite, since this was a very relevant long-term cost factor. Those were his two remarks, and he was sure that there would be more.

MS SCOTT asked about Jamaica and the progress that was taking place there. She asked for more details because this continued to be a nation that dominated track and field and it was concerning that the anti-doping programme was not up and running and in full swing yet. She thought that there were a lot of athletes worldwide who were very concerned and was interested to know where WADA was and how much further it had to go.

MR ESTANGUET observed that he also wished to make two remarks, one of which echoed what Ms Scott had been saying about the athletes' concerns, that there were still some grey areas in the world and some countries in which the situation was not effective. Although WADA was doing whatever it could to fight against these failings, he wondered whether there were any standby solutions. He had understood that something would happen at the next meeting in November, but had WADA foreseen any alternatives to step up the fight against doping in sport in those countries?

He welcomed the fact that ADAMS was being updated and that the various parties were now participating, in particular the athletes, who were able to contribute to the development. They were very happy about it, and it was very important and would have a big effect in terms of making ADAMS more user-friendly, although there were still some concerns about uniformity, especially during the Olympic Games. The new platform should

really be a single and effective platform during major events such as the Olympic Games, and that was not yet the case. The Outreach programme was quite effective, but WADA could go even further, especially regarding whereabouts, towards making athletes aware about using the platform properly. Since there were several platforms in operation, could there be a breakdown to understand which countries were using which platforms? It would be nice to know which countries were using which systems because, for WADA's credibility, one platform should be envisaged, or a single interface for all athletes, to allay the athletes' concerns. Were there any concerns about national legislation in some countries regarding the protection of personal data? There were some difficulties in terms of national legislation and they could hamper the use of a single platform.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL told Mr Ricci Bitti that he had taken very good note of the comments made in relation to legislation and he hoped that the project he had mentioned at UNESCO would address that; that was certainly the responsibility of governments, and UNESCO was the right place for it to occur. WADA felt very responsible in that area and it would partake in the project. He hoped, therefore, that the report delivered in November would help in relation to that aspect. It was definitely required. The other key component of the comment was the relationship between the NADOs and the IFs, and Mr Koehler was only too well aware of that necessity. WADA would address it again at the ADO symposium in March in Lausanne, directly with the NADOs in discussions with them, and would continue to evoke the importance of such relationships when dealing with them. At the end, what he had noted was that it very much depended on the personality or personalities of those involved, and WADA had some very good connections at the workplace and some that were not so good, and so it needed to work on the latter but enhance the former as well.

Regarding ADAMS, there was an agenda item that addressed the issue of other systems because, in the revised Code, WADA was required to have ADAMS used by all its stakeholders or any other system as approved by WADA, so WADA would have to approve other systems, and he had listed in agenda item 5.2 the criteria that it was felt needed to be covered by those seeking such approval, so that was a discussion that would take place later that morning. The issue of the development of the new ADAMS was one to which WADA was very alert, and he wanted to make sure it was done in the right way. WADA would certainly listen to the voice of the athletes and all those using ADAMS to make sure that it would be covering the requirements that everybody had.

Ms Scott had asked about Jamaica. First of all, the prime minister in Jamaica was the minister of sport and she was very alert to the issues that had been raised in 2013. The whole of the previous board had been replaced. There had been conflicts of interest that had been pretty obvious to the WADA management but perhaps not obvious to those involved, so the new board was independent. The second thing was that a new group had been appointed to run the staff. There was a new CEO who had been to Montreal and been trained, so Jamaica had staff in place, which had not been the case in 2013. A programme was currently being conducted following WADA guidance and in conjunction with the CCES. CCES representatives had been down to Jamaica several times, a new DCO training programme had been put into place, and Jamaica was currently collecting samples. From doing virtually nothing, WADA had helped Jamaica get back to the position it had been in in 2011, which was being an active NADO, and there would be more meetings in the coming months on which WADA could report. He was happy that Jamaica had come back into conformity with the Code.

The back-up solutions requested for those countries that were not really addressing the issues WADA felt they ought to was really an issue of compliance, and the Executive Committee would have to suggest to the Foundation Board that it consider imposing a non-compliance declaration in relation to those countries. That was probably the only step that WADA could take in terms of imposing any kind of penalty. Before reaching that stage,



WADA tried to work with them, give them guidance, work with other NADOs or people who could give the help that they needed, or engage them through a RADO, doing everything possible before reaching the stage of coming and asking for something more formal. If the athletes had information or were concerned about countries, he would be very happy to hear about it and address issues that might be apparent to athletes in those countries, so he would welcome any assistance in that regard.

He had covered the issue of ADAMS. Regarding the platforms in existence in other countries, there was one called SIMON, which had been engineered by USADA. WADA had had a significant meeting with USADA in July. It was not adamant that SIMON continue to be used, and was open to using ADAMS, and so WADA had been developing on that relationship over the past weeks and months to ensure that that would be the case. If it did work in that fashion, he did not think that there would be a problem. It might be a transition issue more than anything else. Only four other countries used that system.

The last matter raised related to data protection, and he was not really the person who should answer that. He asked Mr Niggli to respond to the comment made.

MR NIGGLI said that there was not much new on that front. It was mainly a European issue, as the members knew. The European Commission had recently changed, and new commissioners were being appointed and had yet to be confirmed by the European Parliament, so there was nothing new as far as Europe was concerned regarding recognition of Quebec or anything like that. The matter had been at a standstill for the past six months. WADA was still following that closely. It was likely that, once the new European Commission was in place, it would be part of the agenda to get the new legislation on data protection progressed and passed at European level. Negotiations were still ongoing between the European Parliament and the European Council as to the final wording of the text, and it was still too early to see whether the provision of concern would be amended or not. WADA would keep a close eye on that and, once work recommenced in Brussels, he would report to the Executive Committee. Apart from that, WADA had pursued two different avenues, one in Canada and one in Switzerland, and discussions were still ongoing to make things a little easier by talking to the relevant authorities in those countries. It was in progress.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, without wishing to prolong the meeting, he was particularly concerned about the difficulties in Kenya. Dr Stofile knew the situation there. This was a country that year after year produced some of the finest track and field athletes in the world, and WADA had enormous difficulties maintaining any kind of relationship with Kenya. It was going to become a major issue. Where did Dr Stofile think Kenya was?

DR STOFILE responded that he had met with the then minister of sport and authorities of Kenya at the African Youth Games in Gaborone in May after the meeting in Montreal. At that stage, WADA had been raising the issue of the report of the commission of enquiry appointed to look into some of the irregularities and non-compliance issues with regard to the administration of sport in that country. He had met the minister as well as his director general at the time. They had promised to make the report available and put in place the necessary steps to correct the situation. He knew as a matter of fact that, as he sat there, there was a new minister in Kenya. The new minister had been in office for only two weeks, and he had not been able to talk to him, although Mr Swigelaar had, and he would say that officially there was still no copy of the report, although some copies had found their way to his eyes, so to speak, but WADA still had not received the report and as such had seen no concrete steps articulated by way of remedying the issues identified.

There was to be a meeting in Egypt in two weeks' time in preparation for an inter-ministerial conference, to take place in Addis Ababa from 27 October to 1 November. It was a pity that the minister from Côte d'Ivoire could not attend today's meeting, as he coordinated the group, and he had urged the minister to place the Kenya matter as well as

the Nigeria and Ghana matter as matters for urgent attention by the African Union commission on sport, as well as the ministers for sport of the African continent. He was afraid that he did not have an update on that, as he had been hoping that the minister would provide an update on the situation.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was not sure that the Executive Committee members could sit there and pretend that the problem was going to go away because clearly it was not. WADA should immediately contact Mr Lobognon and get an update on the situation, as Dr Stofile had indicated, and perhaps then WADA might formally write to the new minister in Kenya and tell him that the matter would be discussed by the Executive Committee at its meeting in November and also politely remind him that a new Code would come into place on 1 January 2015, when there would be rigorous compliance issues. WADA would be pointing out the process through which it might have to go, and it would end up in his view in potential great difficulty. Although WADA might say that, as a country, it was non-compliant in terms of NADOs and all the rest of it, he was quite certain that the Olympic Movement would wish to protect the Kenyan athletes, so the mechanisms of how to deal with this were complicated, but he felt quite strongly that WADA could not just sit back and hope that it would be fixed, because quite clearly there was currently no will in Kenya to fix that. Were the members happy with that modest step towards progress?

DR STOFILE responded that he was quite at ease with that approach. The All Africa Games would be taking place in Brazzaville the following year, and he was sure that Kenya and the African Union would not like those games to be diluted by the absence of athletes from Kenya, so WADA should find a diplomatic way of nudging the African Union commission to nudge the Kenyan Government to get a move on regarding that particular issue.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if anybody wished to raise any other issues following the Director General's report.

MS SCOTT said that the members had in front of them the athlete's reference guide to the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code, hot off the press. It had come about as an idea at a meeting a little over a year previously, and it had been really championed by the members. It had gone through several revisions, discussions and many edits, and she was very pleased and proud to have the document in hand, as she thought it would be very beneficial not only to athletes, but to coaches, support staff and members of the sport community who would find it useful. Athletes got a lot of their information from those people as well. She was very happy with the document and saw it playing a very integral and important piece of communication and education for athletes worldwide. She had been at the International Triathlon Union World Championships grand finale in Edmonton a couple of weeks previously, and she had happened to attend the U23 race briefing and, at that point, when the authorities had gone through the race briefing and got to anti-doping, a slide had come up on the screen, and the race director had told the young athletes under 23 years old that, if they wanted to get to know the new changes for the 2015 Code, they should just go to the website, a URL of about 50 characters, and then the slide had changed, and she had thought at that time that not a single athlete in the room would go to the website to familiarise themselves with the Code. If the athlete guide had been available and handed out, she was sure that a lot more headway would have been made. That was why she thought it was such a critical piece in the education of athletes. The upcoming meeting of the Athlete Committee would be on 26 September at the Asian Games in Incheon and the Athlete Committee members would see the athlete guide for the first time there.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that he was delighted to see it. He had heard rumours about the athlete guide for some time. It was also available electronically and, with a bit of luck, people would be able to access it more easily than the athletes at the race briefing described by Ms Scott. He congratulated Ms Scott on its production and wished her well in Incheon. On the agenda for the meetings in Paris there would be a full report from Ms Scott after her

committee had had the opportunity to discuss all the things he knew the members wanted to discuss in Incheon.

## DECISION

Director General's report noted.

– 3.1 2013 testing figures

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the Executive Committee members that the figures had been published some time back. The testing figures came from the laboratories, and they all used ADAMS. The members would see the figures for that year in 157 pages, broken down significantly into all the testing authorities in the world that were engaged in collecting samples. There was one issue in particular that needed to be developed and the WADA management was currently looking at a paper internally. Many of the testing authorities were not signatories to the Code; they were often subsidiaries of either national federations or subsidiaries of others collecting samples on behalf of an IF or a NF. They were non-signatories, and there were issues raised in result management as a result of that. WADA therefore needed to look very carefully at how they were addressed going forward. That was alongside the comment made at the Foundation Board meeting in May of non-accredited laboratories, which the management would also address in the report. Other than that, it was for noting, and he had several hard copies with him if anybody wished to have one; members would be welcome to take one.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, when such information was published, it was of great interest to the media, which took a very particular view on either sport or countries, so the information was important.

Since it was the first time that she was speaking at the meeting, MS FOURNEYRON thanked the IOC president for his welcome letter and Mr De Kepper for his words; it meant a great deal to her to be in the de Coubertin room. She wanted to underline the importance of the report for all those involved in the fight against doping in sport, for the transparency of the fight, the monitoring of control activities and the organisation of the controls, to enable ADOs to compare the work done under the various jurisdictions and sports. It was not only hotly followed by the media, but it was also a very important tool for all those stakeholders involved in the fight against doping in sport, the NADOs and laboratories. Mr Howman had said that an important step forward would be to have full result management transparency, and that was something she had been underlining at several meetings, that the result management reports be fully transparent.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL thanked Ms Fourneyron. The intention was to further the report that WADA had to include result management. WADA could do that only when result management was provided to it, of course, and the figures used for publication currently came from the laboratories and not the ADOs. WADA was looking at a tool to ensure that it occurred, and would be collecting that information the following year, but it would probably not be in the 2014 figures; it would be in the 2015 figures. That was part of what WADA was going forward with.

## DECISION

2013 testing figures noted.

– 3.2 External organisation reports to Executive Committee and/or Foundation Board meetings

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the initiative had come from the President and the management had been asked to put forward a policy that really took over from the informal approach adopted to date. WADA had received reports from time to time from some stakeholder groups, such as UNESCO, Interpol and others, and there had been a report from

the Major League Baseball people in May, and of course they were not even signatories. It had been felt that greater formality was needed. WADA would look at invitations to be given to bodies to come to Foundation Board meetings in particular to give reports in a formal and public fashion, and that policy enabled WADA to pursue that. The document essentially spoke for itself, but he would be happy to receive any comment or question.

DR ERDENER said that the Olympic Movement agreed with the new proposed policy in principle but needed some clarification. He suggested continuing the case-by-case approach on the matter, where potential external organisation attendance at Foundation Board meetings was decided on by the WADA President. It depended on the situation.

MR NIWA introduced himself. He had been appointed on 1 September as a Japanese state minister. It was nice to meet all of the members. He supported the proposal but, among the agenda items of the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings, there were items that should not be discussed outside the meetings. In order to secure the confidentiality of such discussions, WADA needed to discuss some procedures to have WADA meeting participants sign a confidentiality agreement or leave the room.

MR RICCI BITTI echoed what his colleague had just said. He believed that it was a very delicate matter, because there were two aspects: the interest of listening to third parties, then the institutional side, which involved the balance between the two parties. For instance, comparing SportAccord to INADO was not a very appropriate example. He would make a difference between institutions and also freedom and discretion. He was happy that WADA had the discretion to invite people of interest to the group, but he would be very prudent in terms of policy.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded that he could answer only as a member of the WADA management team. The idea was to ensure that the Foundation Board in particular received reports from those organisations providing very good anti-doping programmes or experience. In that way, there would be a more formal approach so that, if anybody around the table felt that the President should issue such an invitation to UNESCO or somebody from which a report was necessary, that could be delivered, and that had been the idea. It had not been to participate in discussions of WADA policy matters around the table, but to come in and give reports and answer questions directly rather than those reports being provided by the WADA management. That was the direction that the management had been seeking, and he thought that that probably answered the questions raised.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members to remember always that Foundation Board meetings were public meetings; they were open to the media, so they were conducted effectively under a different set of rules to an Executive Committee meeting, and he agreed that on occasions there was the opportunity to get very interesting information. The Major League Baseball report had been very good example. That was a good principle. He had used the word 'prudent' many times in his life, and he would try to exercise prudent discretion in terms of who WADA might invite to be present or even to speak to the members on an issue.

MR RICCI BITTI fully supported the proposal. He had been slightly angry about the background put in the paper, which was not appropriate. Sport used one spot for SportAccord, whereas the governments did not use one for INADO. The background was not totally appropriate, but the rest was fine.

#### DECISION

Proposal regarding external organisation reports to Executive Committee and/or Foundation Board meetings approved.

– 3.3 iNADO

THE CHAIRMAN stated that WADA was involved in negotiations and discussions with iNADO and those could be discussed more fully by the Executive Committee to reach some resolution.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that WADA had been formally approached by iNADO to extend the grant that WADA had made to it some years previously to allow it to function. Three years previously, ANADO, the predecessor, had fallen into financial problems and had been dissolved. The NADOs had formed a new group called the Institute of National Anti-Doping Agencies. It had a number of members, and WADA had given it a grant of 160,000 dollars a year for three years. That would expire in June 2015, and iNADO had asked for an extension. The grant had initially been to enable it to get on its feet and become self-sufficient, but it not been able to achieve that in the three-year period, which was why the extension was being sought. His recommendation was to provide an extension for an 18-month period subject to the conditions set out in the written paper. There had been a letter from iNADO in relation to that. WADA was still recommending that the criteria be part of the extension of the grant and WADA would discuss that directly with the iNADO people if approved by the Executive Committee. There had been a similar extension of the grant to SportAccord for 18 months to allow it to function, and that grant expired at the end of 2015, so a similar approach was being made to each of the bodies and the management felt comfortable with the equality of process and conditions. Therefore, his recommendation was that the extension be approved by the Executive Committee.

DR ERDENER spoke on behalf of the Olympic Movement. He agreed in principle to supporting iNADO financially for a limited time, but would like more detailed information on the concrete activities and outcomes expected from iNADO using such funds.

MS FOURNEYRON agreed entirely with the comment just made. WADA could approve the extension of 18 months' financial support of iNADO. It was a private company; it was not government, it was an association, a private company, therefore it was important to grant the extension, but it had to be on a very clear contractual basis, with clear conditions so that, in 18 months' time, the same debate would not be held regarding financial support of iNADO. The second aspect had been underscored, which was that there should be equal treatment, and she supported that.

MR BOZA agreed with Mr Erdener's and Ms Fourneyron's comments. Also, so as not to be there in one more year with the same discussion that iNADO was not sustainable, it was important to be very clear in the contract or the extension given to iNADO that it was the final extension and that iNADO would have to be self-sufficient in the future. WADA needed to be clear when granting the new extension to iNADO and to other institutions.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that it was very helpful to hear from the members, as those were the conditions set out and the criteria that the management felt were a responsible approach from WADA. The management would discuss the conditions with iNADO to ensure that it was fully aware of them, and each of the matters raised by the members was contained in the list so, if the Executive Committee approved it, the management would certainly make sure that iNADO was aware. A similar thing had been done with SportAccord, which was certainly aware of the conditions under which it was operating and that the grant would conclude at the end of 2015, so he was heartened by the support from the members.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the correspondence had come in a letter from iNADO to him as President. iNADO had asked some questions of clarification on the conditions that the management had applied to continuation of the grant, so WADA would deal with those, and it was quite clear that WADA wished iNADO to become self-sufficient as an institution, preferably at an earlier date but, in the meantime, he thought that the decision was that

WADA would renew its financial support but make it clear to iNADO that it was not for an unlimited time period.

#### DECISION

Proposal to renew financial support to iNADO for a limited period of time approved.

#### – 3.4 Standing committee chair – Health, Medical and Research

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that two nominations had been made by the stakeholders. As the members knew, there had been much discussion on the issue over the past several days and weeks involving a number of people around the table. He would speak very openly on the grounds of transparency. It was quite clear to him that WADA had not handled the issue terribly well; for whatever reason, WADA had got itself into difficulties and he had been trying quite hard with considerable assistance from a number of people around the table to make sure that WADA could improve and try to avoid the kind of situation that had arisen. From the discussions that had been taking place right up to a few moments before the meeting had started that morning, he thought that a resolution existed along the following lines: that the sport movement would support the candidacy of Ms Fourneyron. If that was the case, he expressed immediately his gratitude to Dr Erdener for the elegant and distinguished way in which he had dealt with that. Secondly, WADA as an organisation should insist that the appointment of Ms Fourneyron would be for a two-year period, but WADA would then try to link the termination of all of the chairmanship appointments into the year ending 2016, and those four chairs would all come up for renewal or reappointment so that WADA could think the matter through and look to find the appropriate people to lead the four standing committees. If WADA did that, it would make it easier to maintain the convention, and it was only a convention, that WADA had had for many years that two of the chairmanships should be held by representatives of the sport movement and two by public authorities representatives. If the members were happy, WADA would proceed on that basis, with one rider, and that was that, in the minutes of that meeting, there be a clear statement that said that the Executive Committee understood that, when reviewing the chairmanships in 2016, there may be a nomination from the Olympic Movement for the chairmanship of the Health, Medical and Research Committee which would commence on 1 January 2017. Were the members happy to proceed on that basis? If that was their wish, the Executive Committee could appoint Ms Fourneyron as chair of the Health, Medical and Research Committee for a two-year period when a system was clearly understood on how to do that going forward. He would be happy if anybody wanted to speak on that and, if nobody did, the meeting could continue.

DR STOFILÉ said that he did not want to go back into the history of how WADA had got there, save to say that it was a good thing that WADA's members had reached the point at which they could walk again in the same direction, focus on the same issues and not allow themselves to be side-tracked by other issues less important than the purpose of the existence of such an august organisation as WADA. The matter had been discussed the previous day and, indeed, the public authorities had discussed it that morning. He had reported to them the developments with respect to limiting the term to a two-year term to align it with the expiry of the terms of the other three standing committees of WADA. In short, there was currently total consensus. He had still been expecting the African delegate to arrive, and now that Mr Lobognon would not arrive, it was correct to say that it was total consensus from the public authorities and that they accepted the solution to the problem. They had not pronounced on the issue of the future because they did not want to muddy already muddied water. When it had been said that the IOC may nominate a candidate in 2016, that presumed other things and they did not want to include presumptions in what he thought was a normal process because, when the terms of office came to an end, it was a

normal process to nominate successors. That had not been discussed, but he was stating his personal view that the small addition seemed to him to have big implications.

MR BOZA said that the members were sitting in the room of the founder of the Olympic Movement, Pierre de Coubertin, who in 1804 had had a big idea: the ideals of the Olympic Movement. He had been involved in the Olympic Movement since 1980, and the first thing he had learnt in sport was that the rules were clear for everybody. Everybody competed in the field; everybody had to respect others and play fairly. The rules had been written. He had just been informed at the public authorities meeting of the proposal from the sport side because, for the Americas, or CADE, the rules had been that there was a deadline, and he believed that the rules should be fulfilled. This was nothing personal. He wished to separate this from people. The rules were for everybody; not for the people, but for the future, the institutions, for the development of sport, and what had to be transmitted to young people. He wanted to play true and clean and his personal opinion was that WADA should separate this from the people and comply with the rules, with what was written. Change could be discussed if necessary, but that was his personal opinion.

MR RICCI BITTI asked about the rules.

THE CHAIRMAN emphasised that WADA would be doing nothing that broke any rule and would not break rules. He assured the members that the sport movement had discussed it in considerable detail that morning. He understood fully that the public authorities worked on a different basis of process, but this was an elegant way to bring the movement together and WADA had been gratefully helped by one person sitting around the table, and he would like the Executive Committee to agree and move on, but he assured the members that WADA was not breaking any rules.

MR BOZA clarified that he was not saying that WADA was willing to break the rules. He had said that the agenda had been to consider the election of the chairman of the Health, Medical and Research Committee, and not to change the period. Perhaps he had explained himself badly; he did not wish to say that WADA would be breaking the rules, but he had been concerned about a change to the deadline. He apologised for any misunderstanding.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he still wished to do what he had suggested, because this would give WADA an opportunity to resolve an issue that had been a difficulty and run the organisation better. Was everybody happy with that? In that case, he formally nominated that the Executive Committee appoint Ms Fourneyron as chair of the Health, Medical and Research Committee for a period of two years, and he repeated his thanks to the sport movement and to Dr Erdener for the elegant way in which he had dealt with the issue.

MR RICCI BITTI congratulated Ms Fourneyron and wished her all the best.

MS FOURNEYRON thanked the members for their confidence along with all those who had sought to ensure a satisfactory conclusion, which was the essence of the history of WADA: a balanced and transparent, effective and respectful partnership between the governments and the Olympic Movement. She thanked her colleague Dr Erdener for all his work, along with the other members who had worked so hard over the past few weeks. She would carry out her responsibility with humility, determination and commitment. She had been a member of the Executive Committee for the past two years, and she would fully respect the rules in 2016 which would apply to all four committees.

#### DECISION

Proposal to appoint Ms Fourneyron as  
Chair of the Health, Medical and Research  
Committee for a two-year period  
approved.

## 4. Finance

### – 4.1 Finance and Administration Committee chair report

MR RICCI BITTI said that he would try to be brief, but he had some items to draw to the members' attention. The Finance and Administration Committee meeting had taken place in July in London, and had been attended by the President, the Director General and Mr Niggli, and he would like to thank Ms Pisani for her preparation and great professional assistance provided at the meeting, which had gone ahead very smoothly and amicably. The first item dealt with at the meeting had been the acceptance of the internal control memorandum. Once again, no control shortcomings had been found, so he congratulated the staff. The report had been very positive. There had been a discussion on contributions received at the time. There had been talk about the six-month financial period and the committee had revised the 2014 budget according to the variants that would occur between then and the end of the year. The most important item discussed (and this was a specific agenda item) was the 2015 draft budget with the allocation of cash reserves, and there had been a long and interesting discussion, with contributions from members including the IOC finance director. Four options had been put forward, and the Finance and Administration Committee had chosen one option in the end which was the best in its opinion.

#### DECISION

Finance and Administration Committee chair report noted.

### – 4.2 Government/IOC contributions

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members that, to date, WADA had received 94.38% of contributions; that was unfortunately two points less than the previous year at that time (96.5%), and there were some pending matters, with some countries that had not paid. On the one hand, it was 94.38% but, on the other hand, it was worse than the previous year. The members had received the information in hard copy, but that was the global outcome.

#### DECISION

Government/IOC contributions update noted.

### – 4.3 Additional funding

#### 4.3.1 Government matching funding for research

MR RICCI BITTI noted what had been received. There was a letter from the IOC with mention of the ten million dollars and the various criteria. He thanked Turkey on behalf of WADA, as it had committed to contribute 250,000 dollars, and then there were intentions expressed by Saudi Arabia, China, Japan and the USA. He would give the floor to the President and the Director General to talk about the additional funding.

THE CHAIRMAN said that WADA was talking to the IOC about practical arrangements.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that WADA had already received 250,000 dollars from Turkey and 100,000 dollars from Saudi Arabia, and would have four other payments from Saudi Arabia, so the total payment from Saudi Arabia would be 500,000 dollars. There was a commitment from China of one million dollars and he expected that money to come in the coming weeks. There was a commitment from the USA of six million dollars over three years, an initial commitment from Korea of one million dollars spread over five years, and an initial indication from Japan of one million dollars. Those were the current amounts received; some of them were more formal than others. That day, he had been informed that Kuwait would make a commitment, he did not know the amount,



and some smaller amounts had been promised from Côte d'Ivoire, Peru and other countries which WADA expected to receive in the coming months.

THE CHAIRMAN joked that he would be speaking to the British sports minister since he was still British.

MR RICCI BITTI believed that the information was very positive, in general terms. He recommended that the Director General really study the mechanism of matching with the IOC, as there had been some misunderstanding. It was very important to have the mechanism as, for instance, there were lump sum contributions, and it would be better to study a procedure to better manage the money coming in and matching.

#### DECISION

Additional funding/government matching  
funding for research update noted.

#### 4.3.2 Tokyo 2020

THE CHAIRMAN introduced a short presentation, which was slightly unusual. The London Olympic Games organising committee had decided to try to be a little bit innovative, and had put together a project called International Inspiration, which had raised funds and been used to develop sport for young people in many different parts of the world. There were quite a lot of programmes out there that did that, but the London Olympic Games organising committee had felt that it would like to do it, and in fact it had been successful, raising substantial sums of money that had been very well invested (12 million young people in 20 countries all round the world had benefited).

Mr Kono, who was the President of the Japan Sports Council, had approached WADA and said that, in a sense, the Japanese equivalent of International Inspiration would be a programme called Sport for Tomorrow, and one part of that had a specific anti-doping element in it and, as Japan developed its plans, it seemed to him to be entirely reasonable that WADA invite him to come to the meeting and tell the Executive Committee members what Japan was thinking of doing. He passed the floor to Mr Kono and asked the members to note with interest what he thought was a very interesting suggestion, which would certainly benefit the world anti-doping community. He thought that it would also benefit Japan and it might even benefit WADA.

MR KONO thanked the Executive Committee for giving him time to briefly present the legacy project of the Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic Games. As Vice-President for Tokyo 2020, he thanked in particular Messrs Reddie and Howman and all the WADA Executive Committee members. Although Tokyo 2020 was in the early stages of planning and development, he wished to take the opportunity to share the Sport For Tomorrow legacy project, which included anti-doping initiatives.

The Sport for Tomorrow legacy project had been presented by the Japanese Prime Minister, Shinzo Abe, during the final presentation in Buenos Aires at which Tokyo had fortunately been awarded the Olympic Games for 2020. That was a government commitment. The overall theme of Sport for Tomorrow was to create a future with the power and core values of sport. Hence, the vision was to develop an ethical legacy in society and bring about a positive impact on people through the values of sport. Sport for Tomorrow aimed to strengthen the integrity of sport and sport's educational role in society, and develop future leaders through sport. By 2020, it aimed to reach 10 million people in 100 countries. As the members could see in the slide, there were three pillars. First in the middle was sporting power, second on the right, the international sports academy, and the third and most important was global play true focused on anti-doping.

Sport for Tomorrow had been developed in accordance with the very successful London 2012 International Inspiration programme, but at the same time it was a kind of legacy project from the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games under the name of JAICA. Japan had been sending sport expertise to over 80 countries and sport equipment to over 90 countries since 1964. Similarly to the London 2012 programme, Japan would like to create opportunities to access sport and physical education. That would be delivered by the Japanese Sports Council. The international sport academy (on the right) would provide a master's in advanced sport studies to young people, including athletes invited from all over the world. The university involved had already signed a memorandum of understanding with AISTS, the international academy of sport science and technology, based in Lausanne. The university was running an official Olympic studies centre approved by the IOC, and Mr Niwa had visited AISTS the previous day to seek further collaboration. A pilot class would begin at the end of the month.

He explained the pillar called Global Play True. Global Play True 2020 would be developed based on Japan's experiences in contributing capacity development to Asian countries, such as Singapore, Myanmar and Malaysia. For example, JADA had worked with Singapore to develop its NADO when the first Youth Olympic Games had been decided upon. The same had occurred with Myanmar before, during and after it had hosted the Southeast Asian Games in 2013. These experiences had given Japan further commitment in building stronger anti-doping capacity and networks.

Working with WADA, Japan aimed to strengthen the global anti-doping movement and integrity of sport. Japan planned to work closely with the WADA regional office to identify strategic areas particularly for the development of the RADOs and NADOs. After 2020, Japan planned to invest a total of six hundred million Japanese yen, about six million US dollars in the anti-doping part of Sport for Tomorrow's Global Play True 2020 project. That would be in addition to the current annual allocation of the WADA budget (1.5 million US dollars) and also the annual voluntary contribution of 200,000 dollars and the matching funds discussed.

There were five project areas, because it was still in the very early stages. Japan would work more on the detailed plan with WADA. Just touching on project five, strengthening the anti-doping community through conferences or symposia, Japan would co-host an international conference on the partnership between the pharmaceutical industry and anti-doping authorities in January the following year. Japan expected that the WADA President, along with representatives from the IOC, UNESCO, WHO, Interpol and IFPMA would attend. In the lead-up to 2020, and also beyond 2020, he hoped that Sport for Tomorrow Global Play True 2020 would have a lasting impact and legacy.

As he had mentioned, it was still a very early stage in preparations for the Tokyo Olympic Games. He looked forward to working with WADA, the IOC, the IPC, and also colleagues from NADOs and IFs working for clean sport and for the integrity of sport. He was open to suggestions and inspiration. He thanked the members for their precious time and kind attention.

THE CHAIRMAN suggested going back one slide in the presentation to the five project areas, which had been slipped over quite quickly. Looking at the range of global capacity-building, that was the ADOs and RADOs, development of values-based education aimed at young people, development of core anti-doping professionals, social science research, something WADA did a little of, and then strengthening the whole anti-doping community, with the commitment over the period of six million US dollars, that was an enormous contribution to the anti-doping community. He thanked Mr Kono for taking the trouble to come and make the presentation. Were there questions on how the project, which he accepted was in the early stages, would develop in any specific way? He would ask his questions later on. He thanked Mr Kono, as he thought it was really exciting, and he complimented him on the additional efforts to be made by Japan as the host of an Olympic

Games. It was really very exciting for the anti-doping world to be included as part of the major project. WADA would follow the development of the project, and would do everything possible to help develop the project. He thought WADA might be able to be of some value. He looked forward to joining Mr Kono at the meeting with the pharmaceutical industry the following year. He would certainly be there to provide support. He also thanked the minister on behalf of the WADA Executive Committee.

#### DECISION

Tokyo 2020 update noted.

#### – 4.4 2014 quarterly accounts

MR RICCI BITTI said that the quarterly accounts showed a profit of ten million dollars. The members should not dream. The profit was the result of the seasonal nature of the operation. Expenditure was only 50% in June, and WADA had to spend more money, so it was worse off than the ten million showed, and WADA needed all that money to get to the end of the year. He mentioned some specific items of variants, the additional income, the voluntary contribution, and some items of expenses. It was worth noting that they had already been accounted for, for example the Sochi Olympic Games, the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings in May, including the higher costs because of additional travel costs, and that was due to the decision to allocate to the partners, and it was not working completely and had resulted in additional expenses. He also noted the communication audit commissioned by the President to review the WADA communication operation situation. That had not been budgeted. The good news was that the cost of the ADO symposium, considered to be one of the most important activities, was already included, but the plan was to expand the symposium, as it was one of the most effective initiatives in terms of stakeholder connections. That had all resulted in a revised budget.

#### DECISION

2014 quarterly accounts noted.

#### – 4.5 Revised budget 2014

MR RICCI BITTI said that the revised budget in global terms contained a lot of variations, but they compensated one another. There was not a lot of difference from the previous budget, the additional income had been allocated to capital investment, and there was an increase only in unallocated cash reserves, to the amount of 128,000 dollars. Obviously the exchange rate had been adjusted. The revised budget did not really differ greatly from the previous budget in global terms. That was good news, but it also meant that WADA needed all the money that appeared to be a profit at that point in the year.

#### DECISION

Revised budget 2014 noted.

#### – 4.6 Draft budget 2015

MR RICCI BITTI said that the Finance and Administration Committee recommendation was very clear. There was a problem regarding money. There were two activities that had been considered unavoidable, and they were very relevant. One was Code implementation: it required more people, more staff. The second one was the update of the new ADAMS, split into two years for a total of 3.4 million dollars, meaning that the cost would be 1.661 million dollars in the 2015 budget. Those two unavoidable activities required a lot of money, and the other condition, which was worth mentioning, was a very restricted use of reserves. The reserves were not used and did not correspond to many months of activity, and it was very dangerous to reduce the reserves. So the Finance and Administration Committee accepted the recommendation from the staff not to exceed 500,000 dollars to dig into the reserves for

2015 and 2016. With that limitation and the expenses to be incurred for the two big projects, in the range of four million dollars, the budget, based on a 3% increase in contributions, would allow WADA to survive. Otherwise, it would be necessary to dig deeper into the reserves and also, to achieve what he had said, WADA would have to reduce two important items in the budget, in particular the research fund and the litigation costs. Mr Niggli would explain the reason behind the reduction in litigation costs.

Those were the key decisions made: unavoidable projects such as Code implementation and the ADAMS update, restricted allowance of the use of the reserves (up to 500,000 dollars), and a 3% contribution increase in income. Looking at the global presentation, that was what the Finance and Administration Committee recommended for the Executive Committee's consideration and discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that there was quite a lot of paper and a lot of information, including the updated strategic and operational plan explanations, so every penny of expenditure was shown in detail; but, at the end of the day, on the principles discussed at the Finance and Administration Committee meeting, that WADA had to prioritise expenditure, and the priorities were to upgrade ADAMS and make sure that WADA would be able to organise Code compliance, and within the limited budget that WADA had, some things had to go. That was the basis of the discussion.

DR ERDENER spoke about two different things. He strongly supported the 3% increase in the following year's budget; as a result, the temporary arrangement on travel costs would not need to be extended beyond that year. Another issue was that there was an IOC executive board decision about matching procedures for the new fund, and after meeting the IOC president, some flexibility had been agreed to, and an official letter had been sent to the WADA Director General. The only problem was that there could not be long-term use of the fund. That was the main issue. In fact, according to the IOC executive board decision, the amount received from governments before the WADA Foundation Board meeting in November would be matched shortly, but the official letter stated 'government commitments' instead of 'amounts received'. That was also important with regard to use of the fund.

MR MOSES said that he had a couple of questions, mainly concerning the refurbishment of ADAMS. In the USA and several other countries, systems other than ADAMS were used, mainly SIMON, and he knew that the Director General had had conversations with USADA about the use of SIMON and the exchange of information from ADAMS to SIMON. Looking at the proposals, large amounts of money were being earmarked towards upgrading ADAMS, and not only USADA but also other countries using SIMON were really concerned about how SIMON would be integrated in the system. It seemed as though WADA had done an in-house assessment on what a new ADAMS could look like, but he thought it would be prudent to include those NADOs that did not use ADAMS and think about how ADAMS and SIMON were going to work. He understood that the Athlete Biological Passport programme was dependent on getting as much independent testing data into a global system as possible and, as long as the two systems were not talking, WADA was losing data. The objective should be to enhance the Athlete Biological Passport programme and make the whole testing procedure more efficient, so it would be prudent, before an RFP was put out, to have the end-users of systems other than ADAMS at the table to figure out how and what it was going to look like.

MR RICCI BITTI repeated what he had said that morning. ADAMS put before WADA financial and political problems. One system would be better than two. The second solution was that, if one had two systems, they had to talk to each other if one wanted a global system. Moving to financial matters, if two systems had to talk, one had to develop an interface, or the technology to interact. That was the problem. Financially, a cost of 1.66 million dollars would be required for two years, meaning a total of 3.4 million, as that was

what the technology people would require to update WADA, including some features to interact with other systems. Before that, a political decision or direction was very important, and he believed that the attitude of the sport movement was that it should state (rather than impose) its priority, which was obviously ADAMS.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that that was a clear statement from Mr Ricci Bitti on behalf of the sport movement and from a financial point of view.

MS FOURNEYRON said that she wanted to talk about the research fund and underline the commitment of the President, who had done a lot to make sure that there were matching funds from the IOC and had provided information throughout the summer. Communication had been excellent, with e-mails and press releases and requests for input regarding the various initiatives. She thanked the President and the management for sharing information. Regarding the revised draft budget for 2015, she asked Mr Ricci Bitti why the amounts related to accreditation and reaccreditation of laboratories had been practically doubled in comparison to the 2014 budget.

MR RICCI BITTI replied that a new laboratory had been accredited. The accreditation of the Egyptian laboratory had not been budgeted for, hence the figures.

In response to the other comments and questions, the agreement to allocate expenses to the respective stakeholders was not permanent but would end when WADA had said it would end. If that was approved by the Executive Committee, it would be reflected as soon as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the question of matching funding was that there was correspondence with the IOC and Mr Howman and Mr de Kepper were discussing it. The only major difference was that the IOC had indicated that it would like to have funds (actual money) paid to WADA at the latest by 31 March 2016, and WADA currently had some offers from governments that were offering funds on their own budgeting systems that ran past the date of 2016. That was the issue that was subject to discussion.

MR RICCI BITTI referred to two more years: the following year plus the first part of 2016.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was very clear about what was being suggested but, before that date had been applied, WADA had indicated it to governments, and some had said that they would pay WADA over five years. If that was not going to be possible, it was only proper that WADA go back to those governments and speak to them. It was a factual situation that WADA had to resolve.

MR RICCI BITTI said that, otherwise, the money would have to be kept in the bank for many years without using it. That was the problem.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that he was happy that the money was being kept in the bank in the certainty that it would be used. He could count. That was the only technical issue. Mr Howman had written, and he knew that Mr de Kepper had been very busy with other things, but he had receipt of the letter and WADA would deal with that. Personally, he was encouraged by the response received from the governments. On record, with Mr Niwa present at his first meeting, he publicly acknowledged as he had in Nanjing the commitment of the Chinese Government for one million dollars; that was very healthy and would create, at the end of the day, a very substantial fund for research purposes at WADA, which he hoped would more than offset the temporary reduction in funding for one year in research which was necessary in the priorities outlined by Mr Ricci Bitti.

MR NIWA said that Japan was currently negotiating with the ministry of finance to be able to contribute to this and would work hard on it. Whilst that amount was allocated by the finance authorities, he wished to make it conditional to Japan posting a person at the

WADA headquarters, and he understood that some other countries in Asia had stipulated similar conditions, and he hoped that that was well understood.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that he clearly understood and he would leave it with the WADA management to consider the implications of that, but personally he saw no great difficulty.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he would cooperate as much as possible. There had been a similar approach from Korea, which had also asked for a secondment. WADA would talk to Japan and Korea about the logistics.

MR RICCI BITTI noted that the draft budget in attachment 2 item 4.6 indicated the four major decisions, including a substantial reduction in science and research, a substantial reduction in litigation costs, restrictions on the use of the reserves to 500,000 dollars, and a 3% contribution from all stakeholders. Those were the basic conditions, and he put the proposal to the members of the Executive Committee for their approval.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the budget would be taken to the Foundation Board meeting in Paris for approval.

He was very well aware that the organisation was facing financial restrictions and he was trying to think that through. There might be other ways of raising funds. He just wanted the members to be aware that he knew the issues and they were being discussed. There was nothing worse than hinting that there might be more money, because that was a wonderful excuse not to take any action. He was aware of the situation and work was in progress.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that WADA had had discussions with USADA at some length about SIMON and ADAMS. The RFP regarding the new ADAMS of course took that into account, and WADA would look at making sure that all current systems could be compatible, but WADA had already received assurance from USADA that it would use ADAMS going forward and would encourage the others to whom it had sold SIMON to do likewise, so WADA was working with USADA with that in mind, and that should be recorded as a sign of further cooperation between WADA and USADA. WADA would be working on that, so the concerns mentioned by Mr Moses were certainly under control.

#### DECISION

Proposed budget for 2015 to be put to the Foundation Board in Paris in November for approval.

### **5. World Anti-Doping Code**

- 5.1 Implementation of World Anti-Doping Code and International Standards 2015 – rules update

THE CHAIRMAN noted that this was one of the two priorities that Mr Ricci Bitti had outlined and which the Executive Committee had regarded as priorities from a financial point of view.

MR NIGGLI stated that the first item was mainly an update. As discussed at the previous meeting, the first step in any compliance programme was to have rules in place. The aim was to have all ADOs having implemented a new rule by 1 January 2015 so as to start working on getting an efficient anti-doping programme in place. The management was working to help all stakeholders have the rule in place, using model rules and what was available on the website, and obviously working directly with them on reviewing their rules and making sure that WADA was getting the right things in place.

In part three of the document, all of the numbers had changed since the paper had been prepared, which was a good sign, as it meant that all of the organisations had been working.

To give a few examples, WADA had 55 NADOs or NOCs acting as NADOs that had drafted their rules, seven Olympic IFs, three other Olympic IFs currently under review, etc. The work was progressing; WADA was in daily contact with all the stakeholders and kept pushing for the deadline at the end of the year.

MS FOURNEYRON supported the process, and assured WADA that all of the European countries were doing their utmost to be in compliance by 1 January 2015. There could be delays in the various countries linked to issues of legislation, but everything possible was being done to ensure that all European countries were in compliance by 1 January 2015. She congratulated and thanked the WADA team for their support, contributions and visits to assist the various NADOs and guide them towards compliance with the new Code. She gave the example of the Netherlands, which had greatly benefitted from such essential support because, for different countries, it was not so easy to be on time. A decision had been taken to make public all those countries that would not be in compliance with the Code, so it was essential to get there, but she praised the work, especially since a great deal had been asked of the WADA management, particularly given the difficult financial circumstances.

THE CHAIRMAN echoed Ms Fourneyron's comments. He had attended the meeting of the European sport ministers on Thursday. Mr Andy Parkinson on behalf of the Council of Europe had presented precisely that issue to the European sport ministers, and it had been received particularly warmly by the Netherlands, so he thought that there was clear understanding that the issue needed to be addressed. There was a willingness to do that. It would not be as easy in all 47 European countries. He was grateful to Ms Fourneyron for her kind words about the efforts that had been made.

#### DECISION

Update on implementation of the World Anti-Doping Code and international standards 2015 noted.

- 5.2 Code 2015 reference – ADAMS or another system approved by WADA

MR NIGGLI said that the item referred to the systems other than ADAMS and the provision in the Code that would enter into force on 1 January 2015 about recognising other systems. This might be only for an interim period, because it would concern the time before the new ADAMS was in place, so that was the situation with which WADA would have to deal for a couple of years, after which everybody would hopefully be working on one single common system. A process needed to be put in place so as to understand how to deal with the issues when they arose and if WADA got requests. Obviously, there were some formalities in terms of deadlines and how to apply, and there were a few criteria included for information. They might not be the only ones. There would be a high-level IT discussion whenever requests were received, but there were a few principles that needed to be understood. First, it made no sense to have a system that was not compatible and could not talk with ADAMS because otherwise there was no point having the system. It was absolutely clear that security of the data and athletes was of primary importance; therefore, WADA would not recognise a system that did not offer security that was as high as that provided by ADAMS. The whole idea of anti-doping was harmonisation; it was the role of WADA to make sure that it could monitor what was going on. Therefore, WADA would need access to the system so as to play its monitoring role. The last one, which was also very important, was that the system needed to provide some traceability in terms of what was performed in the system. It was a little more technical but it was very important; it meant that WADA needed to have the possibility of knowing who had done what within the system. There had been many legal cases in which there had been questions about the athlete trying to enter whereabouts information but the system had not worked, or who had got access to that information from the system. They were very important questions, and such IT problems

might have an impact on the athlete, so WADA needed to be able to know exactly what had happened. ADAMS enabled that, and he thought that any system recognised as compatible would need to offer the same kind of security to the athletes. That was the principle; obviously then there would be IT discussions to make sure that it could work, and that again was until WADA had a new system in place where interface would be built in from the beginning. Hopefully after the discussions with USADA, everything would be in place when the system got there. He sought approval in principle from the Executive Committee; then he would deal with the requests as they came, if any.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, from long experience, decisions on IT systems were complicated, but it was an issue of principle that Mr Niggli and the management wanted.

MR GODKIN said that his constituents had raised some concerns about the time frames at play. If they were talking about principles, they could be worked through, but those who had undertaken systems other than ADAMS in good faith and were looking for an interface had expressed some concerns about some of the restrictions and would like further consultation in relation to implementation.

MR RICCI BITTI said that, if he took the technical explanation given by Mr Niggli, it was more political than it looked. WADA needed to establish some priorities. Would the system be ADAMS, or would there be a multi-system? To him, the latter was not acceptable. ADAMS had to have priority, with all respect for people who had adopted different systems. The second point had to do with the consequence of the cost. Having been a technology man in the past, the cost involved in interfacing a system had to be taken into account, and he did not believe, if one had a priority system, that WADA had to undertake all the costs. Some consideration had to be given to the cost of interfacing, as he thought that, in theory, it was not WADA that had to take care of everything.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that Mr Ricci Bitti's comments were clear: that the organisation should state quite clearly that its priority was ADAMS and that access to ADAMS should be met by other systems.

MR NIGGLI said that consultation was to take place on the design of the new system. In the interim period, he was pretty clear about the requirements that had to be in place and, of course, WADA could talk to whoever wanted a system to be recognised, and WADA would see how to deal with that, but it would be better to work on the future right away. As far as temporary recognition of a system was concerned, there should be no cost for WADA. If somebody wanted a system working with WADA, the interface would be at the expense of the organisation seeking the interface. WADA was trying to resolve that problem through the design of the new system, and that was a different ball game.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the principles were for approval. Did they have the members' approval?

#### DECISION

Criteria for an approved clearinghouse system  
(other than ADAMS) approved

#### – 5.3 Compliance activities plan 2015

MR NIGGLI said that this item was the most important of the three items, to give the Executive Committee the overview of what WADA was currently thinking about putting into place for the future in terms of compliance and helping stakeholders to be compliant, and it actually mirrored the budget that the members had just seen and justified and explained the costs linked to compliance.

The paper provided the broad picture and, once the Executive Committee approved the direction, the management would come back with a more refined proposal, but currently



there were five big steps being taken. The first one was obvious, and it was to continue to work with all stakeholders to get the rules in place by 1 January 2015. The second step WADA would take would be to establish the independent technical committee that had already been discussed at the previous Executive Committee meeting. The idea was to have a group of people outside the WADA management, non-political, technical experts in the business of compliance, and that group would have the role of overseeing the compliance programme and would provide the expert recommendations that were needed on the way to compliance. WADA was seeking a group of five to seven people, and the members would see from the budget that the idea was that they would meet every quarter, so there would probably be four meetings a year to oversee and provide recommendations from time to time on compliance issues. There would therefore be an independent view on compliance issues when they arose. The third step was more of an internal issue, so it did not have a specific cost attached to it. It would be an internal organisation within WADA to ensure that it spoke with one voice to all stakeholders in terms of compliance. A number of different departments at WADA would be involved in helping stakeholders have an efficient programme in place, liaising with stakeholders in terms of compliance assessment and so on, and the idea was to have one internal group that would meet on a regular basis to appraise all the elements on the table and communicate with one single voice on all issues with stakeholders, so there should be only a single communication from WADA and that would address all the potential issues regarding an efficient anti-doping programme. He thought that would benefit all stakeholders.

The fourth step to be implemented was to have an ISO accreditation for the compliance process. That meant that WADA wanted an ISO certification for the process itself. That existed already in other fields of activity; for example, in the airline industry, there was a monitoring programme to regulate air traffic, and there was an ISO certification for the way in which monitoring was carried out. He thought that it would be a good idea if the WADA programme (in other words, what WADA was looking for, how it was going to look at things and how it was going to report on the process) were ISO-accredited, as it would give all stakeholders reassurance that the way in which the programme was implemented was done in the most professional way, and it would ensure that the right process was in place. WADA would undertake the exercise; obviously, there was a cost associated to that but once it was in place there would be a fairly modest maintenance cost.

The fifth was to continue to assist all stakeholders to achieve an efficient anti-doping programme, which meant that 2015 would be a year in which, rather than talking too much about compliance, WADA would talk more about supporting all partners to put into place a good, efficient anti-doping programme, and that was the first task that WADA would do, leading naturally to assessing how that worked out in the following years. The members would see in the papers the staff and cost implications. If the Executive Committee were comfortable with the direction chosen, all the elements would be refined, starting with providing some names in November for the independent expert committee.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he was very happy about what Mr Niggli had said. He echoed what Ms Fournayron had said. He had the same feeling, that perhaps 'compliance' was a word that had policing implications, and he preferred 'assistance'. At least during the first stage, assistance to the ADOs was very important so, with regard to the style of the general operation, it was important to know that many NADOs were not yet at the level they should be (although he did not wish to criticise), so he thought the concept of assistance expressed so well by Ms Fournayron was very important before compliance activities. The refinements mentioned were very much welcomed by the sport side, which wanted to know the role of the compliance review committee vis-à-vis the role of the internal task force involved in this. He thought that, to be effective, WADA had to do a lot of work to clarify the mission and function of all the bodies and organisations, as that could have a direct impact on activities, so he welcomed everything that had been said, but he was concerned about the future and

stressed that it was very important to have a definition of the mission of the bodies that WADA sought to put in place.

MR NIWA said that he thought compliance was very important; however, with the budget deficit, the new spending increase of two million dollars would put further stress on WADA's operations and could harm anti-doping activities; therefore, first he would review the budget and look at ways of reducing spending on ADO operations to shift the saving to the project.

DR ERDENER agreed with the proposed compliance activities plan but, as Mr Ricci Bitti had also mentioned, some clarification was required. For instance, how would WADA implement its sole communication policy and other issues on intelligence and investigations? What would the role of the working group on compliance monitoring be?

MS FOURNEYRON expressed her gratitude for all the work done to achieve a compliance strategy, which was currently visible. It was important to have a detailed plan on the costs of the compliance programme in the draft 2015 budget so as to be able to make the necessary financial decisions associated to that, and to have more detailed information on the global strategy that she fully supported and had just been presented. She had no problem supporting the proposal to recruit independent experts, something that had also been done for the Independent Observer programme. Perhaps with a view to transparency and regular information, the reports could be made public, or at least the relevant ones, and then, with a view to harmonising the different actors in the fight against doping in sport, perhaps internal resources could be pooled and there might be cooperation with partners such as the Council of Europe. The President had said that he had attended a recent Council of Europe meeting. At the Council of Europe, annual reports were presented on all the work done and evaluation visits had taken place since 1996. UNESCO also had a questionnaire, so perhaps it would be a good idea to take advantage of the synergies that existed, which would be useful at a time when the work done by WADA's partners could be of benefit.

MR MOSES said that he welcomed more compliance and thought that the organisation was really the focal point for the athletes, and the athletes expected WADA to help maintain the integrity of sport. Ms Scott had been asking about Jamaica that morning; coming from a country that ran a tough programme and had no qualms about taking on even top-level athletes if it found out that they had made a mistake and used drugs, the athletes wanted that to happen. Coming from a major country such as the USA in which drug testing was tough and took no prisoners, one had to wonder when one sent a clean team to the Olympic Games what everybody else was doing. Athletes in the USA were looking at countries such as Jamaica and Russia, and saying that the USA was sending a clean Olympic team and all of a sudden they were seeing a complete rash of athletes testing positive who were Olympic and world champions. Those athletes were going to USADA and asking what was going on, and why was it that their system was tough but what about everybody else? Compliance was an area that was very important to the athletes. They needed to know that compliance was going to be executed across the board for every country. It would have to be a tough system because, if compliance was not there, WADA was not doing its job in terms of providing a service to the athletes, who wanted to compete in clean sports. That was what it was all about. His view was, the more compliance, the better. It was necessary to have a very strong hand when it came to it. When it came to the position and the execution and updating of the Code, he thought that the organisation was duty bound to call it what it was, no matter who it was. That was a really important issue. That was what athletes were concerned about: that what was fair for them was fair for everybody else. That would be very important going forward. The tougher the hand, or the tougher WADA was, the better.

THE CHAIRMAN made it clear that the Code said that the responsible body for compliance was the Foundation Board so, rather than just bring an issue to a Foundation Board meeting, WADA needed to have very expert back-up before doing that, and it seemed to him to be implicit in the kind of suggestions being made. Secondly, there had always been a worldwide

assumption that, if one spent two years developing in detail a new Code, it made no sense to bring in a new Code without then trying to encourage in whatever way one could compliance with that Code.

MR NIGGLI responded to the comments. A few general points would cover Mr Ricci Bitti's and Dr Erdener's questions. The idea was to provide assistance first. That was the plan. That was what WADA would do in 2015 whilst getting organised. Clearly, the target for WADA was to help as many organisations as it could, not only to become compliant, but also to have an efficient anti-doping system in place. That was what WADA wanted. It wanted to serve clean athletes. That was the primary goal. That did not mean that, if WADA had a huge issue, it could not deal with compliance in 2015.

Clearly, there was a need for refinement. It was the idea that this would give the general direction, then obviously he would come back with terms of reference for the committees and a detailed plan and, if WADA became ISO-accredited, the members would have more details than they wanted on how the process would work and so on. It was a real step-by-step process. WADA had to lay the foundations for something that needed to be credible; if it wanted to have a strong hand, it needed to be credible, and have a process accepted by all as being fair. Once that was in place, ultimately the Foundation Board would be able to take a decision, knowing that the process leading to that decision had been appropriate. That was clearly the idea.

Responding to Mr Niwa, this was an expensive programme, and was one of the two big priorities within the organisation, and of course WADA would look at the overall budget every year to make sure that it delivered on that.

He told Ms Fournayron that WADA would look at possible synergies between the programme to be implemented and those that already existed. The first thing was to have a programme in place, and then see how the necessary information could be collected and what kind of cooperation might be possible. Of course, that had been done in the past with the Council of Europe. WADA would continue such dialogue and try to avoid duplicating work.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the document was very comprehensive. It stated very clearly the steps that WADA asked the members to approve, the management had put the best estimate onto it, and it was one of the two priorities. He asked the members formally if they were happy to approve the document and authorise the management to continue the work that it had been doing, certainly with an emphasis on assisting people to become compliant.

#### DECISION

Proposed compliance activities plan 2015  
approved.

#### – 5.4 Technical Document on Sport-Specific Analysis

THE CHAIRMAN said that, having read the document, he was not sure he could answer any questions on it, but the Technical Document on Sport-Specific Analysis was a formidable piece of work, led from a WADA point of view by Mr Tim Ricketts, together with Dr Peter Harcourt, who had chaired the expert working group on the preparation of the technical document.

MR RICKETTS informed the members that he was very grateful that Dr Harcourt had been able to attend the meeting that day; he had been a good chairman and had led the group very well throughout the process. The document that the members should be looking at was the one that was tabled. There had been a few minor amendments following the Prohibited List changes (that document had been circulated before that), and there were also some changes to the sports and the names of the sports in appendix one.

The document itself was in six categories, and the first three were the mandatory core components, including appendix one on the minimum levels of analysis for all able-bodied sports. Appendix two would be for those sports for athletes with impairments. The remaining three documents were supporting documents to assist ADOs in the implementation of the document, and that included the application form for the potential reduction of minimum levels of analysis, specific information on the prohibited substances within the scope of the technical document, and also an extensive question and answer section that contained 48 questions and answers, which highlighted the technical and complex nature of the document.

The technical document was one very important part in the overall move towards the implementation of more effective programmes, and he thought it was a revolutionary milestone for the anti-doping movement and would bring about change to the ways in which ADOs conducted testing for the specific prohibited substances, which would ultimately lead to greater harmonisation.

The consultation process had been very extensive within the nine-month period of work; it had begun in December with the appointment of the committee, followed by two rounds of consultations with the IFs in the development of the physiological assessment of the different sports and disciplines. That had been followed by a further two rounds of consultation with all the ADOs together, the NADOs and major event organisers, and that was reflected in the number of submissions or comments received. In addition to the electronic consultation sessions, there had been a number of in-person sessions in which members of the drafting group had been heavily involved, and they included Dr Harcourt attending the IOC medical conference in Monaco in April to speak with his peers, the chief medical officers of all the Olympic sports, on the development and implementation of the technical document, and had also involved presentations at the ASOIF medical group meeting. Presentations had also been given at the ADO symposium in March and at SportAccord in April.

Overall, the nine months of work, the buy-in and input from the various stakeholders had really got WADA to where it currently was with the document. He reminded the members of the dynamic group of experts chaired by Dr Harcourt: Dr Richard Budgett, from the IOC, Dr Toni Pascual, from the Barcelona laboratory, who was also the chair of the IPC anti-doping committee, Dr Matt Federuk from USADA and also on the IPC anti-doping committee, Dr Stuart Miller from the ITF, Professor Don McKenzie from the International Canoe Federation, who was a professor in exercise physiology and also on the board of the Canadian NADO, and a new addition to the group, although he had been on the other side of the fence in May, was Mr Andersen, who had continued his work as a member of the group.

DR HARCOURT thanked the members for giving him an opportunity to make a presentation and talk about the work undertaken over the past 12 months. It was fair to say that it was a relief, because that day was the deadline for achieving the tabling of the document with what could be seen had been very significant consultation. He had been assisted by the group, because the members represented diverse professional backgrounds and different organisations. There was a strong mix of IFs, the laboratories and NADO representation, and there had also been engagement by the members to talk to their peers about the issues as well, thus creating a very strong framework of engagement and talking about what WADA was trying to achieve with the document.

What was the TDSSA and why did WADA need it? It was in the 2015 Code under article 5.4, where there was a requirement for WADA to consult with IFs and other ADOs to create a list of what substances were likely to be abused within the various sports and disciplines, using a risk platform, and it had been driven by that second point, which was that there was an inconsistency among the ADOs about their use of specific analyses, so all ADOs would have their standard testing and there was optional testing that sat around that standard

testing. A number of ADOs had been sticking to the standard testing and not exploring other directions, indicating that there had not necessarily been a lot of thought about what tests were used to detect drug cheating. The document had been about defining the minimum levels of analysis for each sport and discipline. It had been a challenging task.

What would the TDS aim to achieve? Obviously to close off the loophole of ADOs not really engaging in the range of tests available to detect the range of prohibited substances, some of them quite significant. It sent a message to athletes generally that WADA and the ADOs were becoming smarter in their test development, so it was a general deterrence in support of clean sport. It was generating a lot of metrics, as could be seen from the technical document (in appendix one) that would hold ADOs accountable in how they went about and implementing smarter testing. It would also drive and improve the range of tests that the laboratories would provide by creating a demand for those tests. One of the issues that had been faced was that not many laboratories tested for insulin. That was not in the document and he would talk about it in a moment. The idea was that it would drive the capacity and the work that the laboratories did to encourage them to extend the range of services that they provided to ADOs.

He presented the substances covered by the document. There were two parts: erythropoiesis, which was basically red cell mass, boosting the red cells in the blood, leading to an increased oxygen-carrying capacity, which could very significantly improve performance. In cycling, for example, EPO could improve performance by 5%, which was an astonishing improvement for an elite athlete. The other two were probably better grouped together: growth hormone and growth hormone releasing factors, and there were other substances related to that. These were used more in power sports, but there was also some intelligence that would suggest that growth hormone was used in recovery. Those were the three areas currently being looked at.

The group had looked at insulin as well and had removed it after consultation with the WADA Science Department and ADOs and laboratories, as the level of testing of insulin had been quite narrow, and there had been some real issues regarding laboratory capability, so it had been taken off to be put back on the agenda in 2016. It also highlighted that there was currently a platform, when new tests came on stream, to be able to integrate that into the programme; so, if a new test came along for a substance that was not currently known about and that required a specific analysis, it meant that there would be a process in place to deal with that and hold ADOs accountable for delivering the testing for that.

Looking at appendix one in the technical document, athletics and three disciplines within athletics had been chosen, so a range of sports had been broken up into the disciplines based on physiological demand, because that closely related to what a drug would do to enhance performance, and then two columns had been created on the right-hand side, and the members would see ESA, which would include CERA and EPO, and they would see that sprint events and long-distance events in athletics had been classified according to the value of ESAs in promoting performance, and obviously in a sprint event, which did not have quite the same aerobic demands, ESAs were less important than, say, for a marathon event, and the members would see that the ESA minimum percentage was 60% there. Likewise, with growth hormone and growth hormone releasing factors, a sprint event was more power-orientated, so growth hormone would make more sense; therefore, it had a higher percentage than for a long-distance runner. Nevertheless, the members would see that some ESA and growth hormone were included in both events, and the reason for that was that intelligence was coming through that athletes in sports that one would not necessarily expect were using some of those substances so, in weightlifting, for example, there was some evidence to suggest that there was EPO abuse, which was not something that one would expect. That covered both international- and national-level athletes, creating another level of complexity, so there was the range of sports, the range of disciplines within those

sports, and there were international-level and national-level athletes, and it had been quite a task for the committee.

The next slide also highlighted the task for NADOs, which pretty much had to mirror the same thing, as well as domestic-level athletes. So, NADOs were going to have a real challenge in delivering compliance, whereas for IFs it would be relatively straightforward. For his sport of basketball, there were two disciplines, and it should be relatively straightforward for FIBA to be accountable with regard to ESAs and growth hormone levels.

For athletes with a disability, the group was close to completing appendix two, which was another list. The members would understand the complexity of sports and disciplines and coming up with different percentages. In athletes with a disability, there were various levels of impairment within different disciplines, so that was even more complex and the group was heavily reliant on the IPC and other IFs that dealt with those athletes to assist in developing the document. It would be tabled in November, so the group was well advanced. It had already been through the first stage of consultation with the IFs and it was currently with the NADOs, and then there would probably be a final consultation with the IFs before it was tabled.

The Athlete Biological Passport obviously related to the programme but it was not mandated in the TDSSA, because it sat in a different department in WADA, although it overlapped with the ESAs; so, knowing where to test for ESAs, it was really important to have a good quality Athlete Biological Passport that would profile athletes and say where to go to test. The Athlete Biological Passport was not perfect, so sports would need to have baseline ESA testing alongside the Athlete Biological Passport; they would use the Athlete Biological Passport to know where to go for target testing but needed other sources of information to test for EPO, because not all of it would be picked up in the Athlete Biological Passport. The group had put a strong recommendation that, if a sport or a discipline had an ESA requirement of over 15%, there should be an Athlete Biological Passport in place, and to support that was allowing a reduction of up to 50% in ESA testing for those sports with a recognised Athlete Biological Passport in place. There would be an inadvertent push and support of the Athlete Biological Passport with that document that he thought would create a smarter testing platform for ADOs.

Applying for a reduction in the minimum levels of ESAs and growth hormone, the final point was the Athlete Biological Passport, which he had just touched on, but there were other means by which one could think about having some flexibility within the test distribution planning, and an example of that might be if there was intelligence coming through that there were peptides, and this was an example of what had been happening in Australia over the past two years: ASADA might come to WADA and say that it had an issue and intelligence about peptide use, and that it wanted to skew its test distribution planning heavily towards those substances. That was an example of where one had to allow some flexibility to adjust the programme so as to reinforce an intelligent test distribution plan. WADA obviously had the opportunity to approve or reject such reductions.

In terms of the impact of the TDSSA on ADOs, a number of IFs and NADOs were already above the minimum levels, so there would be no change for them. For those below the levels, there would be some resource allocation that they would have to think about in order to be compliant with the 2015 Code via the document, so there would be an increased percentage of analyses for some of the specific things for which there was currently no testing, and that would require resources. There would obviously be competition for resources from an increase in investigative activities, so there would have to be a lot more thinking about budget processes within organisations, which highlighted an issue of implementation and how long that would take in the lead-in, because people were going to have to adjust their budgets and think about how to deal with the different issues. There might be a reduction in test numbers because of the increased cost of each individual test

so, as part of the process, the group had defined a test as any event at which an athlete was approached for a sample, and obviously there could be three different types of analyses being done on that one test, so it highlighted that probably, in some organisations, there would be a reduction in the number of tests but presumably smarter testing.

Because of some of the practicality issues of implementation, the budget processes being year-ahead processes in which organisations were allocating resources, and because of the heavy consultation that there had been and which had been needed, WADA was treating 2015 as a year of implementation. Obviously, though, WADA was looking at ADAMS and would be using that to judge how it performed, but in 2015 it was committed to continuing consultation and hearing about the different issues, particularly from the NADOs, which had quite a complex implementation issue ahead of them, so that they could share some of the details. The long list of questions and answers was an example, as it basically mirrored the questions that WADA had been receiving from IFs and NADOs, and that document would be extended so as to share practical tips on implementation, with a view to compliance becoming more rigid in 2016.

He finished by saying that work had been quite intense since February when the committee had first got together and started really dealing with some of the issues. He had been blessed with strong support from the WADA management but, just as importantly, the group of people on the committee had been quite dynamic, quite engaged and highly committed to addressing the issue and achieving the tabling of the document that day.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he knew that another committee member was present so, on the basis of openness and transparency, asked him to feel free to speak out. He would be happy to hear from Dr Budgett if there was anything he wanted to say. It seemed to him that, if he had the skills to be a member of that working group, he would be proud to have it on his CV. It was a formidable piece of work. He could only offer congratulations on behalf of everybody present on bringing it to that stage at that time. It was a remarkable piece of work and it had been set out very clearly. He asked the members if they had questions or comments.

MR GODKIN congratulated the group on the document; it was a great piece of work. Were there any early views on how this might be reviewed in time to judge its effectiveness as a change in tack?

MS FOURNEYRON congratulated the members of the group on such excellent work, carried out in such a short period of time. It truly tied in with the objective under the new World Anti-Doping Code to have more effective and better targeted testing, to strengthen the credibility of WADA's work, for athletes first and foremost, but also for all of the partners and the public in general. She had a very technical question on insulin, and sought an explanation as to why there had been a decision not to include insulin in the current documents and postpone any work on that until 2016.

It would be a challenge to implement the entire document across the board, and there would be costs involved for the laboratories, so it would be important perhaps to have an evaluation after a year of the consequences of the implementation of the technical document. Perhaps the impact on the accredited laboratories could be evaluated so that, at the end of 2015, there might be an evaluation on the costs and consequences and how to be more efficient through all the work carried out.

As to the coordination of the WADA departments, on the Athlete Biological Passport with the steroid profiling and the work done by the group, it was clear that the departments could not work separately and she highlighted the relevance of continued cooperation between the two departments.

MS SCOTT echoed what Ms Fourneyron had said. This was an impressive piece of work and, in terms of testing and monitoring and compliance, it would be very useful. She was wondering about how the numbers would relate. She had been looking at long-track speed skating, for example, and the figure of 30% of the ESAs, but how would that relate to a sport such as cross-country skiing, for example, with 60% versus 30%? She was just curious as to how that had been calculated.

MR RICCI BITTI declared that he was very proud to have contributed to the work, which was going in the direction that was always encouraged to make the system more effective and secondly to communicate very well that this was the case, because the media often distorted issues and such efforts, so he congratulated the group and the WADA staff. The procedure should be continued, as he had also been impressed by the speed of the work. There had not been much time to produce something so interesting.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Ricci Bitti for allowing Dr Miller to be part of the working group, as he understood that he had been a leading member of the group.

THE CHAIRMAN noted the impressively long list of questions.

DR HARCOURT thanked the members for the questions. In terms of compliance, there would be a really data-rich matrix, which would add to the extensive data already collected in ADAMS, so it would actually assist with compliance by providing quite deep insight into how ADOs were going about their business. It would therefore be easy to pick up an ADO that was perhaps struggling to develop its test distribution planning. A good example would be in some IFs, in which the group had seen high risks for ESAs or growth hormone: they had had virtually no tests for those particular substances that the group had viewed as being high risk, so there would be a lot of data helping with compliance. The committee was also looking to use its engagement and consultation as another means of collecting information as to how people were coping with implementing it.

MR RICKETTS added that ADAMS would be key for that and, in terms of ways of measuring implementation, the ADO symposium would include a session on that in March, and WADA would look at ways in which to engage with the different stakeholders to get their feedback and have some NADOs or IFs present on how they had found the implementation of that. WADA could also look at further consultation through a questionnaire and, as Ms Fourneyron had said, look at producing a review of that at the end of the year. It took time for a process to bed in. The implementation year was not going to be a compliance year but, to get the data to review, WADA needed the ADOs to put their best foot forward and make every effort to meet those minimum levels so as to have a true evaluation of that.

In terms of assistance, there was a new guideline coming out on implementing effective testing programmes, and that was on the next agenda item. Part of that was the technical document, and there would also be webinars, to which stakeholders would be invited, and they would be able to ask questions later that year on both the technical document and some of the new guidelines that were going to be released.

On the Athlete Biological Passport, WADA would be working closely with the ADOs that took up the recommendation of those sports at 15% or greater for ESAs, and he had actually already had one sport contact him asking about how to put an Athlete Biological Passport process in place, so the document had already had an immediate effect.

DR HARCOURT said that the group had been close to including insulin on the list. Ms Fourneyron would understand the practicalities of insulin and the information received was that it was being used but not widely; however, more importantly, only five laboratories in the world tested for insulin and, of those five laboratories, the test for insulin was poor for synthetic insulin, so it had been felt from a return perspective that insulin would be kept on the table, but that WADA would hold back and implement what were clearly more obvious



areas to deal with first and come to insulin a little later. That was the reason for the delay on insulin. It was sitting there ready to go and a lot of work had already been done but, because of practicality issues, WADA had held back.

On coordination, the whole exercise was about more intelligent testing and more intelligent test distribution planning, so the boundaries were going to blur between the Athlete Biological Passport, specific analysis, intelligence and risk analysis of individual athletes, and all those different elements that went into good quality test distribution planning would require coordination and, with some of the capability development that WADA was undertaking with the webinars, etc., it was inevitable that there would be wide-ranging discussions and the boundaries would become blurred between the different elements of a good test distribution plan.

MR RICKETTS made another important point on the implementation of minimum levels of analysis. It was fine to go out and do 10 tests for ESAs on 10 athletes without looking into the background or risks of that, so that would become part of the compliance process down the track, that those tests were applied to the right athletes at the right time, based on the factors mentioned about test distribution planning, looking at various intelligence, Athlete Biological Passport and other information, so that WADA was getting the maximum return for its money when it was doing the tests. That was crucial to the implementation of the document as well.

DR HARCOURT said that, on the issue of how the group had gone about developing the minimum levels of analysis, the starting point had been the physiological demands of the sport, so something like long-track skating did have a high ESA risk, as did cross-country skiing. The group had therefore put a quantitative level of risk according to the different physiological demand parameters on each sport and discipline, and Dr Stuart Miller had developed a complex formula, which had then been used to translate that into minimum percentage levels of testing. Those two sports mentioned were very close, although how close he could not say, as it was an exercise that had been carried out a few months ago but, basically, that information had then been passed on to the IFs for their feedback, and then the physiological levels and the levels of testing proposed because of the physiological demand assessments had all been pretty much rubber stamped by the IFs, bearing in mind that it was quite a long process with a lot of backwards and forwards, making sure that everybody was on the same page, so the IFs had signed off on those differences, but it was a complex process that had required a lot of work. He thought that, ultimately, the value of it would not be so much in the minimum levels of analysis being locked in because, as more intelligence came through, WADA would adjust its testing strategies and it would become more data-driven as more data came through, so the data would be useful for compliance but it would also be useful in terms of knowing where the hotspots were and where to look at readjusting percentages, and it might be that, in five or ten years' time, there would be another complex element and WADA would look at geographic variations of testing rather than just sports or disciplines, so there was a lot of data that would be used to drive it.

The time restraints had been very aggressive but the group had known about the deadline. There had been some complaints from the NADOs about the time restraints. The group had made sure that it gave the IFs and NADOs specific feedback about their comments, so there had been a lot of changes to the document based on that consultation, there had been a lot of personal contact and feedback, and the feedback to the ADOs had been specific about the issues raised, but the group had managed to achieve its work by the deadline.

THE CHAIRMAN maintained that, with that last remark, the group had certainly done an outstanding piece of work. He congratulated the group. As part of the Code planning and Code consultation, and as part of the demands put on WADA, WADA had said that it would do it, and he thought that it was a fantastic effort to have done it in so much detail and to

have it ready in the state it was currently in. He asked Ms Scott and Mr Estanguet to take the issue to the Athlete Committee as part of a discussion, as he would like the Athlete Committee to know that it had been achieved to see what kind of reaction the Athlete Committee members gave, as it was quite important that, when WADA said that it was going to do something, the athletes actually understood that it had been done and that it had been done on time, and it was going to make the prospect of more clean athletes that bit more reliable.

He thanked Dr Harcourt for his chairmanship and Mr Ricketts for corralling everybody into the right place at the right time and beating them over the head and getting it done in time. It was splendid. He thought that, as had been hinted, it was probably not one of those issues that would be deemed finished; it would probably be moving on. He did get the impression that it had been a very enjoyable intellectual challenge and, if it had been, he thought that all of those involved had risen to that challenge wonderfully well.

He sought formal approval of the document.

### DECISION

Technical Document on Sport-Specific Analysis  
approved.

#### 5.5 Guidelines for Anti-Doping Organisations

MR RICKETTS told the Executive Committee members that he had some good news to pass on to them: there were a number of guidelines that had been reviewed and developed as a result of the new Code and international standards. He brought to the committee's attention three new guidelines that had been developed. He had two with him in draft form; they were at the editor's but, if anybody wanted a copy of them, they could see Ms Nicole Nezan afterwards, who would get them a copy. He warned the members that they were in draft form and only for information at that point, not for distribution.

The result management guideline was pretty extensive; it was obviously a complex area of the Code. There were a number of procedures that ADOs had to apply in particular order when an adverse analytical finding was returned. In addition to that, there were a number of criteria that could result in potential reductions of sanctions based on degrees of fault or if substantial assistance was provided; another was an additional process to deal with whereabouts failures and notice of charges for non-analytical anti-doping rule violations, so it was a very complex area on which the ADOs had actually asked for a guideline, and there had actually been discussion as part of the Code development whether it should be an international standard. It was 127 pages long, so it was a very detailed document written by the WADA Legal Department as well as some external experts from NADOs and IFs. The good thing about it was that it had eight templates at the back, which were all the various types of documentation or letters that ADOs would be sending to athletes when certain situations arose, and they were in template form, so it would certainly assist many ADOs in going through the process and it would also possibly represent a cost saving for some ADOs, as they would be able to do it internally rather than externally and having to go to lawyers to run the process.

The second guideline was a guideline on implementing an effective testing programme, and it was another very important document that really flushed out the international standard for testing and the process through which ADOs should go to develop an effective testing programme.

The third was a guideline for major event organisers. As the members knew, major events moved from country to country with varied anti-doping experience. The first port of call should always be the NADO, but in some cases that did not happen, or there was no NADO or the RADO did not have the capacity to deliver such testing. The guideline therefore

set a standardised platform for various organisations and events to implement and ensure a more consistent application of the ISTI and also deliver more effective programmes that would hopefully eliminate the need to reinvent the wheel every time a major event went to a new country or a new organising committee.

WADA had been involved in two events in terms of the development of policies and procedures in developing the guideline: the World Games in Cali the previous year and also working in partnership with the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow recently to further develop the new guidelines.

That concluded his information session on the guidelines. He would be happy to answer any questions on them.

THE CHAIRMAN said that anybody who would like copies should speak to Ms Nezan, who would arrange that. On the grounds that athletes struggled to get round the WADA website and said that it was too complicated, which had resulted in a shorter version, was there any value in having a shorter version on result management and implementing an effective testing programme for those NADOs that might find it a real struggle?

MR RICKETTS thought that the effective testing guideline was written in simple language; it had a lot of diagrams and examples and comments in there to help. It was simplified as it was. The result management one was 127 pages long; it was going to be a bible for some of the lawyers in terms of following process.

THE CHAIRMAN repeated his question: would it be possible to make it shorter and use the word 'reasonable', which would keep the lawyers even happier?

MR RICKETTS replied that he could certainly look at that.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Ricketts for that and, yet again, for more high quality documents.

## DECISION

Guidelines for ADOs noted.

### **6. Science**

– 6.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee chair report

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was impressed that Professor Ljungqvist had been breakfasting with him at half-past six that morning to get the seven o'clock shuttle to the meeting venue. Professor Ljungqvist had been sitting very peacefully and quietly for a very long time, so he asked him to report on the Health, Medical and Research Committee meeting and then lead the members through the various science items.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST thanked the Chairman. He had been sitting silently round the table, which was a little unusual for him. As Chairman of the Health, Medical and Research Committee, he wished to give the members some introductory remarks before going into details, assisted by Dr Rabin. Since he had not been able to attend the earlier meeting in Montreal, he took the opportunity to express his satisfaction to see that Dr Stofile had taken over his place as vice-president of WADA. Dr Stofile had been his good friend for many years. He welcomed Dr Stofile and knew that he would do a good job.

Getting down to business, he would give the members an introduction on the science item, but said that he had advised the office and Mr Howman earlier that perhaps science and medical could be lumped together on the agenda as they were covered by the same umbrella committee. For the future, he would feel better if he could give an introduction on both the science and medical items. He would get back to the medical report under item 6.7, but they were very much related.

The members had all of the information in their folders, so he would not speak at great length on certain matters, but there were some points that had perhaps not been fully covered. For instance, one problem had been touched upon already by the Director General in his report, and that was the situation in Rio de Janeiro in view of the upcoming Olympic Games. Time was almost running out and there were still huge problems there. The IOC was of course aware of that but, from a scientific point of view, he certainly felt worried and wished to express his concerns, as the laboratory was not yet in place. Serious attempts were being made by WADA and the IOC to make sure that a proper ADO was in place in the country, including a laboratory, and site visits had been made and the next visit would be in early November, but it was less than two years until the Olympic Games, and laboratories usually needed quite a long time to run up to an event like that. It was not just any event; it was a particular one that made even experienced laboratories a bit worried, and it was not that easy to cope with. He just wanted to alert the members to the issue. He would say that there should be a plan B and he knew that there was. Of course, FIFA had found a way out, but it was no comparison. There had been a limited number of samples over a long period of time during the FIFA event but, at the Olympic Games, there would be a huge number of samples over a short period of time, so it was a totally different situation. He would hope for the best but warned that the members should be prepared for problems.

Science was moving on and so was the WADA Science Department. In October, there would be a science conference in Istanbul, and he thanked Dr Erdener for hosting it. It was wonderful news, and WADA was very keen on those scientific conferences, as they were the perfect opportunity for updates on various scientific matters. That time, the participants would deal in particular with problems related to illegal substances to identify designer drugs and such like, sharing of investigations, finding out what was really going on behind the scenes and on the underground market. It was an increasingly significant issue. The IOC was well aware of that and he was happy that strong action was being taken against such illegal goings-on that were linked to other forms of crime such as illegal betting. It would address very up-to-date issues and he thanked Dr Erdener again for hosting it.

He thanked the Japanese minister for agreeing to host the conference in January. It would be a follow-up conference to the Paris conference in 2012, which had been the first at which WADA had met with the pharmaceutical industry. Several approaches had been made, even before WADA had been born, to the pharmaceutical industry, as it was an essential partner in the fight against doping in sport. The industry had not been very interested when the IOC had been in charge of anti-doping, as it had not wanted to have its products linked to doping, since it gave a negative image, or so it had said, but it had changed its mind when WADA had been created and the governmental partners had come on board, and a joint approach had been made, resulting in a different attitude and a very fruitful discussion that had taken place in Paris in 2012. He thanked Dr Rabin for having taken that initiative, which had been a very remarkable step forward in a very difficult field, and that would be followed up in Tokyo, so he thanked the minister again for that.

There would be two items under the science item, the Prohibited List and research projects.

THE CHAIRMAN intervened to ask if anybody had any comments on what had been reported. He had asked Dr Budgett to take over an alternate's role for Mr Ricci Bitti because, at an Olympic Games, the anti-doping work was the responsibility of the IOC. Dr Budgett was heavily involved in the Brazil situation, so he asked him to bring the whole Executive Committee up to date on where WADA was.

Professor Ljungqvist had made reference to assistance from governmental agencies. During the Youth Olympic Games in Nanjing, with the assistance of the Chinese ADO, he had met at a very high political level with one of the vice-premiers of China to discuss with her (quite openly, with some other WADA people present) how it might be possible to cooperate

on the movement of illegal substances out of China. That was easy to talk about but very difficult to do, but one had to start somewhere, and it helped if one started at a very high level. Work on that area continued and, eventually, if it did work it would be of benefit to the Science Department. He asked Dr Budgett to update everybody on test events and task forces.

DR BUDGETT thanked Professor Ljungqvist for everything he had done over the past few years. There were challenges relating to Rio in 2016 but he was very pleased and reassured by the work being done in the joint IOC-WADA task force, and that was helping ensure that the project, and it was a project for the next two years, actually went through each point in time. Working with Rio 2016 and the Brazilian NADO, ABCD, both those bodies had been present at the Sochi debrief that had happened the previous day, and that had given them a real feel of the challenges that lay ahead, and it was unique because there were so many tests conducted in such a short time and the intensity of that programme was unique so, yes, it was another major event, but it was the biggest event with which they had to cope.

There were significant challenges regarding the laboratory, and he was grateful to Dr Rabin and the WADA Science Department for all the work they were doing to help the Rio laboratory regain accreditation in time for the Olympic Games, as that would be hugely important, and there was a plan B but it would be far less satisfactory than having the laboratory on-site and, added to that, everybody wanted to leave some legacy for Brazil afterwards, which he thought would happen. Certainly everybody was putting in an enormous amount of effort and he was very grateful for it.

#### DECISION

Health, Medical and Research Committee chair  
report noted.

#### – 6.2 Prohibited List 2015

PROFESSOR LJUNGVIST said that the Prohibited List had been prepared in the usual way, with several meetings of the List Committee, which had ended up in a proposal, which was not revolutionary. It contained some minor changes or amendments, some quite editorial, ending with confirmation by the Health, Medical and Research Committee a few weeks previously at its meeting in Montreal, but this was what he wanted to submit to the Executive Committee for approval. The major amendment had been made earlier that year when the Executive Committee had wisely added some inert gases to the Prohibited List, an urgent matter of which WADA had become aware at the Sochi Olympic Games. Then there were some further amendments.

DR RABIN said that he would lead the members very quickly through the changes proposed to the 2015 Prohibited List. There had not been many changes; they were mainly adjustments, which was probably a good sign, showing that stability was being achieved. There were still some areas of intense discussion, not only by the List Committee members, but also at the level of the Health, Medical and Research Committee, so it would be interesting to see how the discussions progressed in the future.

The proposed changes to the 2015 Prohibited List were very minor. Even though there had been many discussions on section S0, no changes had been proposed. In the anabolic agents section, he had highlighted in yellow the proposed changes, and they were very minor adjustments, just adding 5 $\beta$ -androstane-3 $\alpha$  17 $\beta$ -diol to the Prohibited List to make sure that WADA was absolutely complete on the anabolic steroids, and androsterone had been added as a name, even though the chemical name had already been added to the Prohibited List specifically by name, so those were really minor elements.

In S1.2, other anabolic agents, two examples of SARMS had been added by name, andarine and ostarine, which were really the leading compounds in the field. Even though

the clinical development of one of them had been stopped, it was so widely available on the Internet that it had been felt that it would be important to have the two compounds listed. They were really the leading compounds in the field of SARMS, so that made a lot of sense in terms of presentation.

Moving to S2, the List Committee had benefitted from the presence of Dr Mike Culler, who was an expert on peptides and hormones, and had suggested (as had the whole group) that mimetics be added. Mimetics was a technical term that everybody clearly understood: they mimicked the effect of peptides and hormones, and that was what was being seen increasingly in terms of the development of small peptides or small substances that acted as peptides and hormones. There had been several changes, at least in S2.1.2, and the members had heard about them earlier that day, relating to erythropoietin-stimulating agents. In the past, the List Committee had resisted adding too many names to the section, and finally, taking into account the development worldwide of new non-erythropoietic EPO-receptor agonists, as well as of course other kinds of agonists, in particular the HIF stabilisers in that section of ESAs, it had been recommended that more examples be added and that the Prohibited List be more specific on examples of substances currently seen that were either in development or being made available on the Internet. For the hypoxia-inducible factors, he simply drew the members' attention to the fact that cobalt had been added. It was not a new substance; in fact, many had known about the effects of cobalt for quite some time, but adding cobalt specifically was a strong sign that the substance was prohibited, noting that vitamin B12, also known as cyanocobalamin, which contained cobalt, was not prohibited of course, because it was a vitamin.

Still in that section, the effort had continued to be a bit more descriptive on the substances that were prohibited, such as chorionic gonadotrophin, where some names had been added, and again that represented also the dynamic of drugs in development by the pharmaceutical and the bio industry companies, where more and more of those products were reaching the market, so some substances had been added in the chorionic gonadotrophin and LH releasing factors section. The same applied for corticotrophin, and he wished to draw the attention of the members to the expansion of the group of growth hormones and all the substances that triggered the release of growth hormone or mimicked the effect of growth hormone, and there were many out there in development. The List Committee had decided to list some of them. That was a section in which, trying not to be too detailed in the past, the List Committee had resisted the idea of having too many examples, but the reality was almost catching back when WADA saw some of the substances being associated with doping situations, so it was currently thought that it was important to have the products listed and probably also better categorised in terms of growth hormone itself, or growth hormone releasing hormones or growth hormone releasing peptides, and this was reflecting the current situation with such substances. IGF-1 had been moved. That did not change the status of the peptide or hormone that was known to be prohibited; it had simply been shifted to the additional prohibited growth factors as a matter of logic.

Two changes were proposed in S4, hormone and metabolic modulators: the renaming of the activators of the AMP activated protein kinase. That was a technicality, but it was really to stick to a better description in the scientific world of those substances. In particular, it was known that AICAR had been in the news over the past year, so it had been considered important to stick to the best labelling of the section, and trimetazidine had been added to the list. It was one of those metabolic modulators that was increasingly being seen and affected cardiac metabolism by shifting the fatty acid source of energy for the heart to glucose. That had been seen in the context of substances used by the athletes.

In S5, diuretics, and the members might remember that, in the past, it had been called 'diuretics and other masking agents', WADA had faced some situations whereby the title had led to misinterpretation of what was meant; in other words, a lot of people had thought that

diuretics were only masking agents and nothing else, but that was not the reality. Diuretics could be other things too, for example, they could help lose weight in weight category sports or disciplines, so the committee had felt it would be useful to slightly alter the title of S5 and call it 'diuretics and masking agents'. Continuing in the section, it might look impressive but there were absolutely no changes in principle to the footnote to the section, which meant only that, when using a diuretic for other core threshold prohibited substances, one also needed a TUE, so there were no changes, simply rewording of the section in an attempt to make it clearer.

In section M1, there were no changes. In section M2, there was just one proposed change to reflect practice in M2.2 on intravenous infusions. That was mainly the recommendation of the TUE Committee, facing a lot of questions about how to use intravenous infusions, when and in which conditions, and the proposal had been to add surgical procedures to the list of exemptions that would require a TUE for intravenous infusions. There had been numerous discussions among the medics in the List Committee, but he thought that, overall, everybody agreed that that made a lot of sense.

There was no change to section M3. Moving to S6, the stimulants section, he referred to what Professor Ljungqvist had been saying earlier on the symposium at the end of the following month in Istanbul and the fact that there were more and more designer stimulants being uncovered by different organisations in charge of drug enforcement. WADA was very aware of the substances, because some of the street drugs ended up in the tests, and they could be analysed by the anti-doping laboratories. The members might remember that, the previous year, there had been a proposal to have cathinone and cathinone derivatives added. That year, WADA was seeing more and more of the designer drugs coming from the phenylethylamine family, and it had been proposed that phenylethylamine and its derivatives be added to the list of prohibited stimulants. Even though they had been considered prohibited in the past, it had been felt that this should really be clarified in the 2015 Prohibited List.

Phenmetrazine was a stimulant that had been moved from the non-specified to the specified stimulants, for the simple reason that one of its main metabolites was in the S6b section so, in a sense, this made things a bit more logical, although phenmetrazine was not a stimulant that would be seen that frequently.

In the exceptions for the use of stimulants, the local application and in particular ophthalmic application of some of the drugs was not considered to be prohibited, because some of the substances were extremely useful (and he would certainly defer to the expertise of Dr Erdener) and could not be taken in the context of doping practice. That was a clarification that he hoped would be very useful.

A recommendation had come from the TUE Committee to change the name that WADA had had for many years in English of glucocorticosteroids to a more common and accepted name for that class of substances: glucocorticoids, which probably made a lot of sense.

In substances prohibited in particular sports, in particular under P1, alcohol, the World Karate Federation had asked to be removed from the section, and the List Expert Group had found that quite acceptable. In P2, there had been a formal request from the World Underwater Federation (CMAS) to add some of its disciplines to the list of disciplines prohibiting beta-blockers. The federation had come up with a medical explanation that the List Expert Group had felt was quite acceptable. He drew the members' attention to the fact that, until as recently as Thursday (and this showed the complexity of some of the wording), WADA had still been discussing how to make sure that the disciplines were properly listed, and there had been a recommendation for a last-minute change, to move 'with or without fins' from free-immersion apnoea to constant weight apnoea, which was logical. That was why the modification was highlighted in red in the document.

On the monitoring programme, which also needed the approval of the Executive Committee, there had been very minor changes. After a few years of monitoring pseudoephedrine below the threshold of 150mg/ml, the committee recommended that monitoring be ceased. The addition of telmisartan, which was an angiotensin II receptor antagonist with PPAR $\delta$  properties, had been proposed, as well as trimetazidine, which was a substance that affected cardiac output and the metabolism at a cardiac level, so that was also proposed for addition to the monitoring programme. They would not be prohibited substances, but they would simply be added to the monitoring programme to collect information and allow the List Expert Group to take decisions on the status of those drugs in the future.

DR BUDGETT reassured the Executive Committee that, as a member of the List Committee, he was obviously not going to ask any detailed questions. He thought that the Executive Committee was the appropriate forum in which to ask about the broad direction of the Prohibited List and what WADA felt about the strategic direction of the Prohibited List towards something that was perhaps close to some of the members' hearts, which was a single list for both in- and out-of-competition.

MR GODKIN sounded a note of gratitude for the inclusion of some of those specific substances, particularly those under S2, which had been very high profile in major investigations, and that would certainly assist in the work there. Perhaps some clarification that these had always been banned in the explanatory notes would also put that beyond question, particularly in legal disputes.

MR MOSES said that one of his questions was about the metabolism and mechanism of cobalt, as he had never really heard about that, and then the first point under S6, stimulants, said that, for the sake of clarification, topical/ophthalmic imidazole derivatives had been mentioned as exceptions of non-prohibited substances, and he just wanted to know a little bit more about the mechanism for that, a little bit about how they worked.

MS FOURNEYRON said that, before talking about technical issues, the Chairman had said that Professor Ljungqvist had got up early that morning. She thought that he had always got up very early since he had been the chair of the Health, Medical and Research Committee so, on behalf of the 47 European countries, she thanked him for all the work he had done since the start of WADA and for his commitment to getting the sport movement and the governments to work together. Thanks to him, so much important work had been achieved. The work was very complex, and it had taken years to achieve WADA's credibility, through the Prohibited List, laboratory accreditations, research projects, all in the interest of clean athletes and their health. His commitment had gone, as the English would say, beyond the call of duty, and she would do her best to follow in Professor Ljungqvist's footsteps. She had first met Professor Ljungqvist in Montreal and she would always remember his warm welcome and the gift that Professor Ljungqvist had given her, his book, Doping's Nemesis, which she highly recommended to the members if they had not yet read it, as it described better than anything else the path that had been trodden and illustrated the kind of athlete and doctor that Professor Ljungqvist had been in his fight against cancer and doping, as well as his human qualities, apparent in all of the work he had done at WADA, and she wished to thank him again on behalf of Europe and personally.

Regarding a technical aspect on the Prohibited List, Europe, and Germany in particular, had made a request for more information for its experts about the reasons behind the changes to the Prohibited List. It was clear that it was very complicated and it was necessary to be an expert to follow the development of all of the new substances and how certain substances were misused. A request had been made at the Council of Europe for scientific arguments regarding the proposed developments.



MR ESTANGUET said that the subject of the Prohibited List was part of the two main concerns for the athletes, which were whereabouts and prohibited substances, and the latter were so difficult for athletes to understand and the presentation did not really allay his fears. Looking at the modifications (as he saw no major changes), if athletes were to ask him what had changed and which substances would be prohibited or permitted, he would not be able to answer clearly. He knew it was a very complicated matter. Earlier on, there had been talk about the guidelines for the ADOs, and perhaps there should also be a guide on the Prohibited List for the organisations to enable them to better educate the athletes. There was too wide a gap between what the experts understood and the majority of athletes who really found it difficult to understand the Prohibited List.

MS DAGOURET informed the members that, with the permission of her representative, who was currently on his way to the airport, she wished to repeat a request from one of the members of SportAccord, the International Motorcycling Federation, to have alcohol removed from the Prohibited List, as it was a specified substance prohibited for particular sports. The request had been made at the last minute, and the federation members were aware of that and sincerely apologised. One of the reasons for the delay was that they had realised that there might be some kind of perverse effect on the implementation of the new Code as of 2015, that the intention might be badly interpreted and the consequences might be that an athlete drinking a beer after a race could potentially be subject to a four-year suspension. The same applied to use by athlete support personnel, which was a new provision in the revised Code.

DR STOFIE announced that he also wanted to say a word of appreciation for Professor Ljungqvist's leadership in WADA in general and the Health, Medical and Research Committee in particular. Professor Ljungqvist had really opened the eyes of many of those who did not come from the natural sciences and he knew that Professor Ljungqvist had saved many a young athlete who could have fallen into those pitfalls.

The question of the status of the laboratories being mentioned around the table was of great concern. He had been pleased to hear that morning that Egypt had been accredited, but he had been even sadder to hear about the problems of the laboratory in Bloemfontein. He thought that a little bit of background was necessary. He had never known that the laboratory in Bloemfontein preceded the existence of WADA in terms of accreditation. There were many laboratories in the world and many institutions had their own laboratory, but WADA accreditation was something special and unique to the intended function of such institutions. He did want to assist them, at least in the continent he came from, to really jack up their boots. He pleaded on behalf of the scientists of that continent that they be invited to international conferences. Mr Moses had mentioned that morning the annual conference that took place, and he really wanted to be kept in the loop so as to assist with mobilising. Academics were a very interesting type. He had discussed with some professors and researchers in May, trying to get them interested in applying for research projects, and they had said that, no, they did research, academic research, so they were not looking at that, and he had said that research was research, and even WADA research was an academic enterprise, but they lived in a different world, and he was not criticising Professor Ljungqvist, as he had once been a professor himself, but he knew how such people thought, and so he was saying he wanted to help them. He declared that he had already started negotiations with Cologne after his meeting in May with the professors to look at ways of strengthening and assisting the laboratory in Bloemfontein, which had been the only one accredited at that time, but was also facing a lot of challenges. He was pleading for help, so as to help the laboratory and help the world. He thanked Professor Ljungqvist for his example, and he insisted that Professor Ljungqvist should not be retiring just yet.

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that WADA would have the pleasure of Professor Ljungqvist's company in Paris in November.

PROFESSOR LJUNGOVIST thanked Ms Fourneyron and Dr Stofile for their kind words. He had been privileged to be the Health, Medical and Research Committee Chairman from the beginning of WADA and during the 15 years up to an age at which one was normally no longer active, and that was thanks to repeated appointment by the Executive Committee, and he understood the privilege it meant for him to be able to keep up with his own profession and hopefully keep his brain alive and knowledgeable. Thanks to the commitment at WADA and the need to be kept updated, as he had been by the intellectual surroundings in the Health, Medical and Research Committee and with all the people involved. Ms Fourneyron would take over a wonderful job and he wished her all success with that and to be more successful than he had been in one respect in particular, namely to defend the research budget. In 2005, WADA had had the privilege of distributing 6.5 million dollars for research; the draft budget for 2015 was down to 1.8 million, so that was a reduction from 25% to 6%. He did not want to start a new debate about the budget. One of the three main reasons as to why WADA had been created had been to have a budget for research and the other reasons had been to produce the Code and make sure that it would be implemented around the world and monitored.

He thanked everybody for their kind words and felt very grateful for the confidence placed in him, particularly after he should have retired. Everything came to an end. He would be in Paris for sure, perhaps not at the Executive Committee meeting, as the evening before there would be a major celebration at the Karolinska Institute, again because he had reached a particular age: it would be 50 years since he had gained his PhD.

The Prohibited List was not an easy exercise. Even back before WADA, in Olympic times, the list had been short yet complicated and difficult to understand by athletes; therefore, a lot of responsibility lay with the entourage, the coaches, doctors and team leaders to help the athletes understand it in the right way. There had been accidents over time and WADA could not prevent that from happening. He remembered in particular one example of the poor top athlete, the absolute world top runner who had not been able to compete in the Olympic Games in Athens because she had had a migraine for which she had taken a drug, which was fully legal in the USA from the WADA point of view, but she had happened to be competing in Martinique, in the French territories, in which the same product contained a banned substance, and she had had a migraine attack and had sent her coach out to buy the medicine. Accidents happened because of mistakes; she could have read the label, of course, but it showed the importance of having the right education for the entourage. He did not have better answers. The members could look at having some guidelines or a handbook that the athletes could use; that was one way of doing it. Feedback had also been mentioned.

The procedure to establish the Prohibited List each year was simple. Invitations to comment on a proposed amendment to the existing list were circulated, which was why the List Committee or the List Expert Group had a number of meetings, first in January to look into the existing Prohibited List, to see if there was anything the members wished to amend or suggest; then, they invited people to submit comments, leading to a review of the comments made in relation to the opinions that might prevail at the committee or working group table, and then a final proposal was circulated for a decision to be taken in September by the Health, Medical and Research Committee for proposal to the Executive Committee for a final decision. That meeting had taken place a few weeks previously. He remembered in pre-WADA times that the IOC medical commission had simply decided on the list without asking anybody, and nobody had commented on that. Currently, when it was circulated, people were invited to respond to the extent that numerous responses were received.

DR RABIN said that WADA had received about 40 or 50 comments that year, so more than 120 pages of comments had been reviewed by the List Expert Group.

PROFESSOR LJUNGOVIST said that it was a lot of work, and it ended up in a complicated document, which was unavoidable, as it had to be explained and clearly listed. There was the experience from court cases or CAS cases that, if it was not listed, there could be difficulties in pursuing a case, even though there was a general paragraph saying that similar substances were also banned. The first experience had been at the Atlanta Olympic Games in 1996, when the IOC's attitude vis-à-vis certain stimulants produced in Russia had not been accepted, and that had been repeated over and over again. That was why the Prohibited List had been amended with some additions that were not really necessary in his view but, from a legal point of view, they were, so it was complicated but difficult to avoid.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that, having been a lawyer, he was quite relaxed that a very comprehensive Prohibited List was needed, and that was a complicated process, but WADA had to get it right. In terms of information, he had looked at the athlete guide and there was a page that dealt in very general terms with what was banned, and it occurred to him that, when looking at producing version two, it might be possible to expand that. That raised the question that Dr Budgett had asked about having just one list for in- and out-of-competition. That was the one he wanted to be answered. There were ways of telling athletes in general terms that substances were bad but that they should go and check, rather than trying to produce a shorter version of a very complicated list that was necessary for legal protection, he thought. He suggested taking the in- and out-of-competition question first, then the other questions.

PROFESSOR LJUNGOVIST referred to what Ms Dagouret had said. There was a process, as he had explained, involving several meetings with the List Committee, a deadline for requests with respect to that, and now unfortunately there was a case whereby a federation had discovered that it wanted to amend the Prohibited List for its own sport, but the request had come after the deadline and it had not been reviewed by the List Expert Group and the Health, Medical and Research Committee had not seen it either, as it had come a few days previously, so he personally did not feel comfortable proposing something that had not been reviewed. It was that simple. He thought that WADA should stick to the procedure it had. Moreover, there was one other aspect that, in that particular case, made him feel that it would be better to review it for the following year's Prohibited List, because alcohol was also banned in the FIA, and the sport was very similar to motorcycling, and the medical chairperson of the FIA was a member of the Health, Medical and Research Committee and had not seen the request, so he felt uncomfortable about a decision being taken that had not been reviewed by the experts.

MS DAGOURET repeated her apology on behalf of the federation in question, as it was fully aware of the situation, and it would never have forwarded the request for the general list, and the federation believed that it was for its particular sport, so whatever other sports might think did not have to be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the decision should be relatively straightforward for the Executive Committee. Ms Dagouret was perfectly correct; she had been asked to raise an issue by one of her members and it had been put on the table. The Chairman of the Health, Medical and Research Committee, presumably backed up by the Science Director, had advised that he would be reluctant to agree to that because it needed more work and it could be done the following year. Instinctively he was reluctant to change lists on 48 hours' notice, and he thought that motorcycling would survive for another 12 months. That was a personal view, but he needed a decision from the Executive Committee.

DR BUDGETT agreed. On reflection, it was correct to leave the Prohibited List as it was and consider the change the following year.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, if necessary, WADA would be happy to write formally to Ms Dagouret's member association and express clearly why that decision had been taken.

DR RABIN spoke about the concept of the unique list. That was something that had been under the radar of the List Committee for quite a while, probably moving from two extreme positions, if he could describe them as such, with some people thinking that WADA should simply get rid of the substances that were prohibited in competition and focus only on what was prohibited at all times, and another group of people saying that WADA should include what was prohibited only in competition and make it prohibited at all times. There were pros and cons for the two approaches; the fact was that it was a priority matter for the List Expert Group to review as of January 2015. That was really something the List Expert Group wanted to further explore that year so, if there was some particular guidance from the Executive Committee members, he was sure that the List Expert Group and Health, Medical and Research Committee members would like to hear from them, but he knew that the point was going to be very high on the agenda in 2015.

THE CHAIRMAN asked whether, on the grounds that it was going to be looked at, it would be fair to say that, having discussed it, the Executive Committee encouraged further review and, rather than thinking about it for five years, it might be possible to come back and say clearly what the two options were, because it was in the interest of making it as simple as possible, certainly for the athletes.

DR RABIN noted what the Chairman had said. To answer Mr Godkin's point, he confirmed that there had been no addition of substances; they were all already prohibited under the 2014 and even previous lists, and he would be more than happy to look at the explanatory note and make sure that it was clearly stated, in particular for those peptides that had already been considered prohibited in previous years.

Cobalt's mechanism of action was clearly stabilisation of the HIF factor; it was the stabilisation of the HIF factor that sent the signal for increased production of EPO, and that in turn increased the production of red blood cells. It was known that cobalt, in particular in animal models, had worked extremely well. That had also been looked into by the people in charge of equine testing, and WADA had been discussing with them the testing strategy for cobalt. It was clear that, because cobalt was present in many different aspects of life, including in food, WADA would need to establish a threshold. That remained to be done but, clearly, it was known that there were quite a few substances or dietary supplements that included cobalt in a form that would have that effect. That was something that also needed to be monitored but, as he had said, vitamin B12 was not covered by the prohibition and it was very important for the athletes that it continue to be something that they could take.

On the aspect of topical use and in particular for imidazole, what needed to be understood was that it was not necessarily the biological effect but more the clinical structure. Imidazole molecules were cyclic molecules, and some of them were stimulants, but used as eye drops they did not have a stimulant effect or a performance-enhancing effect. It had been felt important to exclude that route of administration and those imidazole molecules from the Prohibited List so that people, in particular ophthalmologists, when they used those drops for certain diseases, and there were quite a few for which imidazole derivatives were used, could use them even for athletes, because there was no effect on performance enhancement, so that was certainly something that had been looked at very carefully.

He would not cover the points that had been covered by Professor Ljungqvist, but mentioned to Dr Stofile that the Egypt laboratory was not yet accredited by WADA; it was a candidate laboratory, so it meant that the laboratory would need to complete its due diligence before it was considered for the probationary phase by the WADA Science Department.

Regarding Bloemfontein, there had been a site visit the previous year that had addressed some issues. The laboratory had been under surveillance for a while and WADA hoped that it

could do better, and it certainly deserved to do better, but there were some concerns among some of the experts that the laboratory was not reaching the level that was expected in certain areas. Science and analytical science were advancing every day and any laboratory that could not really catch up at some point got further and further behind. That was the current concern regarding the Bloemfontein laboratory. He understood that there had been a recent meeting at the Bloemfontein laboratory and the regional director had been present and conveyed WADA's concerns to the university authorities, so he knew that something was being done and he did hope that the authorities would provide the essential support that the laboratory needed to catch up in the areas about which WADA had some concerns.

Regarding Ms Fourneyron's question, it had been decided in the past that WADA did not have the human or time resources to answer every single question that was received. Every year, WADA received hundreds of pages on the documents that it released (the Prohibited List and the ISL, and the technical documents). The process proposed in the past was well understood by some but perhaps less by others, and it was that they could contact WADA at any time to seek the necessary information to answer the questions that they might face at national or international level. WADA tried to be very careful about the amount of information it sent in writing, and there were some technical discussions that integrated not only the science but also the intelligence received on some of the substances, so WADA was very careful about the information but, as he had mentioned many times to his colleagues and his counterparts in many organisations, they could come to WADA at any time and it would provide them with ad hoc information. WADA did that on a regular basis for many of its stakeholders.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that the important moment had come: a draft Prohibited List was before the members, they had noted the changes, and he was quite pleased to see that there were lots of drugs that he did not take, and his wife had retired from medicine 20 years previously so he looked forward to winning an intellectual exchange with her that evening when he got home. He submitted that the Prohibited List as presented to the Executive Committee by the Health, Medical and Research Committee should be approved.

DR RABIN noted that the monitoring programme also needed approval.

THE CHAIRMAN replied that he had included the monitoring programme as well, and the Executive Committee was happy with it.

#### DECISION

Prohibited List and monitoring programme approved.

#### – 6.3 Research projects 2014

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that 116 research projects had been received, all from very qualified researchers. WADA would have been happy to be able to fund most of them, but 30 had been accepted given WADA's limited budget, and Dr Rabin would provide further explanation on the outcome.

DR RABIN said that, every year, some facts were presented to the members about the research projects received. Regarding the number of grant applications, it was a record number of 116 grants, as mentioned by Professor Ljungqvist, substantially higher than in previous years, and probably double the number of applications WADA had been receiving some six or seven years previously. Given the amount of grant applications, it had been agreed with the Health, Medical and Research Committee that WADA would try to pre-filter some of the grants, still involving some external experts, that it felt did not fit in the priority areas and, despite efforts to communicate on the priority themes, there would always be teams that sent in some research projects that did not necessarily meet WADA's expectations.

He was always pleased to see that WADA was receiving projects from the five continents, which kept the W in WADA. He often heard that WADA might receive too many projects from the anti-doping laboratories themselves, and of course those laboratories were at the forefront of the science developed in anti-doping, but was pleased to say that the vast majority of the projects WADA received came from leading investigators who were not in the anti-doping laboratories, so it was very reassuring that WADA was having experts and people coming with their views and that they were not only the anti-doping laboratory people, and that was very important to note.

Regarding the distribution of the projects, there were four main themes, and a substantial amount of the projects (about one-third) had been received in category three, on detection and identification of novel doping trends, so there were researchers out there who were thinking about what was coming next and what WADA was trying to address. It was not only about what was currently being done; it was also about looking at the future, and that was something that was encouraged from all scientists proposing research projects to WADA. The process was very important, because WADA had a fairly robust, well understood and transparent process involving some review by independent experts in the field at the beginning, so there was no suspicion of any bias in the way in which the projects were reviewed, which was very important for the credibility of WADA. There were sometimes researchers who were unhappy with the outcome; that was logical, and some asked for access to the independent reviews, and WADA provided them. Of course, it did not name the experts involved in the independent reviews, and usually that kept the issue well covered.

All projects were submitted for ethical review, not only from the researchers themselves with their local ethical committees, but also WADA ran an independent ethical review, and that was important to make sure that there was good harmonisation of ethical practices in the system, and then it went to another level, the project review panel, which ranked, based on the independent reviews, the projects by order of priority, so there was another level of people looking into that, and it was fairly robust, before going to the Health, Medical and Research Committee, and it was important to acknowledge that there could be conflicts of interest among committee members, who were clearly identified and did not participate (they even left the room) in the discussions of the Health, Medical and Research Committee. Then, of course, there was the presentation of the Health, Medical and Research Committee recommendations to the Executive Committee.

The 30 projects had been approved for a total of 3.2 million dollars, which was about 12% of the total amount of money requested. The success rate was lower than in previous years. There had been success rates of up to 40% or 45%; in that case, WADA was really getting to 25% or 26%, and that was logical with the reduction in the budget, but also taking into account that there was a tremendous effort by the Health, Medical and Research Committee and the PRP group to reduce the budget as much as possible, whenever reasonable and wherever justified, so there had been some pretty drastic reductions in the budget of some projects, moving sometimes from a three-year project to a one-year pilot project before any more money was committed by WADA, the result of which was that some projects, after satisfactory pilot outcomes, were coming back for additional funding the following year, and that was really something that should be encouraged, in particular for innovative and prospective research.

He would be brief on the projects that had been approved, taking them by group rather than one by one, starting with seven approved in the area of blood manipulation, three of which were on autologous blood transfusion. As everybody was aware, that remained an issue, and WADA had spent quite a bit of money on the detection of autologous blood transfusion in the past with mixed results. That year, three projects looked specifically at how to identify the haemoglobin mass, at markers for the detection of autologous blood transfusion. In the detection of EPO by mass spectrometry, some very good papers had

been published in the scientific literature recently, in particular by the group in Japan, the Mitsubishi laboratory, which proposed a follow-up with all the other EPOs, and WADA was reaching a point whereby the sensitivity of mass spectrometry could allow WADA to detect EPO, which would be much more satisfactory than what was currently in place, and also the identification of future EPO-like substances, how to be more efficient and more time-efficient in particular in the way in which such substances were detected.

The major undertaking of the Athlete Biological Passport was well supported by science. There were six projects to expand or strengthen the Athlete Biological Passport in different areas, but there were many confounding factors that could be faced in the variations of the variables in which WADA was interested, and some of the projects were looking at the confounding factors, while others looked at how to bring new analytes or new tools in support of the Athlete Biological Passport, so that was a very active area of research and interest by the researchers. The members would have seen the modifications proposed for the 2015 Prohibited List, and proteins, peptide hormones, insulin and myostatin inhibitors were clearly areas that were of great interest to the scientific community, as were new technologies and detection methods in the anti-doping field, and two projects had been received on capillary electrophoresis coupled with mass spectrometry to see how that might enhance the detection capacity of anti-doping laboratories.

There were five projects trying to improve on the detection of doping substances. There was an area that had made tremendous progress over the past few years because of the gain in sensitivity of analytical methods, known as the long-term metabolites. A couple of years previously, one of the laboratories had come up with two new long-term metabolites of anabolic steroids, and that had led to the reporting of more than 150 new adverse analytical findings. Something that had not been explored in the past was that, when one took an anabolic steroid, it was first metabolised, and that was what had been looked at, the first metabolism, but it was currently known that there could be secondary or tertiary metabolites produced in very small quantities, and there was currently the capacity to look at the secondary or tertiary metabolites that could really provide precious information, in particular when the drugs had been taken weeks or sometimes months prior to sample collection. It was like having a telescope: in the past, one had been looking at a piece of the sky and seen five stars; currently, with new telescopes (or new methods), looking at the same piece of sky, one saw 100 stars, so one was looking at the stars and working out which was which, where it came from and whether it made any sense, and that was really what WADA had started to do with the long-term metabolites.

It was also very important to understand how the drugs were metabolised and disposed of in the body, and scientists were looking increasingly at the enantiomers of some of the drugs and the chirality of some of the substances. There was a fair bit of work being done in the area of glucocorticosteroids, and also beta-2 agonist thresholds, which had led to the relief of pressure on salbutamol, salmeterol and other drugs in the past, and that was really something that was worth pursuing in the field.

There were three projects on new and improved analytical methods, and he referred to the integration of new techniques or the better connection between some of the techniques, in order to be more accurate, faster and hopefully also cheaper in the future on some of the ways in which the analytes were being analysed and reported by the anti-doping laboratories.

There was one project to validate the detection of gene doping; that was something that had been active over the years and WADA was reaching a point whereby it had the tools and needed to validate them to be able to implement gene doping detection.

There were five projects that had been accepted as part of the targeted/reactive projects. It was very important for WADA to keep the capacity to be very reactive when

facing new drugs, and WADA had faced designer drugs in the past, or to be able to target certain concepts or research from some teams. WADA was moving more and more towards the mass spectrometric analysis of HCG, so that had made tremendous progress over the past two or three years, and was currently being analysed for routinely by the laboratories. There had recently been an issue regarding an antimalarial drug that was well known and it had ended up having a metabolite that could be very close to one of the stimulants, so WADA was looking at it more carefully and needed to make sure that it left no stone unturned in terms of the metabolism of drugs, and the risk of reporting a false positive was clearly something into which WADA had to look carefully.

The members would have heard about xenon and argon. There was also a proposal for the detection of xenon to consolidate the detection of xenon from the Cologne laboratory.

There had been information that some athletes had been using ozonation to mask the detection of EPO, so WADA had looked into that very reactively and the EPO profiles, but WADA needed to be able to react to such situations and provide robust answers to the anti-doping community when some of those issues were raised.

Finally, regarding the exploration of analytical means to establish doping with clenbuterol, as the members had heard that morning, meat contamination was a very serious issue, and it was looked at from the anti-doping perspective, even if there were more health considerations involved when talking about meat contamination, but WADA wanted to be able to provide satisfactory answers to the anti-doping community and be able to distinguish between the potential abuse of clenbuterol as a doping agent and meat contamination of course. That concluded his presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that, for years, that had been an issue whereby WADA had had to rely on its technical experts and WADA had always had the ability to be reactive in a small way. The xenon issue was clearly one on which WADA needed to be reactive. Everybody had seen the list of applications and the recommendations. He asked if there were any comments.

MR NIWA stated that all the projects were interesting and he supported the proposal to adopt them; however, in order to further promote research, WADA should encourage engagement in regions in which such research practices were not established, so he wanted to let laboratories know that grants were available and he would like to see some activities to further promote anti-doping research projects in other regions among more researchers and institutions with cooperation through WADA regional offices.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it seemed to him that, if WADA was getting more and more applications, the chances were it might be getting more and more from the parts of the world that interested Mr Niwa. Was that correct?

DR RABIN responded that it was in a sense, knowing that the review process really looked at the quality and not necessarily only the quantity coming from a given region, and he thought that it was really the driving force behind the way in which the experts were working in support of the Health, Medical and Research Committee, and he had no doubt that in Asia there were highly talented researchers who could provide some very good projects, and Mr Niwa might have seen some projects approved from the region. He was sure that WADA could try to engage more, and use the regional offices to convey all the information. He assured the members that, every year, WADA sent all the information to all the researchers who in the past ten years had submitted projects to WADA so that, should they be interested, they could approach WADA, so WADA was trying to be as active as possible to promote the programme, and that could also be the price of success when looking at the number of projects submitted that year.



PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST added that, over the years, it had become quite clear that WADA had become known in the scientific community as a research funder, and it was so important to be recognised as having a stable fund, which would continue for years to come. That was a much better process than taking temporary action, and he was pleased to see that WADA had expanded, as presented by Dr Rabin on the first slide, way beyond the traditional anti-doping laboratories.

THE CHAIRMAN said that there was no doubt that, without going over old arguments, there was not enough money in the world to provide for scientific research. He thought that WADA's record was pretty distinguished and he agreed with what Professor Ljungqvist had just said. In the spirit of what he had said about relying on the advice of the experts, were the Executive Committee members happy to approve the list of applications and the decisions recommended by the Health, Medical and Research Committee and invest around 3.2 million dollars in that?

MS FOURNEYRON declared that she had no doubts regarding all the projects presented for approval. About two-thirds of the research projects had been submitted by researchers not coming from anti-doping laboratories, and the anti-doping laboratories also received some funding. Obviously, WADA constantly sought to have more funds available to finance research. In Europe, there were four million euros devoted every year to research in all the laboratories, so it would be good to have greater coordination as far as information exchange was concerned. When a research project was allocated to one country, it sometimes involved university researchers, and so it would be useful if the other anti-doping laboratories and governments could be informed. That would make it possible to pool research. Sometimes the research budget given by governments was supplemented by WADA and sometimes it was not, but it would be good to have a more global vision of all of the research being conducted.

DR RABIN thanked Ms Fourneyron. Since he had started working at WADA, one of the most difficult tasks he had been given had been to try to coordinate anti-doping research projects around the world. A number of initiatives had been launched by WADA and its Science Department involving national and international ADOs. WADA had also organised a kind of informal meeting with the backers of anti-doping research projects, in NADOs or IFs, and there was very good cooperation and exchange of information with certain organisations. Unfortunately, the exchange did not necessarily work well with all of WADA's partners around the world. He knew that the Director General was very good about explaining the benefits of joint cooperation to WADA's stakeholders, which would help WADA to speed up the process and also improve coordination with the ADOs.

THE CHAIRMAN confirmed that the Executive Committee was content to approve the list and he thanked Dr Rabin and those in his department.

#### DECISION

Proposed research projects approved.

### **7. Medical**

- 7.1 Athlete Biological Passport – associated technical documents

THE CHAIRMAN said that it was quite clear that the Executive Committee had stated that the documents had to be improved; they dealt in the main with the Athlete Biological Passport module. Was there anything in them that was particularly significant or should they be noted and approved?

## DECISION

Athlete Biological Passport associated  
technical documents approved.

### **8. Any other business/future meetings**

THE CHAIRMAN said that it occurred to him that that meeting was possibly the busiest meeting that WADA had in the year, as there were some major decisions to take and, that year in particular, there had been a number of other major decisions to take on the technical document on sport specific analysis, compliance etc., so it was longer than normal but everybody had worked hard. Moving forward, WADA would meet next in Paris and Ms Fourneyron had asked if she could take the floor to tell the members briefly about the delights that would be awaiting them in the capital city of France.

MS FOURNEYRON informed the members that the organisation of the meetings in Paris was moving ahead smoothly. The Executive Committee would be meeting on 15 November and the Foundation Board on 16 November. The meetings would be held in the lower chamber of the French National Assembly building in the seventh arrondissement, by the River Seine, close to the Louvre, the Place de la Concorde and the Eiffel Tower. On 15 November, the Executive Committee meeting would be in the modern part of the parliament building, where the first meeting with the pharmaceutical industries had been held in 2012. On 16 November, the Foundation Board meeting would be in the Palais Bourbon on the other side of the street, which was the official residence of the president of the National Assembly. It was an 18<sup>th</sup> century building, which was very beautiful, and on the Friday evening there would be welcome drinks there, at which the highest political authorities would be represented. Everybody was working very hard to prepare the meeting and she hoped that the meeting would meet the members' expectations. She was a go-between as a former minister of sport and a member of parliament. She thanked Ms Nezan for all her work regarding the organisation of the meetings. To mark the solemnity of the occasion for French MPs, she invited the President of WADA to be heard by the committee for education, culture and sport at the National Assembly and the foreign affairs committee, of which she was a member and which comprised two former prime ministers, to talk about the fight against doping in sport. The French authorities were honoured to be hosting the WADA meetings in Paris in November.

THE CHAIRMAN promised that he would do precisely what he was told to do and represent WADA properly. He only hoped that the quality of the debate matched the quality of the surroundings in which WADA would be holding the debate. The other dates were in the members' files. WADA would be in Montreal in May, in Copenhagen in September and, in November the following year, WADA would be in Colorado Springs, where Mr Hybl had been of great assistance in making the preparations, and he looked forward to having close discussions with the USOC at that time.

He thanked the members very much indeed; it had been a long working day, but he really believed that the Executive Committee had moved the whole fight against doping in sport forward in terms of the quality of the papers before the members, and hopefully in the quality of the decisions taken. He thanked the interpreters and all of the WADA management and staff for the way in which they had set everything up and, in association with them, he would be writing to Mr Bach to thank him for the facilities and the wonderful entertainment that WADA had had in Vidy on behalf of the IOC. He looked forward to seeing all the members in Paris.

## DECISION

Executive Committee – 15 November 2014, Paris, France;  
Foundation Board – 16 November 2014, Paris, France;  
Executive Committee – 12 May 2015, location to be confirmed;  
Foundation Board – 13 May 2015, location to be confirmed;  
Executive Committee – 16 September or 17 September, Copenhagen, Denmark;  
Executive Committee – 17 November 2015, location to be confirmed;  
Foundation Board – 18 November 2015, Colorado Springs, USA.

The meeting adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

## FOR APPROVAL

SIR CRAIG REEDIE  
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA