

**Minutes of the WADA Foundation Board Meeting
18 November 2012, Montreal, Canada**

The meeting began at 8.30 a.m.

1. Welcome, roll call and observers

THE CHAIRMAN formally declared the meeting open.

He distributed the roll call and asked the members to sign it.

The following members attended the meeting: Mr John Fahey, AC, President and Chairman of WADA; Professor Arne Ljungqvist, WADA Vice-Chairman, IOC Member and Chairman of the WADA Health, Medical and Research Committee; Mr Toni Pascual, Chairman, IPC Anti-Doping Committee; Ms Tanja Vogel, representing Mr Joseph Blatter, Member of the IOC, President of FIFA; Mr Willi Kaltschmitt Lujan, Member of the IOC; Mr Christian Thill, representing Mr Robin Mitchell, Member of the IOC, Secretary General, Oceania National Olympic Committees; Mr Richard Pound, IOC Member; Mr Patrick Chamunda, IOC Member; Mr Eduardo Henrique de Rose, President, PASO; Mr Richard Young, Representative, ANOC; Ms Monika Ungar, representing Mr Tamas Ajan, Member of the IOC, President of the IWF; Mr Anders Besseberg, President of the IBU; Ms Claudia Bokel, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Adam Pengilly, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Ms Beckie Scott, IOC Member and IOC Athletes Commission Member; Mr Pambos Stylianou, representing Mr George Demosthenous, Minister of Education and Culture, Cyprus; Mr Tim Scully, representing Mr Leo Varadkar, Minister for Transport, Tourism and Sport, Ireland; Ms Bente Skovgaard Kristensen, representing Mr Uffe Elbaek, Minister of Culture, Denmark; Ms Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Deputy Secretary General, Council of Europe; Ms Snezana Samardzic Markovic, Director General for Democracy, Council of Europe; Mr Vincent Meriton, Minister of Community Development, Youth, Sport and Culture, Seychelles; Mr Fernando Sumbana Jr, Minister of Youth and Sports, Mozambique; Mr Osama Ghoniem, representing Mr El Amry Farouk, Minister of State for Sport, Egypt; Mr Ernesto Irurueta, representing Mr Miguel Angel Rimba Alvis, President, CONSUDE; Mr Yoshio Yamawaki, representing Mr Hirofumi Ryu, Minister in Charge of Sports, Japan; Dr Ramlan Abd Aziz, representing Mr Dato Ahmad Shabery Cheek, Minister, Youth and Sports, Malaysia; Mr Mohammed Saleh Al Konbaz, President, Saudi Arabian Anti-Doping Committee; Mr Jiang Zhixue, representing Mr Duan Shijie, Vice Minister, State Sport General Administration, China; Mr Bill Rowe, representing Ms Kate Lundy, Minister for Sport, Australia; Mr Craig Reedie, IOC Member; Mr Patrick McQuaid, President of the UCI; Professor David Gerrard, representing Mr Murray McCully, Minister for Sport and Recreation, New Zealand; Mr Gian Franco Kasper, IOC Member and President of the FIS; Dr Patrick Schamasch, representing Mr Francesco Ricci Bitti, President of the International Tennis Federation and Member of ASOIF; Mr MacAdam, representing Mr Bal Gosal, Minister of State (Sport), Canada; Mr Edward Jurith, Senior Counsel, Executive Office of the President, ONDCP, USA; Mr David Howman, WADA Director General; Mr Rune Andersen, Standards and Harmonisation Director, WADA; Mr Frédéric Donzé, Director of the European Regional Office and IF Relations, WADA; Mr Rob Koehler, Education and Programme Development Director, WADA; Ms Julie Masse, Communications Director, WADA; Dr Alan Verneq, Medical Director, WADA; Dr Olivier Rabin, Science Director, WADA; Mr Olivier Niggli, Legal Director, WADA; Mr Kazuhiro Hayashi, Asia/Oceania Regional Office

Director; Ms Maria José Pesce, Latin America Regional Office Director; and Mr Rodney Swigelaar, Africa Regional Office Director.

The following observers signed the roll call: Javier Odriozola, Stan Frossard, Una May, Marc Vouillamoz, Chen Zhiyu, Louis Jani, Andréanne Morin, Nishel Kumar, Carlos Tembe, Martin Holmlund Lauesen, Ole Sorensen, Louise Barton, Andy Parkinson, Benjamin Carlier, Pavel Kolobkov, Nathalia Zhelanova, Jason Chung, Françoise Dagouret, Joseph De Pencier, Rafal Piechota, Kari Töllikkö, Mikio Hibino, Shin Asakawa, Ichiro Kono, Graeme Steel, Yaya Yamamoto, and Walter Palmer.

– **1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest**

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any conflicts of interest that the members wished to disclose. He noted that this was not the case.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 18 May 2012

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the minutes of the previous meeting on 18 May and asked if it was their wish that he sign those minutes as a true and accurate record of the proceedings of that meeting.

DECISION

Minutes of the meeting of the Foundation Board on 18 May 2012 approved and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that he would highlight some of the items in his written report and update them on some of the matters that had taken place since it had been written, as it had been written some three and a half weeks previously to accompany the papers sent to the members.

Regarding UNESCO, there had been 172 ratifications. Three countries had completed the documentation and forwarded it to Paris, but it had not yet been received and processed by UNESCO, so that would make 175 countries before the end of the year. There was a note in his report about the legislation report co-commissioned by WADA with UNESCO on countries that had adhered to the convention and introduced laws on trafficking and distribution; he had one comment in relation to that, which was that there were still many countries to introduce effective legislation for that purpose, so he encouraged the members representing governments to help in their regions to achieve a better result.

With regard to the WCO, WADA was still looking for an officer to be seconded to the WCO in Brussels so, if any of the representatives had a person within their customs department whom they could spare and send to Brussels, the WCO would welcome that person with open arms.

Regarding the NADOs to which WADA was giving special attention, the members would see the report on Brazil. The legislation was in place, the people who were running and had been appointed to the NADO there had been appointed, and the testing programme had started, so WADA was down the track a little bit more than when the Foundation Board had met in May. A WADA team would be going to Brazil the following week to further the progress, and WADA had received a plea from the IOC to ensure that there were many DCOs trained and ready to partake in the event in 2016 but obviously also at events prior to that time, and that would be one of the aims WADA would achieve in the coming months.

Ghana had decided that it did need an anti-doping programme and it would achieve that to start with by belonging to one of the African RADOs.

With regard to Russia, there were visits that had taken place in recent times and there would be visits upcoming to ensure that the Moscow laboratory could transfer its operations to Sochi for the Olympic Games in 2014. That process would be similar to the one in Vancouver when the laboratory in Montreal had had a satellite laboratory there. RUSADA had established an investigation unit, and that was an advance on what he had reported in May.

There were two countries that were not really on the list of NADOs that WADA had targeted but that it had since included. The first was Jamaica, which had seen a lull in its programme because the chief executive had resigned. There was now a new chief executive, and WADA had visited Jamaica in October and was happy that the programme was back on track.

The other country was Kenya, and the President and the Regional Director for Africa had visited Kenya the previous month, and they would be able to report more thoroughly than he could, but one of the issues there related to allegations of doping among Kenya's elite athletes, long distance runners, and WADA had asked the minister and the sporting presidents to institute an independent enquiry, and he awaited the outcome or progress in relation to that.

ADAMS had been used very successfully in London for the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games. The profiles for the ABP were available on ADAMS, and that was a huge advance. WADA had just signed a contract for the phone app, and he knew that many of the athlete representatives there had been anxious to see that, so that application would be introduced the following year. WADA had written to the five countries that had been wanting to try to achieve compatibility with ADAMS through the systems that they currently operated, and the members would recall comments about this the previous time, that SIMON and EUGENE were not currently compatible with ADAMS. WADA was awaiting a response to its letter and he had been told the previous day that a response was imminent.

There was a brief item in his report on management, accompanied by an attachment that showed the members all of the tasks that the WADA management had been mandated to do pursuant to the Code or had been asked to do by the Executive Committee. The previous day, the management had been asked to see whether that list could be shortened or changed and he would look at whether that could be done and whether the Executive Committee would agree to that the following May. The WADA office in Montreal operated with the same staff level as there had been in 2004; there had been some alterations in job descriptions and structuring of the way in which the staff responded to issues, but there was the same level of staffing and he thought that everybody realised that part of the issue that WADA needed to confront was an increasing and continued sophistication by those who were cheating, and WADA needed to respond to that and other major international issues that required a response from WADA.

There was a brief report in his paper on the Olympic Games and the Paralympic Games, and the members should note that the reports from the Independent Observer teams present in London had been completed, discussed with the IOC and the IPC, and posted on the WADA website.

He made special mention on extra funding assistance received from governments in recent times. These extra contributions were invaluable to WADA; not only were they useful to WADA's activities, but they were matched by money from the IOC until the government contributions reached 100%, so WADA worked very hard to achieve that. WADA had received a proposal from Russia to make an extra special contribution going forward, and that was not only extremely well received but also significant in its gesture. Russia had decided to support WADA and contribute financially to reinforcing the fight against doping in sport in order to develop new anti-doping programmes and was

proposing to offer 300,000 euros to allow WADA to do that. Russia hoped that this would commence in 2013, so he thanked Russia for that generosity and proposal.

In addition, there were generous hosts who helped WADA defray its costs by hosting working group meetings, and that year WADA had Japan and Russia to thank for hosting the Athlete Committee meetings and thereby reducing the amount required from the WADA budget to spend on those meetings, and he thanked Japan and Russia accordingly.

All of the members would be aware of the recent USADA decision in the case relating to Lance Armstrong. This was a very significant decision relating to the uncovering of a major conspiracy to defeat the rules. USADA had issued a very detailed and well-reasoned decision based on a significant amount of collected evidence, a number of riders had provided sworn testimony, and all of those had been deemed to have provided substantial assistance to the USADA enquiry and had been sanctioned for a period of six months pursuant to the substantial assistance clause in the Code. The UCI had elected not to appeal the decision, Mr Armstrong had taken no further steps, and WADA likewise had elected not to appeal and had also accepted the six-month sanctions that had been imposed as being Code-compliant. There were still two more people yet to go through a hearing with USADA; two of the alleged co-conspirators, a trainer and a doctor, had hearings pending, so there was still the probability of more evidence to come from that particular enquiry. For WADA, the case exemplified what it had been saying essentially since BALCO and Marion Jones: sophisticated cheats, aided by very bad, unethical people, could beat the testing programme. WADA's initiatives in joining with law enforcement bodies and others had been instrumental in many big cases from the time of the Winter Olympic Games in Turin in 2006 onwards. It was becoming very noticeable, and he hoped that this latest case would awaken awareness and action among other ADOs. The WADA protocols, which had been published the previous year, were available to all. WADA could be of assistance and had already been approached by several ADOs to give them guidance as to how to do a job similar to that conducted by USADA.

He had highlighted in his report the Ljungqvist Symposium that had been convened in Stockholm. This was a gesture made to Professor Ljungqvist by the Swedish Government to honour his birthday the previous year. It had been highlighted by a significant concentration on social and health issues around doping, and everybody knew that doping was not just a matter to be dealt with by elite athletes; there was a trickle-down effect. It had gone into societies through young people, who took drugs to look good, and security forces and so on. WADA had evidence of the trickle-down effect through positive cases from amateur cycling events, a case involving a member of a national federation board who had cheated, and schoolboys who were pumping up on steroids to help them get professional contracts. It was a matter that WADA viewed very seriously and one that he asked governments to look at in the same way as the Danish Government had looked at it when it had held the presidency of the EU and issued a thorough report on the societal issue and the fact that it was being carried out beyond what he described as the "pointy end" of the fight against doping in sport, which was WADA's responsibility.

The IOC had retested samples from Athens, and there had been a number of positive cases, all of which were yet to receive a hearing, so WADA was not in a position to comment any further until the hearings had taken place.

As to special projects, WADA was working with INADO on how the paperless programme could be initiated globally. Some of the ADOs already had a paperless programme; WADA's task was now to see whether INADO could look at a way of introducing it across the spectrum of ADOs with WADA's guidance. WADA simply did not have the resource or time to carry out the project on its own, so he looked forward to working with INADO in relation to that.

Many asked about statistics. WADA was employing a statistician to look at the information that it had gathered over the past eight years to see whether there could be a better presentation of its information. WADA relied on its stakeholders to give it information and needed them to do that. WADA had also introduced a new programme through ADAMS to ensure that, whenever a sample went to a laboratory, it was fully described, so that the statistics WADA got from the laboratories were better.

Regarding the item on better practice, Mr Donzé would report on this a little more thoroughly, but there was one initiative with which WADA was progressing immediately, with the major games organiser for the World Games, to be convened in Cali, Colombia, in July the following year. WADA was working with its organising committee to ensure that the anti-doping programme put in place was put in place immediately and would not be subject to WADA's scrutiny at the time of the event.

He highlighted the major leagues. The item was not in his report. WADA had had a meeting with representatives in New York after the time of writing of the report. The NFL and its players association were still discussing whether and how to introduce Hgh testing in that sport. There were discussions that were taking place in Washington to see whether there could be stimulus provided to the introduction of that testing. Major League Baseball had introduced more testing of synthetic testosterone and, when he said more, the Prohibited List said that the carbon isotope machine was to be used when the ratio was more than 4:1. Major League Baseball was using it below that ratio, and had found a few cases indicating that athletes using synthetic testosterone could use it and fall below the 4:1 ratio and therefore get away with it. WADA was looking at whether that could be advanced or enhanced for other sports. Just for the record, WADA had not met with the NHL because there was currently a lockout in that particular sport, and both the NHL and the players association were involved in intensive discussions.

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that there had been a most successful conference the previous Monday in Paris, co-hosted by the Council of Europe, UNESCO, the French Ministry for Sport and Minister Fourneyron, and WADA. That conference had been a gathering of the pharmaceutical industry, sport and government. He commended the Science Director for his effort to ensure that the pharmaceutical and biotechnology industry was well represented and the themes constantly hammered throughout the day involved the ongoing partnership: it had been commenced, it was productive, WADA needed to expand it and there was every reason to believe that the resolutions that had followed and the commitments made would allow that to occur as a result of the gathering there the previous Monday.

It would also be remiss of him not to pick up on the comments about the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in London and say to Mr Reddie and his team congratulations, as it had been a magnificent period of time and it had been pleasing to see that WADA had contributed through the Independent Observer and Outreach programmes, both of which had been highly successful in the manner in which they had performed their tasks, and a number of members had had the benefit and the courtesies of being able to attend some magnificent sporting events. He congratulated and thanked the Olympic Movement and all associated there.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI commented very briefly on the important event that had taken place in Paris and said how, in the terms of the way of looking at the future as WADA members, this meeting in Paris had been significant. When discussing the budget and resource mobilisation, she would probably make another comment on how WADA, working together with the pharmaceutical industry, was bringing significant help to the WADA budget.

The Council of Europe had been waiting almost two years for this important conference; it had taken place, it had gone very well and she hoped that WADA would have an opportunity to organise events of that quality in other continents.

She referred to part of the very interesting report by Mr Howman regarding other matters and the Armstrong case. What was very interesting from her perspective was to see how a NADO in a given country started to further develop its capacity for investigation, adding to the traditional analytical investigations the other possibility of seeking information, collecting this information independently and then being able to deliver, as had been the case here, also on the basis of cooperation with athletes, who had been able to provide information. So, this new trend, the way in which one could see, also in other countries, the possibility for a NADO to increase its investigation capacities, was worth mentioning. It had been underlined by the CAHAMA, the group in Europe responsible for the implementation of the Anti-Doping Convention, and the CAHAMA had attached importance to that statement being made that day.

MR STYLIANOU said first that it was a pleasure to be back in Montreal again participating in the Foundation Board meeting. On behalf of the Cyprus Presidency of the Council of the European Union, he wished to thank the Director General and the entire WADA administration for their excellent work and the support given to all the NADOs. He would like to make a very brief comment on the paperless project, and said that Europe strongly supported the special project and encouraged WADA to take into consideration the comments made to proceed with the project and allocate the resources to run a pilot programme with the participation of a small number of NADOs and re-evaluate the situation again in two or three years' time. It was a very important project and WADA should try to find alternative ways of proceeding.

MR POUND referred to UNESCO no longer having a doping specialist; he hoped that this was not an indication of a declining lack of interest in the subject matter, particularly because the treaty had to be monitored, so it was important to have that.

PROFESSOR LJUNGOVIST said that he had a few comments and questions. He thanked the Director General for mentioning his symposium in Stockholm and thanked WADA for the support given to the symposium in terms of posting related information on its website. The members had been provided with a preliminary programme at the previous Foundation Board meeting. He thanked the participants at the symposium. The Director General had given the keynote lecture and the outcome of the symposium had been immediately posted on the WADA website. He thanked everybody for giving support to the symposium.

He commended UNESCO on having initiated the review of legislation among the UN membership and the report given by Professor Houlihan, which was available for reading. He was concerned to find that there was much to be done on the national level in terms of domestic legislation to be efficiently assisting anti-doping activities in the various countries. He had recalled that many times and had had the opportunity to speak on behalf of the IOC president at the UNESCO conference of parties and emphasise the need for appropriate domestic legislation for the purpose of having efficient anti-doping activities in place in the countries around the world, and he recommended that the members read the Houlihan report commissioned by UNESCO.

The London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games had been successful from an anti-doping point of view; the activities had included one considerable innovation, which was the use of an intelligence unit at the UK anti-doping organisation, which had been very helpful in identifying athletes and groups of athletes who had never actually gone to the Olympic Games or had been identified beforehand thanks to the information obtained and activities that had taken place among the IFs well before the Olympic Games, all of which had resulted in low numbers of athletes found doped at the Olympic Games, and he thought that this sort of intelligence unit during Games-time was here to stay, as it was an essential part of anti-doping activities related to the Olympic Games, so he thanked London for setting a good example.

There were two upcoming editions of the Olympic Games, in Russia and Brazil, and he had heard reports that things were moving rather slowly. There was some concern at

the IOC that the Sochi Olympic Games would take place in less than one-and-a-half years and the organisational structure was still not functioning to the extent that it should be at that stage. He understood that there was a laboratory problem related not only to the transfer to Sochi but also to the actual activities of the Moscow laboratory, and there was some concern and the feeling that time was running short for this to be in place in time for the Olympic Games in Sochi. The same thing appeared to be the case in Brazil. Things appeared to be moving slowly. Four years went quickly, and there was no real staff or activity in place in the host city, which was of concern, so he wondered what WADA could do to help those host countries have accurate anti-doping activities in place well before the Olympic Games began.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it was appropriate to inform the members of an event that had taken place the previous day in Beijing: a documentary entitled the War On Doping had won the top prize for best documentary in Sports and Society at the World Sports Film Festival. The film had been made around much of the work that Professor Ljungqvist had in fact been doing over a number of years, and some of the members might remember the cameras going when they had met in Stockholm, so he congratulated Professor Ljungqvist for his involvement in that, and said that it was always nice to think that the topic that WADA members spent their time on was given that sort of recognition when a film was put together to highlight that particular issue in the world, and that came to the top in the context of an award, so he was pleased for Professor Ljungqvist and his role there.

MR PENGILLY said that he had a comment regarding statistics, and he wished to reiterate the point that Mr Howman had made earlier, that it was part of Code compliance and therefore everybody should be doing it. When athletes were not Code-compliant, they had very serious penalties, and therefore it was important that all of the ADOs should give solid statistics regularly and when they should. Related to that was intelligent testing: if there was no good evidence, WADA could not test intelligently, so the two, or even the three, were interlinked.

MS SCOTT picked up on Professor Ljungqvist's comments in support of the concern about Sochi. The winter sport athlete community in particular was deeply concerned and very troubled about the potential for an unfair playing field at the upcoming Winter Olympic Games. She had also heard about the trouble with the laboratory in Moscow and, given that this was the pre-Olympic Games year during which many of the world cup trials would be held in Sochi, she wondered about the testing plan for the pre-Olympic Games year trial races.

MR REEDIE thanked the Chairman on behalf of the two directors of the London Olympic Games Organising Committee, who were present, and the chief executive of the NADO, for his kind words about London. He was very pleased that those members who had attended the Olympic Games had enjoyed themselves. He thought that NOCs had been kept happy; he knew that IFs had been kept happy and athletes had certainly been kept happy, and the whole thing had worked very well. In particular, the IPC had been kept happy, as the Paralympic Games after the Olympic Games had been a huge success, which was when the Executive Committee meeting had been held. He thought that the Olympic Games had made the world a slightly better place, and there were about 55 of the local directors in Rio as he spoke doing the London Olympic Games debriefing and he hoped that some of the experience could be passed on to the next Summer Olympic Games organisers.

MR POUND said that he thought that he had got his UNESCO concern out during his previous intervention; his second question was about the extra funding to which the Director General had referred. He had heard about the quantum in terms of the Russian 300,000 euros, but what was the other, and at what level of extra funding was WADA? On the question of further testing of samples from 2004, this was a point he had raised at the IOC session but he thought that it was worth raising again: after keeping 3,600-

odd samples for eight years, at the last minute the IOC had tested 100, the results had been roughly five times the normal rate of positive tests, and he thought it would be important for WADA to push on that and try and find out why more had not been done and testing not done sooner.

Everybody knew that the compliance standards were ridiculously low; did the Executive Committee have any sense of an increased appetite on the part of the stakeholders to increase those compliance standards?

With respect to USADA and Armstrong, USADA deserved WADA's congratulations as an example of an independent NADO willing to take on some difficult investigations and pursue them to the end. He thought that the fact that everybody had accepted those findings, not only the UCI but also Armstrong himself, was a hallmark of a thorough and complete investigation. Perhaps this had been discussed the previous day, but it would be of interest to the entire anti-doping community and in fact to the world at large to know as many details as possible about the investigation announced by the UCI. Who would be involved? What were the terms of the mandate and limitations on that? It was absolutely vital given the disclosures of the nature and extent of that conspiracy.

Regarding the major leagues, frankly, he found it insulting that the NFL could not seem to get to grips with testing for Hgh when it acknowledged that that was one of the drugs of choice in that league, and the idea of synthetic testosterone being tested only when the ratio was above 4:1 simply did not make sense, knowing what was known about how microdosing was done and how athletes were managing to stay just below the 4:1 ratio. When it had been 6:1, strangely enough, athletes had managed to stay just below that ratio, so it was clearly being manipulated.

One issue that came out of what Professor Ljungqvist had said was that WADA had to be careful about a tendency to push down doping at the Olympic Games to WADA. The IOC was the responsible anti-doping authority at the Olympic Games, and it was up to the IOC to make sure that testing happened. If WADA could help, that was fine, but any suggestion that this was a WADA problem to be solved so that the Olympic Games could be doping-free was something that WADA should resist pretty strenuously.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded to the comments and questions. He thanked Ms Battaini-Dragoni for her comments in relation to the pharmaceutical conference; WADA had appreciated the opportunity to partner with the Council of Europe, UNESCO and the French Government. It was unusual for the hosting of private enterprise in a house of public service, and he thought that that was significant as well. Ms Battaini-Dragoni would have heard his concluding remarks at the conference that WADA was now looking for the money, and he knew that Mr Reddie supported him on that.

The protocols on collecting and sharing of information through investigations was something on which WADA had been working very hard over the years, and there were published protocols that WADA had put out there. WADA had already worked with Anti-Doping Norway and Anti-Doping Netherlands in the past few weeks to show them how they could introduce investigations into their national programmes. Anti-Doping Switzerland had held a seminar some weeks previously, at which there had been ten other European countries attending for the same purpose. That had been spearheaded by the Australian agency, which had been doing this work for many years under the mandate in Australia, so it was encouraging to hear support for that. WADA certainly had been supporting it for a number of years and was pleased that this significant case had brought it to others' attention. In Europe, and it had been mentioned already around the table, UK Anti-Doping had been well involved in this sort of work and had been able to participate in the Olympic Games as a result of that intelligence-gathering.

To Mr Stylianou, he said that WADA would oversee the way in which the paperless project proceeded; WADA needed to work with INADO on it and it was a good

opportunity for that organisation to show the benefits that it could provide to its membership, and he looked forward to seeing how that would go forward.

WADA had been pleased to support the Ljungqvist Symposium in Stockholm and WADA had a link with the WHO as a result of the individual who had represented that body in Stockholm, and that was helping WADA as it went forward with initiatives such as the pharmaceutical industry initiative.

The review by UNESCO on its legislation was a review WADA had pushed for and part paid for, and WADA felt that it needed to keep pushing UNESCO to make sure that the states parties did advance in that area. UNESCO did not currently have a full-time person responsible for the convention, so it had made it a little more difficult for WADA on a practical basis to push, promote and provoke in Paris, and the management had some ideas about how that might be achieved as WADA went forward.

Regarding IOC support from UK Anti-Doping, WADA had suggested that the IOC look at using such a very well resourced agency during the London Olympic Games. The responsibility for the testing programme of course lay with the organising committee through the host agreement and the organising committee in Rio had already approached UK Anti-Doping to see that the experience provided during the pre-Games testing part of the programme could be repeated at Rio with the help of UKAD.

WADA would of course attend to the matters for which it was responsible in respect of laboratories, accreditation, satellite laboratory accreditation and so on in Brazil and Russia, and WADA was also participating with the IOC in regular visits to Russia and Brazil for that purpose.

WADA was very alert to the issue of statistics, and had not looked at article 14 being an item on the compliance programme, as that had not been considered by the Executive Committee to be one in the latest compliance programme report; when Mr Pengilly's comment was allied with those from Mr Pound, it was obvious to see that the compliance report due in 2015 had to be more strenuous. The management was looking at how that could be done and would put a proposal to the Executive Committee in May. He agreed with Mr Pengilly's comment about smart testing. That again involved better practice on the part of the ADOs around the world. WADA could give them the information and protocols and processes to follow, but they still had to be initiated by those people and not by WADA. WADA could not be in every country in the world to make sure that it was carried out, but it could promote and provoke.

To Ms Scott, he understood her comment in relation to the pre-Games testing that he hoped would be engineered in every country before Sochi, and WADA would do its best to see that pre-Games testing was done across the board.

He told Mr Reddie that he did not feel the need to say anything. WADA certainly highly regarded the efforts of UKAD.

Regarding the extra funding that WADA had been receiving, he told Mr Pound that there was a sheet attached to the finance report that showed that WADA had received 220,000 or 230,000 dollars from Japan that year which had gone towards boosting the RADO projects in Asia. WADA had received 60,000 dollars from Australia for the same purpose with the Oceania RADO, and the total extra amount collected that year was around 400,000 dollars. It was detailed in the report.

Mr Pound had asked about the retesting of samples from Athens. WADA had written to the IOC asking for more samples to be retested. WADA had pushed, but had been unable to take it any further as it was not WADA's decision.

He took on board Mr Pound's comment about compliance and noted that he had already responded to Mr Pengilly in that regard.

A report had been received the previous day on the UCI enquiry, and it was progressing in an independent fashion. WADA did not yet have the terms of reference or the composition of the board, but had been told that that would come in the early part of December and that the investigation would be a public one.

Regarding the major leagues, WADA had been for some time trying to explain it to the players association so that it would understand that this was not an argument about science, but regrettably it had become a political issue and not a scientific issue, and that was why the association was looking to some engagement from Washington.

THE CHAIRMAN said that Mr Pound had asked if some further information might be provided on the UCI enquiry. Mr McQuaid had given a very holistic comment the previous day and he asked Mr McQuaid if he would be happy to do the same again for the Foundation Board.

MR MCQUAID said that the UCI, like everybody, had been shocked and dismayed at the revelations that had come out of the USADA report, and so the management committee had decided that it needed to conduct an independent investigation into the period and the allegations contained within the USADA report. The UCI had contacted the president of ICAS to assist it in setting up the enquiry. The president of ICAS had provided the UCI with the name of a potential chairman, whom he had met that week and whom he thought would take up the role. It would then be down to the chairman and the president of ICAS to decide on the other two members. The chairman had already stated that the enquiry would be completely independent and a public enquiry. He expected to hear the composition of the commission by the end of November and would be reporting on that publicly in early December, and the commission itself would determine the terms of reference.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

– **3.1 Working Group on the Ineffectiveness of Testing**

MR POUND thanked the Chairman and the Executive Committee for commissioning the work of the working group. There had been a couple of telephone meetings and he hoped to have a face-to-face meeting early in January the following year. The group had identified a number of the factors that it believed led to the relative ineffectiveness of the testing programmes, and that first analysis had to be completed before the group would be able to make any useful suggestions as to how it could be made more effective, but the group was to his knowledge quite well informed and very interested in pursuing its mandate to a successful conclusion, so he hoped that, by the meeting in May, it would have provided the Executive Committee with at least a draft report, and it would be up to the Executive Committee to determine what action was appropriate and what communication to the Foundation Board was appropriate.

DECISION

Working Group on the Ineffectiveness of Testing report noted.

– **3.2 Executive Committee meeting update**

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL stated that several important recommendations had come from the Executive Committee meeting the previous day which would come up during the Foundation Board meeting, and he would not refer to them, but the approvals that the Executive Committee had made included appointing Mr Jurith, representing the US Government, as chair of the Education Committee to replace Mr Ward, who had retired from public service the previous month, and Mr Jurith's term would be for the remainder of the term allocated to Mr Ward.

Regarding the social science research projects, there had been six totalling 200,848 dollars, and those grants had been approved by the Executive Committee. Four projects came from Europe, one from the Americas and one from Oceania.

The technical document for EPO had been approved with a small addition made to the document.

Regarding the Ankara laboratory, the Executive Committee had determined that it be re-entered into the reaccreditation process as soon as possible and directed that the Science Department give highest priority to the progress of such reaccreditation.

Finally, the haematological laboratory in Japan had been approved for analysis of blood for the ABP. This was a mobile anti-doping unit, which had the ability to travel to events for the purpose of collection of samples and the ability to analyse blood on the spot.

DECISION

Executive Committee meeting update noted.

4. Operations/management

– 4.1 Executive Committee appointments 2013

THE CHAIRMAN said that the decision required was for the Foundation Board to appoint the Executive Committee members for 2013; it had not been possible to circulate these names in accurate form before that morning, as some decisions had been taken only at the conclusion of the Executive Committee meeting the previous day for some regions of the world, but the members now had a final proposal in the paper on the table under item 4.1. He did not believe it required any discussion. Was the Foundation Board prepared to appoint the members of the Executive Committee for 2013 in accordance with the names on the paper?

DECISION

Proposed Executive Committee appointments 2013 approved.

– 4.2 Foundation Board

4.2.1 Memberships 2013

4.2.2 Endorsement of composition for Swiss authorities

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the composition of the Foundation Board was an issue for the Swiss authorities and he asked the members to endorse the composition for the record.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the Foundation Board to formally acknowledge the composition of the WADA Foundation Board as contained in the attachment.

DECISION

Foundation Board composition for Swiss authorities endorsed.

– 4.3 Standing committee memberships 2013

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the members had a list before them of the committees that had been approved for 2013 and onwards. The process was one in which WADA called for nominations. The nominations had been closed on 15 October. Each of the committees was determined through discussion with the President and the chair of each committee, and WADA had to follow the constitution in terms of

composition to ensure appropriate balance. For the Health, Medical and Research Committee, there had been 26 nominations; for the Education Committee, there had been 45 nominations; for the Finance and Administration Committee, there had been 19 nominations; and, for the Athlete Committee, there had been 19 nominations. There were 34 males and 18 females in the way in which the committees were formed. There were four representatives from Africa, 12 from the Americas, 9 from Asia, 23 from Europe and four from Oceania. In terms of individual countries, Spain, Australia, Germany, Switzerland and the USA had three representatives; Argentina, China, France, Japan, Russia, Sweden and Uruguay had two each; and there were 23 other countries represented in the composition of the committees. That was tabled, and there was no need for approval; it was for information only.

DECISION

Standing committee memberships 2013 approved.

– 4.4 World Conference on Doping in Sport 2013

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the members would have in their papers the draft conference agenda. It was something that the management had put together following suggestions from the Foundation Board and the Executive Committee as to the way in which WADA would proceed. For those members who had been in Copenhagen in 2003, it mirrored the agenda that WADA had had then, and the members would see that there were separate sessions for each of the international standards for discussion and debate. WADA had an internal team in place responsible for logistics, and had already appointed a professional conference organiser in Johannesburg. The only other issue in relation to the conference was that the Executive Committee would meet on 12 November; the Foundation Board had two meetings on 15 November. The first meeting would be held in the first part of the day during which the Foundation Board would be responsible for approving revisions to the Code and the international standards. The Foundation Board would then adjourn to go back to the conference so that the conference could be completed with a closing ceremony, and then the Foundation Board would sit again to conduct its normal November business, albeit in a truncated fashion, as had been the case in Madrid.

MR STYLIANOU said that, since this was for information only, he wished to inform the Foundation Board members that the EU had established a new system for choosing European representatives on the Foundation Board, and he had three names before him which he would announce, pending confirmation by the sport council of ministers the following week in Brussels: Mr Leo Varadkar, Minister for Transport, Tourism and Sport, Ireland, representing the incumbent trio of countries, for a term of 18 months; Mr Romain Schneider, Sport Minister of Luxembourg, representing the future trio, for a term of three years; then Mr Alexandre Miguel Mestre, Secretary of State for Sport and Youth, Portugal, who had recently been elected for a term of three years. This of course would take effect on 1 January 2013.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Stylianou; he thought that everybody would welcome the level of continuity that that provided. Again, it was a matter obviously for Europe, but the additional periods of time gave a better chance for the individuals to understand the work done by WADA, and perhaps there was added value in that. He appreciated the information.

MR POUND asked when the elections for WADA president/chairman would occur during the Foundation Board meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the elections for the conclusion of the term that he was serving, for president and deputy, would occur in Johannesburg in November in the second part of the Foundation Board meeting. That was what had been proposed and, as

he recalled, it was the process that had occurred in Madrid. He had been only an observer in those days.

DECISION

World Conference on Doping in Sport 2013
update noted.

– **4.5 Strategic Plan performance indicators**

THE CHAIRMAN said that the item was there for the members' information. He believed that it was a useful tool for the members to analyse the work that had been done and how well it was being done by the manner in which it had been assessed in that report and to give the members an opportunity to ask any questions in respect of the strategic plan performance indicators. Did anybody wish to ask a question or make a comment?

DECISION

Strategic Plan performance indicators
update noted.

5. Legal

– **5.1 Legal update**

MR NIGGLI said that there were two issues he wished to raise for discussion that day: one concerned the draft EU regulation on data protection and the other concerned the widespread use of methylhexanamine in food supplements.

The first matter had been raised a number of times and the issue was that there was currently discussion within the EU of a text proposed by the European Commission on data protection and, if adopted as it was that day, the text would create serious issues for the fight against doping in sport, in particular by taking away all valid bases for the transfer of data outside Europe in the context of anti-doping. The matter had been brought to the attention of a number of EU ministers. The WADA President had met a number of them during the London Olympic Games and afterwards. WADA had also reached out to a number of MEPs to discuss the issue. From what had been heard the previous week at the monitoring group and CAHAMA meetings, it was pretty clear that the member states understood that there was an issue; however, he had to say that, the previous Tuesday at the monitoring group meeting, the Commission had also been present and it had been disappointing to hear that the Commission currently had no intention to change the text and that the only alternative it was proposing was for each individual member state to pass its own legislation, which would allow it to continue its responsibility regarding anti-doping, and everybody knew that this was an unrealistic proposal, at least in the short term, and there would be an issue if this occurred. This remained a concern. It was not a matter in which sports ministers were directly involved; it was a matter in which justice ministers were actually involved, but WADA wished to see what actions member states could take to progress the issue, as WADA had a sense of urgency in terms of resolving the matter, in particular whether sports ministers would be willing to agree to a common resolution to pass on to their justice minister colleagues, so he thought that there was a real sense of urgency and mobilisation should occur in Europe.

The second issue was to highlight that sport had a real issue with methylhexanamine, which was present mainly in supplements. Looking at his report, the members would see that there were no less than ten appeals pending in cases involving the substance. The methylhexanamine cases should not automatically trigger lower sanctions. The three to six month-sanctions were not appropriate in cases in which the substance had clearly

been taken to enhance performance, and every ADO, before reaching a conclusion and handing down a six-month sanction, should look at the facts of the cases and see whether the intention had been to enhance performance or not. It was important to educate and communicate with athletes as to the risk. Initially, it had been thought that the substance could be contained in geranium oil, and that, therefore, when geranium oil was on the label, there was a risk of it being contaminated with methylhexanamine, but there were now two studies clearly showing that it was not the case and, when geranium oil was on the label and methylhexanamine was detected, it was because the latter had been added to the product separately, probably to make the product more effective. WADA had highlighted this on its website and in the comments to the List, studies showing that geranium oil did not contain the substance were on the WADA website, and WADA would probably make direct contact over the next few days with all of the ADOs, but each ADO representative should take the matter back and make sure that the athletes were fully aware that this was a big risk and that the substance was out there. A few countries had prohibited the substance, and WADA would see whether that would change anything, but there was a huge risk. It was not that different to the supplement issue that had been there in the past. When one took supplements, one took risks.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he believed it was important to emphasise the first point raised: the draft EU regulation on data protection. It was very clear to him that this was a matter that would affect European athletes more than anybody else. It would create a problem for sport and the resolution would come only if those who made the laws in Europe had an understanding of the unintended consequences of the proposed law, which might go through as early as June the following year, and the impact that it would have on the athletes of Europe. The resolution had to come from the representatives of governments in Europe. He had taken the time to go to Cyprus and he thanked Mr Stylianou for the reception and the efforts he had made subsequently to ensure a meeting of ministers of sport, which had taken place in Cyprus, but it was ministers for justice who had the conduct and the carriage of this legislation, and they were the ones who needed to be influenced. It was essential that the representatives around the table indicate their plans and the steps that they proposed to take and report back on progress made when the Foundation Board next met. WADA would continue to do its bit as an organisation, but those with the influence were those in Europe representing the governments and were the ones who would ultimately sign off on the regulation. He gave the floor to the representatives to give the Foundation Board an indication of how they proposed to deal with the issue and on the basis that WADA would seek a progress report from them again the next time the Foundation Board met.

MR SCULLY informed the members that he very much welcomed the opportunity to reassure WADA of the work that was being done and he would give some details of what had happened and what was happening. The current review of the EU data protection framework might have important implications for ADOs and athletes. The ministers were currently exploring the possible options within appropriate EU structures to ensure that data protection issues related to the testing of athletes were fully considered and accommodated in the current review without infringing the system of effective doping controls. The current EU presidency, Cyprus, and the incoming presidency, Ireland, would ensure that the appropriate coordination between sport and data protection took place so that the input from sport would be considered within EU structures in the process. In addition, the Danish presidency, at the sports directors meeting the previous June, had encouraged all EU member states to consider the possible implications of the proposed EU legislation on data protection and the anti-doping framework. He would take note of WADA's proposed improvements and pass on the proposals to the relevant working parties within the EU. At present, he worked closely with the EU working party dealing with sport; however, the issue of data protection was dealt with by a different working party outside the sports arena. For the six months from 13 January, Ireland would chair both the sports working party and the working party dealing with data protection matters, and it would use the period to advance significantly the awareness

and potential consequences for sport and work towards finding a solution that was acceptable to all.

MR STYLIANOU said that he wished to thank the Chairman for the comments made about all the work that had been done. Most of it was not in any kind of "announceable" form. He reiterated that, despite the fact that the Cyprus presidency would be coming to an end in six weeks' time, Cyprus would continue to work closely with colleagues, and he emphasised that Cyprus was in full agreement with what Mr Scully had just pointed out. Cyprus would continue its efforts and he was very hopeful that there would be some results in the next few months.

MS KRISTENSEN echoed what her colleagues from Ireland and Cyprus had just said, reiterating what her minister had said at the Foundation Board meeting in May that year to explain the legislative process in Europe and how it worked. This would be considered very carefully and work would be done together with the ministries of justice, which were responsible for personal data protection in most countries. As her Irish colleague had said, there had been a sport directors meeting on 1 June in Copenhagen, and this had been attended by all the EU member states. The input received from the Foundation Board meeting in May had been discussed, and she thought that everybody was working very hard to solve the issue. Denmark was still analysing the rules in general and also in respect of the anti-doping regime. Denmark did not have a final position on the issue yet, but the Danish Government would do that when the time was right and, as her colleague had said, everybody had the aim of having a high standard continuously on personal data protection in Europe for all citizens, including athletes, and also legislation that would work well in accordance with the anti-doping regime so as not to hinder the work there.

THE CHAIRMAN stressed that this was an issue that justice ministers had to address on behalf of sport and European sportsmen and women, and perhaps the next time there might be some indication of the attitudes of the justice ministers in the governments that the members represented in the European area more generally, as that was where an outcome would ultimately be achieved. He stressed that there was no criticism of the law itself or the intentions; it was the unintended consequences that would clearly have an impact on sport and what WADA was seeking to do in anti-doping, and there was a six-page paper that any layman would be able to fully understand. WADA had circulated it as widely as possible and, if the representatives could get that before 27 justice ministers, perhaps they would understand that something might happen that none of them would really want to happen.

MR POUND said that the Chairman had made an excellent point and probably the European friends should go back able to communicate that there was a sense of urgency involved, that Europe should not play itself off-side in an international sport system with unintended consequences, and asked if there was anything that the representatives as Europeans could do and any advice they could give the sport community as to how best to make the point (should the IOC be wading in on this with its international moral authority saying that it was an important issue and it could affect the entire sport system around the world?). It had been disappointing, and WADA had spent far too much time dealing with data protection, which had distracted it both time-wise and budget-wise from the fight against doping in sport, so it was up to the representatives to find a solution but, if there was anything that WADA could do or other governments from around the world could do with their colleagues, because this was not bank account information or medical and health information: it was a system of sport which operated by consent and, with the greatest of respect, the fact that one could not give informed consent simply because an athlete was not as big as an IF was nonsense and somebody had to say that and make it clear.

DR SCHAMASCH said that he did not wish to speak to the matter of data protection but rather to the second part of the report on methylhexanamine. As had been said the

previous day, it was a matter of education. He had seen in the Director General's report that WADA's activities in the matter were bearing fruit; one of the paragraphs said that there had been a marked drop when it came to contamination in China and Mexico of clenbuterol because of WADA's actions. It seemed to him that, when it came to methylhexanamine, education was a matter of huge importance. As Professor Ljungqvist had said the previous day, the IOC had taken similar action at the start of 2000 when there had been a contamination epidemic of nandrolone in food supplements, and there had been research carried out by the Cologne laboratory and it had been found out that 15% of all food supplements had been wilfully or accidentally contaminated. With the athletes, an education programme had been carried out and it appeared to have borne fruit. NADOs should identify those substances, products and supplements that already existed, and provide the commercial names of those products so as to be able to set up a national list that would not be comprehensive but could be shared by WADA throughout the world, as these contaminated products had different names depending on the country in which they were found. Again, education was a key word when it came to reducing this new epidemic.

DR PASCUAL congratulated WADA on its successful appeal of all of the cases, which proved that WADA had been right in understanding that the first decision had not been correct. He asked if Mr Niggli could provide further information on the case of Tyrone McNeal, as this was an example of an IF intervening to change a decision made at national level and, since WADA was in the middle of changing the Code, on the one hand, there were countries that were supposed to be Code-compliant but then there were situations in which cases were judged and the result of those cases was clearly non-compliant, and then an IF tried to save money by not going to the CAS, had thought about the possibility of rehearing the case in order not to go through the whole process, and this was one of the cases that was wrong and not Code-compliant; so, in the process of writing a new Code, what was the impact and what were Mr Niggli's thoughts on the way of doing it without going all the way to the CAS and spending a lot of money when the first decision had been flagrantly wrong?

MS BOKEL said that the athletes believed that it was really important that the data protection legislation did not affect the fight against doping in sport and that WADA should do its utmost to protect clean athletes.

MR PENGILLY reiterated what Ms Bokel had said about data protection. It would be terrible if an athlete were to travel to another country but was unable to have TUE information and then was subjected to a positive doping test and everything that that involved. If the British or German or Italian team were to send its Olympic team to Russia, which was obviously outside the EU, would it not have to share that data and send it across to the Russians, and therefore would it not be breaking the law by doing so? He was not a lawyer but would appreciate an answer to such a question.

MR SCULLY said that Ireland had made products containing methylhexanamine illegal following good cooperation with food safety and medicine agencies. In relation to the data protection issue, this was draft legislation; the members were discussing something that was only at proposal level, and it was not being voted on yet, and it was not at any of those stages. He thought that some of the language being used was unhelpful, and he thought that describing EU laws as nonsense certainly did nothing to help resolve the situation. Regarding getting outside agencies such as the IOC involved, at that stage, there was nothing that it would add. To put it in context, this was a much bigger issue than sport; as he had explained earlier, it was being dealt with outside the sport arena. It had to do with social media, Internet companies, and much bigger issues, and sport was not necessarily on the radar of these people; so, as the Chairman had correctly pointed out, it was the unintended consequences that were the risk, and it was incumbent on the government representatives to get sport onto the agenda and point out the potential that existed if the legislation went through, and to get agreement and find an acceptable solution for all. He wanted to calm things down and put a bit of

perspective on the matter. The representatives would return in May and give an update on what had been done. There was a lot of work going on that he had not talked about; the UK authorities would be going to Ireland with proposals in December, and Ireland had set up a meeting with the chair of the working party of justice, so there was a lot of work going on behind the scenes to find a resolution, and he wanted to reassure the members that the matter was being worked on, but everybody needed to maintain perspective and cool heads and try to avoid inflammatory language.

MR POUND pointed out, lest there be any misunderstanding about the word "nonsense", that he had not been talking about privacy protection generally; he had been talking about the proposition that he as an individual could not give an informed consent to the transfer of personal data within the concept of a sport context; that, he thought, was a nonsensical proposition, not the desire to protect privacy generally.

MR JURITH said that he certainly had sympathies for his European government colleagues because, having worked in government for 30 years, he knew that processes sometimes moved slowly and could be quite difficult. He thought that there was concern around the table, however, not only from the point of view of the other governments as to how this might affect them extraterritorially outside Europe, but also because the athletes were concerned about their rights and obligations if this went forward, and he could certainly understand the sentiment just expressed by his colleague from Ireland that this was just a draft and a proposal, but he thought that what was causing a lot of the concern was the indefiniteness of what was happening, so he thought that, as his European colleagues moved forward in attempting to resolve the issue, if WADA could have some sort of benchmark as to what might be expected as an anti-doping community, that would go a long way to resolving a lot of the concern expressed around the table. He certainly understood from a governmental point of view that sometimes these things were difficult to resolve, but WADA should not allow that to stand in the way of an unintended consequence that could radically affect what was done around that table and, if WADA could have some more definitive benchmarks of how that would be resolved or play out, that would be helpful to responding to many of the concerns expressed around the table.

MR NIGGLI said to Mr Pascual with regard to the Mr McNeal case that the case was indeed an example of an issue between two deciding bodies and a violation of the principle of mutual recognition, which was at the heart of a harmonised system. This was something that had been discussed the previous day by the Executive Committee and would be discussed with FIBA. He was sure that a solution would be found, but it was clear that the system worked only if everybody followed the same path, even if sometimes it might mean an appeal to the CAS, which had a cost, because otherwise one would end up in the situation (as in the case in question) whereby a player was sanctioned for two years in a country and six months in the rest of the world, which did not satisfy anybody.

The answer to Mr Pengilly's question was that, yes, it would be a problem; unless a solution was found before, it would mean that athletes could either not go or they could breach the law.

He added to what Mr Scully had said, because WADA heard from the EU member states that it was a draft, which was why it was being talked about while something could still be done about it. It might take time for the draft to come to fruition, but that was not what Ms Reding, the commissioner in charge of the project, was saying in the media. She said that she wanted it to be put to bed before the end of the parliamentary legislature, which would end before the start of the summer. To him, it seemed to be a very short period of time and she might not get what she wanted but, if she did, everybody should be aware of that. He understood that this had not been done for sport but, in the European treaty, there was an article that said that sport was a different kind of animal and should be treated slightly differently. Thus far, he had not seen or heard

anything that recognised that fact. It was a little surprising. At some point in the European discussion some years previously, there had been a recognition that sport should be looked at slightly differently

DECISION

Legal update noted.

6. Finance

– 6.1 Finance update

MR REEDIE said that the papers were before the members and he hoped that, in their binders at the very end of the package, where the 2013 budget was, there was a second paper, item 6.4 attachment 2A, which had been distributed the previous day to the Executive Committee members. It was all pretty straightforward until the budget: the members had the minutes of the Finance and Administration Committee held in June in Switzerland; they had been before the Executive Committee. The timing of that had been a little complicated, slightly upset by the fact that the Olympic Games had been held in London in July, so the committee had had to do the estimates rather earlier in the year.

DECISION

Finance update noted.

– 6.2 Government/IOC contributions update

MR REEDIE said that WADA had collected in 2012 to 15 November 98.45% of government contributions, an excellent figure. That was matched dollar for dollar by the Olympic Movement and would continue to be so. WADA was about 300,000 dollars short in contributions and he was sure that Ms Jansen and the regional offices would be chasing up those who had as yet not made their contribution; there were several quite surprising ones there, but he would leave the members to look at them.

DECISION

Government/IOC contributions update noted.

– 6.3 2012 quarterly accounts (quarter 3)

MR REEDIE said that the members were shown the quarterly accounts every quarter. The first quarter traditionally showed an enormous "profit", as WADA collected lots of contributions over the first three months and spent only 25% of costs. The half-year figures showed a smaller profit, and the members would not be surprised to see that the nine-month figures showed a smaller profit, but there was nothing in the accounts to give him any great cause for concern.

The members would see in attachment 2 the budget against actual figures for the end of September. He had looked at these and, again, there was nothing hugely significant. He thought that WADA was unlikely to make its targeted investment income from interest of 500,000 US dollars. Interest rates in the market were negligible and, if one happened to be in Switzerland, sometimes one had to look quite hard to see if there was any return at all. It was not beyond the bounds of possibility that in some countries there was a negative interest rate involved, so he thought that WADA would struggle there. For laboratory accreditation and reaccreditation, the figure looked a little low, and that was a feature of the amount of work done in that particular area. On the expenditure side, there was a significant figure on litigation. The Foundation Board had just dealt with the number of appeals WADA had to do, and he could only hope that they would become fairly routine. There was not a huge degree of additional research to be done, so they could be done efficiently and cheaply. On the expense side, one of the

slightly good bits of news was that activities at the executive office and through the Outreach and Independent Observer programmes at the London Olympic Games had been less than budgeted, so that was basically good news; and, apart from that, the quarterly assessments across every department were about where he would have expected them to be.

DECISION

2012 quarterly accounts noted.

– **6.4 Draft budget 2013**

MR REEDIE said that the members would see too under item 6.4 attachment 1 the strategic and operational plan expectations. That justified and was a huge help to the Finance and Administration Committee, which analysed every particular item of expenditure, and these had been before the members over the years so that they could see where the cost emphases were.

The Finance and Administration Committee had initially looked at four budgets, based contribution increases from the public authorities of 0%, 2% 3% and 4%. The Finance and Administration Committee, on the advice of the public authorities representatives, had decided to present a budget based on a 0% or 2% increase. The IOC would be happy with a 2% increase. In conversation with a number of members, particularly the President, it had become quite clear that a number of governments around the world would be unhappy with any contribution increase, and he had tried to react to that over the past 48 hours. The 0% increase threw up a deficit in 2013 of 2.35 million dollars. There had been some thought from governments that WADA should have a balanced budget, i.e., that it spend only what it brought in in income terms. If that agreement were to be passed, it would mean logically that WADA would have to remove 2.35 million dollars' worth of activity from the agency. In his view, that was not a wise thing to do because WADA had much to do and reducing activity was not a smart idea. He had made some suggestions to the President about cuts that could be made to bring that back to what he regarded as an acceptable level. It had then become quite clear that perhaps the balanced budget idea was a bit severe, so WADA needed to get to an acceptable level of deficit for the year, and agenda item 2A revealed almost by magic a deficit for the year of one million dollars. That had been achieved by some intense research in the Finance Department in Montreal. He had found that WADA had an unused sum of money in the research account. WADA approved research grants each year. The grants approved in 2011 would effectively be spent in 2012; it took time for the procedures whereby the decision was peer reviewed and a contract had to be agreed, where there was an ethical examination and so on. It had rather been assumed that all of the grants would be fulfilled. What seemed to have been the case was that some of the offers made had not been accepted or, for some of the grants that WADA had made, the process had not been continued and WADA had got the money back and, at the end of the day, it had been discovered that somewhere just over three million dollars was still in the research account. He had spoken to the Chairman of the Health, Medical and Research Committee and to Dr Rabin, who dealt with that particular issue, and it had seemed wrong that the money should be held unused in research when in fact it could be released. In education, there was a similar surplus, but not for anything like the same amount (it was about 175,000 dollars). His proposal to the Executive Committee the previous day, and he thought that the Executive Committee had agreed with it and wanted to make that recommendation to the Foundation Board, was that WADA effectively make use of the 1.35 million dollars of reserve money that it had in the two accounts and bring it into the overall profit and loss account of the agency. To that extent, he was suggesting the 2013 budget, and that there be a 0% increase in contributions; the IOC would of course accept that and apply the money to the problems it currently had in Vidy, and WADA would proceed with a deficit of one million dollars. WADA still had around six million dollars of unallocated cash. It could fund one million

dollars out of that; however, he had been told of a potential additional donation from Russia and WADA had traditionally been very good at pulling these deficits down by efficiency in the administration in Montreal and also for the past couple of years by exchange rate advantage to WADA. On balance, after all the debate, he would be happy to recommend on behalf of the Executive Committee that this be the budget taken for 2013 in the hope that the end result 14 months from then would be that the deficit would be slightly less than the million dollars shown there.

MS SAMARDZIC said that the representatives of the European governments had been hearing about the informal result of the Executive Committee meeting the previous day and had discussed in depth the Director General's report and, when one saw that doping was not only among elite athletes and how much work had been put into WADA's achievements thus far, she and her colleagues recognised that WADA was doing with its existing budget quite a comprehensive job and she wished for the minutes to acknowledge such achievement and commended what WADA had been doing and continued to do. When the European representatives had discussed the matter, they had thought that they would like to be more ambitious in the future by promoting WADA's good work and helping it to continue but, unfortunately, there were austerity measures being taken by the governments, and not only European governments, which was why she had to reconfirm Europe's position regarding 0% growth on the governments' contribution to the 2013 budget. When it came to the issue of a balanced budget, she supported the concept and reasonable use of unallocated reserve funds.

Speaking about the future wish to be ambitious and try to help as much as possible, she again mentioned the conference in Paris, as that was how the governments saw help, not only demanding 0% growth but also trying to help and, through that, boost some savings, and indeed she had been mandated to ask WADA to explore areas in which budgetary savings could be found.

For the final point she wished to make, the representatives had discussed the possibility of planning well to make it easier for the strategic development of WADA's work, and maybe thinking about a biannual budget, so everybody could make strategic priorities. When she spoke about reducing, it was not only about reducing, but also about prioritising. That was how the European governments would like things to be done. She thanked Mr Reddie again for his report.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI added to what her colleague had just said, mentioning the meeting in Strasbourg at which resource mobilisation had been discussed and that she had appreciated the fact that WADA representatives had visited her secretary general in Strasbourg and raised many issues during those discussions, including data protection, but, coming to the precise subject of resource mobilisation, the fact that there had been an indication on her side of the willingness to cooperate with the possibility of WADA deciding to appoint in Europe a person who could dialogue with Europe with a view to moving ahead with proper resource mobilisation. She was still convinced that, if WADA could appoint a person at its office in Europe to become a daily partner to discuss resource mobilisation, as Europe was really facing the difficult situation of not being able to increase the WADA budget, something could be done jointly regarding voluntary contributions and other possibilities with the private sector, and she would be delighted to do that. She renewed the possibility and said that she had very much appreciated the very frank exchange of views that had taken place when WADA representatives had visited Strasbourg.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it had been said at the time that the European Regional Office Director, Mr Donzé was the person that the resource mobilisation officer should contact. The letter confirmed that. Mr Donzé had said that he was still waiting to hear from the resource mobilisation officer. If there was a misunderstanding, it was Mr Donzé who would work with that resource mobilisation officer as soon as contact could be made.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI said that she would establish the contact with Mr Donzé in person.

MR STYLIANOU said that, further to the comments made, with which he fully agreed, he wished to congratulate the Finance and Administration Committee on excellent work and make a couple of technical suggestions regarding improvements on presentation. Having spent half of his life doing budgets and budgetary control, he would strongly suggest that WADA incorporate in the presentation actuals for 2011. This was very much a technical suggestion, and a better presentation would help make the correct decisions. In that respect, he suggested that WADA incorporate the actual figures for 2011 and, if possible, WADA should have an expected actual for 2012 so as to have real and useful comparisons rather than comparing budget with budget.

MR REEDIE thanked the European colleague for her kind words. WADA had been quite clear, particularly with regard to Europe, that there were economic problems, and this was the case in a number of other countries in the world. Rather than have him do his normal song and dance act about getting more contributions, this was perhaps a slightly more elegant way to proceed. He pointed out, however, that he accepted absolutely the comment on priorities. WADA had to begin to do that and in fact the first steps had been made: the President and he had agreed to meet with the Director General in London in February to start working through a priority list as far as the agency was concerned which would come to the Executive Committee in May. If they did that, he had to say it would be very useful to have some kind of preliminary thoughts from the working group that Mr Pound was chairing, to see what the implications of that would have. It would certainly not bring in any revenue, but it might have an implication of costs. It would also be necessary to work out very clearly the additional duties that WADA would have as a result of adopting the new Code in Johannesburg in 2013, coming into effect at the beginning of January 2015. WADA could not sit back in 2014 and do nothing knowing that it had additional responsibilities, so that was the answer.

One of the issues mentioned earlier on was that the staff had remained constant since 2004; he thought that that was a matter for congratulation. Much more had been done with the same staff; however, there was a limit to how long that could be done and, when the economic picture looked a bit better, contributions would have to go up as WADA would simply not be able to do everything that the members told it they wanted it to do. The fact that WADA had managed to run for two years at 0% increase in contributions should be regarded as a happy outcome as far as the public authorities were concerned, but it could not go on indefinitely.

He thanked Ms Battaini-Dragoni for her offer of cooperation. Mr Donzé was waiting for the phone call and was a highly efficient young man and would be able to help in that area.

To his colleague from Cyprus, he said that the 2011 papers were in the 2011 file before the finance office. If Mr Stylianou thought that this would be clearer by building in the actual figures for 2011, he could do that, but then there would be the figures for 2011, an actual 2012 budget, a 2012 changed budget and a 2013 budget. There would be a lot more figures but, if that was what the members wanted, it could certainly be done in presentation terms. He was happy to make the proposal that the budget be accepted and to express his thanks to Ms Pisani and the Finance Department for the excellent work that they did.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee had indicated the proposed budget as contained in document 2A (which had been put on the table that morning but had not been in the papers delivered previously), to which Mr Reddie had spoken, with a deficit of one million dollars and a 0% increase on the current year. Was that the members' wish? Did nobody disagree or wish to move for something different? He believed that the proposal had been carried.

DECISION

Proposed draft budget 2013 approved.

– **6.5 Confirmation of 2013 auditors**

MR REEDIE formally proposed the re-election of PricewaterhouseCoopers as WADA's auditors for the year ending 31 December 2013. Some 18 months previously, WADA had carried out a tendering exercise involving all four of the major accounting companies, and at that stage it had been decided to appoint PricewaterhouseCoopers, and he had also made the suggestion that the partner dealing with the accounts should change; PricewaterhouseCoopers had achieved that and he had no reason to do anything other than propose their re-election.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the resolution on which a decision was needed was that PricewaterhouseCoopers be reappointed as auditors for 2013.

MR POUND said that he agreed entirely with the prioritisation, and he was sure that the committee did that, but he thought that it might be more graphic to say what things WADA would not be able to do if it did not get increased budget resources. The problem with doing it just by way of numbers was that they became anonymous statistics, but saying that WADA would not be able to do such and such a thing because it did not have the resources for it might focus the attention of stakeholders on the consequences.

THE CHAIRMAN thought that it was a good way of introducing clarity into what outcomes there would be when WADA started to prioritise. The Director General had been very kind that morning by suggesting that the paperless project would be passed on to INADO. The simple fact of the matter was that WADA did not have the resources. Some of those programmes simply could not be done. WADA would work with INADO but could not run that because there was another cost and WADA had to continually look at those aspects and, in that regard, there was absolutely no doubt as he had pointed out that, every time WADA made a decision, it added another task and usually a cost to the organisation. The previous day, the Executive Committee had agreed to work towards the reinstatement of the Ankara laboratory; that would cost WADA money, as there would have to be assessments done, visits undertaken, etc. There was no other way around it, so the members should bear that in mind each time they made a decision or passed a resolution: there was usually a cost factor attached to it, but he would get back to the members on the basis of what had to go off the programme, as the staff could not continually be overloaded with more and more for the same cost.

MR ROWE supported the comment made by Mr Pound; he thought that it would help, but suggested that it did not always necessarily mean that a particular item was either gone or in. There might be options within a particular area of activity that required different levels of funding. What would be helpful to the Executive Committee and the Foundation Board was that, where appropriate, the impact of the various options be advised so that decisions could be made about levels of activity as well.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Rowe for the guidance.

DECISION

Proposal to confirm 2013 auditors
approved.

7. World Anti-Doping Code

– **7.1 Code Compliance**

MR ANDERSEN said that the members had the paper before them. He had been asked by the members to report to them on Code compliance updates, and he was now proposing to the Foundation Board that eight new countries be deemed Code-compliant in accordance with the plan for Code compliance. In terms of IFs, WADA was still

missing two IFs, which were SportAccord members, the FIAS (Sambo), and IDBF (Dragonboat), and WADA was working with SportAccord to get the federations up and running, and the SportAccord board had decided that, if they were not up and running by March the following year, they would be suspended as SportAccord members. These were the recommendations. As had been mentioned by the Director General, he would submit a plan to the members at the May meeting in terms of different criteria for a new Code compliance plan. He was asking the members to approve the proposal that the eight countries be deemed Code-compliant.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the resolution required was that the WADA Foundation Board approve the signatories outlined in section 2.1 in the paper as being deemed compliant with the World Anti-Doping Code. Were they happy to approve that?

DECISION

Code compliance update and compliance proposal approved.

– **7.2 Code and International Standards review**

MR ANDERSEN said that the second Code review process had ended on 10 October, and there had been meetings for each of the international standards and the Code between 10 and 19 October in Lausanne with a number of people and groups. There had been one person in each of the standard groups from the Code group to see the correlation between the Code and the four standards. The number of submissions could be seen on the screen, and he mentioned that some of these submissions had been on behalf of quite a number of countries or IFs, so the numbers were in fact higher than what the members could see on the screen in terms of numbers of signatories that had made submissions to WADA.

The members would see the results of what WADA had been dealing with since 1 October in draft 2 of the World Anti-Doping Code and draft 1 of the four applicable international standards. He also mentioned that, in addition to all the written submissions, there had been a number of meetings with stakeholders from all parts of the world in different fora. There had been face-to-face meetings with a number of stakeholders, but WADA had also made presentations at meetings that it had attended and was using any opportunity available to promote the review process so that as many as possible could provide feedback on the feeling out there and the opinions.

He handed the floor to Mr Young, who would go through some of the significant changes that had been made from version 1 to version 2 and highlight the discussion of the previous day.

MR YOUNG informed the members that, in the submissions, there had been some 525 pages, and everybody on the Code Drafting Team had read every single page, and the reason that the Code was as good as it was was because of the feedback from so many people, and the reason the Code would be better when adopted in 2015 would be because of the feedback that all of the Foundation Board members and other stakeholders had provided. The members had draft version 2.0 in their materials and a memo that highlighted 14 different points on which there had been the most discussion in the stakeholders' submissions. He would go through half a dozen points on which a lot of feedback had been received or important changes between drafts 1 and 2; but, at the end of the slide presentation, the members would have an opportunity to make comments or ask questions about any part of the Code. They had had a chance to read it and, if they had issues on any part of it, they should feel free to raise them.

In draft 1, the team had eliminated the B sample. It had sounded like a good idea, but it turned out that it had not been. The feedback received had been strong and almost universal from all segments of stakeholders, who said that they understood the principle but that it was not a good idea, so the B sample had been reinstated in the

same way as it had been in the 2009 Code. The team had added a new anti-doping rule violation, 2.10, called "prohibited association", which dealt with the issue of, for example, Marion Jones and Tim Montgomery training with Ben Jonson's suspended coach, or Victor Conte showing up at the Olympic Games representing athletes. It was not anything that anybody would want. Everybody had appeared to agree with that in principle, but the language in relation to that section had not been very clearly drafted, and he took credit for that, so a better job had been done in version 2, and the most important piece of that better job was that an athlete could not be charged with a violation of prohibited association until the athlete had received notice in writing that this was a person with whom the athlete should not be associating.

With regard to List criteria, as the members knew, in the 2009 Code and from the beginning of the Code, there had been three equal criteria that the List Committee looked at to decide whether or not to put something on the Prohibited List. Those three criteria were the potential to enhance sport performance, the potential detriment to health and spirit of sport. It took two out of three, and the List Committee could put a substance or method on the List. In draft 1, there had been a change to that approach, and that change continued into draft 2. The same three criteria were present, but the potential to enhance performance had been made mandatory so, to go on the List, something had to have the potential to enhance performance plus one of the other two. This was a politically sensitive topic. The drafting team was just that, a drafting team, and it reflected the views of the people around the table and the views set out in the comments received. The comments on that between draft 1 and 2 had been in favour of making performance enhancement a mandatory criterion, but it was still a very hot topic of debate. He framed what he saw as the sides of that debate and would then back off and let the members decide. The debate took place on two different levels, one of principle and one of practicality. On a level of principle, the side that favoured performance enhancement as a mandatory criterion said that this was about sport and cheating in sport, and to cheat in sport one had to try to enhance performance, and so performance enhancement ought to be a mandatory criterion. On the other side, the argument was that another part of sport was public health and, whether or not something was intended to enhance performance, WADA cared about health and so health and spirit of sport together ought to be sufficient to put something on the List. The team had heard from a number of governments that that was their primary interest in being involved in the whole anti-doping movement. That framed the debate on a principle level. On the practical level, he put the elephant on the table: the issue had to do with marijuana in many respects. He heard from ADOs, and the NADOs in particular, that the purpose was to catch the real cheats, and they were spending a disproportionate amount of resources dealing with marijuana cases, and whether WADA could make marijuana go away so that they could use the resources more effectively to catch cheats. The other side of that, related to the public health perspective, was the picture of a father and son sitting at the breakfast table on a Saturday morning looking at the papers and the son saying to his father that WADA had taken marijuana off the Prohibited List, which demonstrated that there was nothing wrong with it and, from a public health perspective, most of the stakeholders thought that that would be a very bad thing. He could not tell the members whether or not performance enhancement would become a mandatory criterion or whether or not marijuana in particular would be on the List or not. There were certainly some studies that said that it was performance enhancing, at least in some disciplines. That was a framing of the debate, and it could carry on there. What the Executive Committee had recommended the previous day was that the team leave draft 2 as it was with the full recognition that, in the next comment period, the debate would continue and more would be heard.

On sanctions, a very clear message had been received from all the stakeholders, but the athletes in particular, that WADA ought to be much harder on the real cheats and more flexible on the people who made mistakes, and by much harder on the real cheats, if the athletes could have their way, he thought that there would be a four-year ban for

EPO, steroids and the significant substances. As the concept had been run up the legal flagpole, an absolute four-year ban would not work, but what would work was a four-year ban that tied to the intentionality of the conduct. What the members might be able to see on the screen was a chart that was in appendix 3 of the Code, and it was very useful, as it summarised the sanctions sections of the Code in two pages. He gave an example of how the new draft Code would work in a steroid case. After a positive test for steroids, the athlete would get four years unless he or she could establish that the violation had been neither intentional nor reckless. That went to the issue of being a real cheat. In a stimulant case, the athlete would get four years if the ADO could establish that the violation had been intentional or reckless. The real cheats would get four years. The rest of the information on the chart went through how the whole sanctions system worked, with early admissions and no significant fault, substantial assistance and the like.

Regarding team sports, the 2009 Code stated that any individual with an anti-doping rule violation was punished as an individual, just like in any other sport. As to the consequences to the team, the 2009 Code said that, if more than two members of the team committed an anti-doping rule violation during an event, the ruling body of the event would impose an appropriate sanction under its rules. There was no harmony there and in fact there had been complaints about what had happened, and about two teams in different events and whether they should miss the next event, etc. In the interests of harmony, draft 1 attempted to impose a one-size-fits-all consequence to teams for violations during an event. The feedback received from the team sports had been very helpful, very rational and very persuasive. It was not the argument that team sports were different from individual sports, which had been heard before and which the individual sport members of the group had found not very persuasive, but rather an argument that teams in different sports were very different from one another in terms of size and whether the same people were likely to be around for the next time the event took place and the duration of particular events. Looking at it all and trying to figure out some way of having one-size-fits-all, the team had decided that that would be worse than the situation under the 2009 Code, so had gone back to where it had been in 2009; so, in effect, in terms of consequences to teams, there was no change from the 2009 Code.

The team had received comments, particularly from the European governments with regard to article 22. Looking back in the 20s section of the Code, the members would see sections that talked about the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders, NADOs, the IOC, NOCs, and there was a section on roles and responsibilities of athletes and athlete support personnel. Article 22 talked about roles and responsibilities of governments. It was different because governments were not signatories to the Code and the introduction to the 2009 Code clearly stated that the substantive provisions of the article were preceded with the following words: "The following article sets forth the expectations of the signatories". This was not a command to governments; the Code had no power to command governments. It was not an agreement by the governments; the governments had agreed to the UNESCO convention, not the Code, but this clearly told governments what everybody else around the table expected of governments. There was some continuing concern that had been expressed by the governments about that and so a footnote had been added to make it even clearer that the governments were bound by the UNESCO convention, but the purpose of the article was simply to clearly set forth the expectations of the signatories.

He talked briefly about a couple of matters that were not on slides, and one of them had come up the previous day. It had to do with full menu testing. The members would see that in article 6, and he explained the issue and the solution. The issue was that, if one looked at what was happening out there, not all ADOs were testing all samples for everything that they could be tested for. That was fine if they were testing every sample for everything they should be testing for. Not every sport or discipline should be testing

for EPO; some sports or disciplines that clearly should be testing for EPO were not doing it. Some sports and disciplines should be collecting blood, and some were doing it while some were not, so the way in which the Code had been changed (and an issue had come up the previous day to do with blood collection, which would be a further change) worked basically as follows: WADA had limited resources to conduct the whole testing process. What was most important was that WADA use those resources intelligently so, if it was going to go and collect samples, it ought to do so in the way that had the best deterrent and opportunity to catch strength; and so, to ensure that that took place, the team said that ADOs might come to WADA to collaborate on what were appropriate test distribution plans in terms of collection of urine or blood and appropriate menus for sample analysis at the laboratory, and WADA and the ADOs would agree on a sensible approach, and that way, using the best information that the ADO had and WADA had, testing would be as intelligent as the current state of knowledge allowed. If the ADO did not want to do that, it did not have to; but, in that case, when it went out to collect a sample, it would collect urine and blood and would analyse it for every prohibited substance using every available method. It was a fall-back, and it was not the best fall-back but he would certainly hope that people would work together in the name of intelligent testing.

A number of minor suggestions had been made the previous day, and they included a couple of typographical and syntax errors that the team would correct. One of the things that the team would do based on comments received from stakeholders but that the team had not finished at the time the draft had gone out was create an international standard for result management whereby the team would put the result management process, be it for TUEs or as part of the IST or the Code in article 7 all in one place, to shorten the Code and make it more user-friendly. Lastly, he had talked about half a dozen things but, when he opened the floor, any questions that the members had on any aspect of the Code would be fair game.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, as Mr Young had said, the members had an opportunity to comment on any of the matters that he had raised or anything in the papers for the next draft that the members believed was worthy of comment.

MS KRISTENSEN said that she had been mandated by her European colleagues to thank WADA and especially the Code Drafting Team for their great efforts to harmonise the proposals from many different stakeholders and to draft a Code with an even stronger future anti-doping regime; it was appreciated, and her colleagues knew that it was not easy but it was also really important. Europe was following and actively taking part in the process of reviewing the Code and the international standards, and this was done individually in countries and among the European member states and stakeholders to ensure that all points were brought on board. Currently, Europe was still considering what it thought the Code should look like and how Europe would like to see it and was not sure on some matters what it would recommend; it was no secret that the List criteria issue was one of the things Europe was still discussing, and there were other points on which Europe had positions and had put points forward, and it would like to see those points reflected in the next part of the process. She would not go into detail, as the European representative at the Executive Committee meeting the previous day had mentioned many of the important points. She underlined that Europe highly appreciated that the WADA Code Drafting Team intended to meet with European representatives in February the following year, as that was really important for the upcoming process. She thanked WADA for that. Her final remark was to stress that she was happy that the team had been ambitious in proposals for amendments, and that was very good; at the same time, being ambitious also called for impact assessments of the proposals. It was extremely important that, when the stakeholders ended up deciding on how the Code should be in Johannesburg the following year, they know exactly the impact of the new Code for WADA and member states, and so the European view on this was that it would really encourage WADA to make impact assessments on the proposals to ensure a

transparent process and make sure that everybody knew what they would be saying yes to the following year.

MR BESSEBERG observed that he had been rather surprised that more or less everybody had wanted to have the B sample, because the world had developed a lot over the past ten to twelve years. It would be interesting to hear from Mr Andersen on this. There were approximately 1,000 adverse analytical findings during testing during the year, and how many times was the A sample not confirmed by the B sample? Did it happen frequently or was it very seldom? His impression was that it was very seldom, but perhaps he was wrong. People out there did not know about the test methods and the significant developments of laboratories over the past years.

MR POUND thanked Mr Young for his usual clear expression of what was going on. He thought that it was a good idea to maintain the relative equality of the three features under point 3. He thought that the comment about the fact that the feedback from attorneys who prosecuted cases did not indicate a concern that panels would look behind the Prohibited List was naïve in the extreme. The panels already did that with science and, if faced with a four-year sanction, the panels would be looking for a way in general not to give a four-year sanction, so he thought that it should be kept there as a matter of practicality, with the possible exception of marijuana. One did not really bother about something if it did not enhance performance. There was an unstated check in there that was worthwhile.

In point 4, he had some recollection that WADA had started to entertain the thought of retroactive TUEs and, if that was in there, he thought it was a very bad policy to adopt.

In point 5, the default position of full menu unless there was an agreement with WADA was good; that was a very sensible approach to it. He had two questions, one of which was whether a failure to do that resulted in a violation of the ISL, so that the laboratory could be sanctioned; and, concomitant with that, was there an ability on the part of WADA to ask to see any contracts that might limit the range of testing?

On the Osaka rule, point 7, he thought that there was a lesson for people who favoured that approach, which was that they should have done that in 2007, because he thought it would have floated through very nicely, and now there was some resistance.

In point 8, he thought that there had been a double standard between individual athletes and team sports almost from the beginning, and he understood the particularity of various team sports, but he thought that it was important to be able to have no limit on the number of players on a team who could be tested. Some sports said that two players maximum had to be picked by random, and only if one won that lottery and got two positive tests could one think of a team sanction. He thought that there should be no limit on that, and that WADA should say that it was possible to target athletes and team sports in the same way as was done with individual athletes.

In point 11, it would be helpful if WADA were to be given the power or authority to request retesting of any sample at any time, not just those that it had undertaken, so that WADA could ask for permission. WADA would do the testing itself but, if it wanted to test samples from the Olympic Games, for example, all of the stakeholders should agree that WADA had that particular authority because currently, as had been seen from what had happened in Athens, 100 tests only at the last minute, arguably only because the German media had brought it to everybody's attention that there had been no testing, was not satisfactory.

DR PASCUAL disagreed somewhat with point 5 on the analysis of samples. He thought that reaching one-to-one agreements with WADA on the menu to be tested had to be reduced as much as possible, as that was against harmonisation. He was more in favour of studying, for those circumstances in which not the full menu should be applied, the causes for that and trying to cover that on the List so that, for a particular sport, if

something should not be tested out-of-competition or in-competition, it could be covered by the rules. Although he understood that there might be room for these agreements, the List should be reviewed from that perspective to cover things from a legal point of view.

MR JURITH reiterated a couple of points he had made the previous day about the Prohibited List. He could certainly understand the desire of some of the stakeholders to avoid testing a lot of athletes for marijuana when in most cases it was not a performance enhancing drug, but the governments had an obligation, not just under the UNESCO convention but also under other international treaties to which the governments were all signatories, to make sure that controlled substances were not used outside proper medical practice. Everybody had agreed to do that. He did not think that he needed to remind anybody around the table about the dangers of marijuana use and abuse; in fact, recent research, particularly with the higher potency THC marijuana, showed that it was a dangerous drug when used in a recreational context and he thought that there was some evidence, although he was no expert on this, that it might even be performance-enhancing in some sports, but he would leave it up to the experts to make that decision. The point made by Mr Young was very important and it went beyond what the public image of WADA taking it off the List might be; he was more concerned about, if WADA did take it off the List or considered that it was not performance-enhancing, what would happen when an athlete showed up at a competition under the influence of marijuana. That would be a real embarrassment to WADA if it allowed people to engage in doping when it was an anti-doping organisation. That said, he thought that WADA could probably work out some type of result (he did not want to say compromise), and perhaps it could examine the level of use in competition, but he did think it was important from an in-competition point of view that WADA maintain a strong position that marijuana should not be tolerated in competition, particularly when athletes might be impaired.

PROFESSOR LJUNGOVIST said that Mr Young had also mentioned the pros and cons with respect to changing the principles as to why substances should be put on the List or not; there was one more aspect of this that he had raised the previous day and on which he would briefly touch, although perhaps it should be discussed later when a final decision was taken. First of all, the proposal to make performance enhancement compulsory was very attractive of course, as everybody had the idea that doping was the same as taking substances and making use of methods that might enhance performance. To make it compulsory involved some difficulties, and Mr Young had raised some of them. He wished to raise another. He had been Chairman of the List Committee for quite a while, many years, actually, and the present system had worked well, so he was reluctant to change something that was working well, particularly if it was because of the wish to solve a particular problem, in that case, marijuana, and it was wrong to completely change the principles on which the List was based simply to solve that problem. Secondly, if performance enhancement were made mandatory, what would that mean? In his view, it would mean that one would have to prove that a substance was performance-enhancing and, if one had to do that, one would run into big problems. He did not want to give a lecture but, in order to establish the effects or side effects of a drug or a method, one had to perform scientific double-blind crossover studies, and they could not be done on the right population, and not on elite athletes, as it was ethically impossible, so one would have to go by some gut feeling or biological understanding that this could be performance-enhancing. Then there was a new category, which was very much related to the successful meeting held in Paris with the pharmaceutical industry a week previously, namely to reach an agreement with the pharmaceutical industry and find out what was in the pipeline in the industry in terms of potential doping agents. They were there without an investigation as to whether or not they might be performance-enhancing, but were WADA supposed to prove that they could be performance-enhancing, WADA would have to wait for their appearance on the market and for them to be established on the market, and it would still be very difficult to conduct the proper studies, so he simply wished to point out that there was a scientific

problem besides the political problem. Again, why change something that had been and was working well? The List Committee currently gave heavy weight to what it considered the potential of being performance-enhancing when a drug was being evaluated to be put on the List or not, and he thought that this was what WADA should continue to do. He announced this personally, and said that his view was shared by the IOC in general, although not the Olympic Movement, as there were some differences in opinion among the IFs, but the IOC had analysed it and decided to recommend that WADA stick with the criteria as they were, that two out of three criteria would be sufficient to consider a substance or method to be placed on the List and not to make performance enhancement a compulsory criterion.

MS SAMARDZIC said that she had listened very carefully to the Director General previously. He had said that doping was not only among elite athletes. When the Foundation Board spoke about analysis of samples and selective menus, she thought that the European governments would be interested to hear about how these menus would be addressed for low-level national athletes. How was that issue addressed?

PROFESSOR LJUNGOVIST added that there were currently substances, or at least one substance, on the List that was not performance-enhancing but was banned for the sake of security, and that was alcohol in automobile racing, etc., so how would that be addressed? Would it be outside the Prohibited List and a new list drawn up for security purposes? Had that been looked into?

MR PENGILLY said that there were athletes who still believed that performance enhancement should be the mandatory criterion and part of that was due to the cannabis issue, so it obviously still needed a lot of thought to get through the issue and do it in the best way possible. There was a mixed view, but quite a few athletes felt it should be a priority in the principle that, if legalities took over and limited the possibility of catching cheats, that would obviously not be a desirable outcome.

PROFESSOR GERRARD said that he was obligated to place on record the opinion of the New Zealand Government. Informed by its athletes' commission that performance enhancement should be considered an absolute criterion, his government believed that the primary motivation for any substance to be misused in sport was its potential for enhancing an athlete's capability, and it was his government's opinion that this stance underscored an obligation to protect the health of athletes. Furthermore, with respect to the marijuana issue, it would be his government's contention that marijuana should still be monitored, but the question arose as to why WADA considered it appropriate to monitor its use only in competition when, in the spirit of considering the health of athletes, WADA should consider it under all circumstances and disavow its use out of competition as well, and in that regard he agreed with the issue raised by Professor Ljungqvist regarding alcohol and wondered also why WADA did not give the same health emphasis to a substance such as nicotine, which was clearly a drug used recreationally and legally that created not only a health hazard but also an image contrary to the spirit of sport.

MR YOUNG responded to Mr Besseberg on the elimination of the B sample and then the B sample going back in. The team had received differing feedback from a wide spectrum of people: feedback from athletes and others who had spoken about the B sample being an important athlete right, to go and see that the B sample was intact and be able to watch the analysis of the B sample; feedback from lawyers who had said that they liked having the B sample in cases because, if there was a big argument over some technicality by the laboratory in the A sample, they could point to the B sample and say that it had been done correctly in the B sample and that the same result had been obtained when analysing the B sample; in short, there had been feedback from a whole lot of different perspectives saying that it seemed to work pretty well and not to change it. In terms of Mr Besseberg's specific question about how many times the B sample result did not confirm the A, he gave the floor to Mr Andersen.

MR ANDERSEN said that there had been very few B sample analyses over the past ten years that had not confirmed the A sample, and for those that had not confirmed the A sample, there had been even fewer in which it had been impossible to explain why they had not confirmed the A sample.

MR YOUNG said that the team was an information gathering, synthesising and listening group and this of all the issues put out there was the one that had been expressed the loudest and clearest from the stakeholders.

As to a number of the points made by Mr Pound and the equality of the three criteria or performance enhancement as a mandatory criterion, a lot of sound argument had been heard on both sides of that around the table. He really had nothing to add to that. The team would listen and continue to listen to Mr Pound and to other stakeholders, and that would ultimately be resolved at the Foundation Board level. The Foundation Board would receive a recommendation from the Executive Committee and then it would be up to the Foundation Board to decide. He did not have any more technical points to add to that.

As to the question Mr Pound had asked about retroactive TUEs, it was not in the Code, but it was in the changed International Standard for TUEs and there had been a significant liberalisation in the direction of retroactive TUEs. It basically left it to the ADO to determine which classes of athletes were entitled to get retroactive TUEs. The hypothetical example was a major marathon, for which the IAAF might say that elite athletes needed to get TUEs in advance, but the thousands of amateur runners could get retroactive TUEs but, as written, it was much broader than that.

As to the question of what happened when an ADO did not reach agreement with WADA on intelligent testing and went ahead and had a limited menu anyhow, was that a violation of the ISL for the laboratory? The answer was no because the laboratory would not necessarily know in each case what WADA had agreed to; it would be a violation of the Code by the ADO that had not done full-menu testing without WADA's permission, so there would then be a monitoring and compliance issue.

As to athletes in team sports, and the ability to target athletes in team sports and how many tests were done on members of a team, the issue was not in the Code or the international standard; for example, in out-of-competition testing, ADOs tested team athletes the same way and number of times that they did individual athletes and, if they thought that a whole team was dirty, they would target the whole team. The problem pointed out by Mr Pound was more likely to arise in in-competition testing, where the protocol for a particular IF was that so many people from the team were tested and, if there were suspicions, there would be no variation from that protocol.

Regarding the full-menu testing issue commented on by Dr Pascual, the feedback received on that was that one-size-fits-all test distribution planning as to who got tested and the urine and blood testing and the substances that would be looked for in that urine and blood might be harmonised, but it was not an intelligent use of resources and so, when dealing particularly with the expensive tests, such as EPO and IRMS and the collection of blood for Hgh, what was currently happening was that a lot of people who should be doing it were not doing it and, if WADA were to make everybody do it, it would be a use of resources that would in reality mean a lot fewer tests, so the focus was instead to try to be as intelligent as possible with each dollar spent on testing and analysis.

Mr Jurith's comments had been on the List criteria and the points had been well made, but he would not address those. The same applied to Professor Ljungqvist's comments.

To Ms Markovic, he explained what happened with lower-level athletes. The definition of athlete allowed countries to treat lower-level athletes differently. If talking about an international-level athlete or a national-level competitor, one would go to WADA and

work something out. If one was talking about lower-level athletes, it was up to the individual to determine what menu to apply.

Mr Pengilly and Professor Gerrard had made good points, but they were not ones to which he should respond.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the discussion had been useful and he knew that the drafting team would appreciate the views that had been expressed. As to the international standards, which were also on the agenda, he indicated that it was hoped that the report would be available in the public arena for consumption as a draft in early December, and the process would then allow for further comment to come back. The members were seeing some movement through these drafts, and sometimes WADA was reverting to where it had been previously, but that came from the submissions coming in, and again the members were invited to make those submissions and to encourage as many people as possible connected with anti-doping in their area or country to express their views. WADA was seeking a better Code, one that was better in the context of allowing it to be more effective when it was ultimately accepted by the Foundation Board in a year's time. The members should note this in the context of it being a draft; they would be invited to make points again as they had been that day. Nothing was in concrete and would not be until the Foundation Board met again at a later point in May the following year, when the members would have another opportunity to consider it further.

MR ROWE said that he had waited until the end, as he had wanted to bring up a point that had not been among the points raised by Mr Young. It went to the level of exposure within the Code of investigations and intelligence gathering. The Australian Government remained convinced that greater prominence should be given to investigations and intelligence gathering in the Code. If recent events had taught anything, and he was referring to the USADA investigation of Armstrong, it was that the detection of doping cheats was changing from being based on the identification of prohibited substances through testing to detecting doping through non-analytical means, supported by strategic and/or intelligent testing. The Code explicitly set out principles and procedures for the development and conduct of testing plans, the analysis of samples and the result management of samples when there was a positive test. The members had the opportunity to make the Code a document for the future and should make the most of that opportunity. He thought that the 2015 Code needed to acknowledge the role of investigations and intelligence gathering in a modern-day detection regime and inject some language into the Code that recognised this role; otherwise, the Code would continue to look and feel like a document that had been drafted when things had been all about testing. While he accepted the need for countries to conduct investigations in accordance with their own national laws, one way to do this might be to specify some minimum principles or requirements around the conduct of investigations and intelligence gathering, and the protocols to which the Director General had referred earlier might well be a place to start.

MR JURITH associated himself with Mr Rowe's comments; he thought that the discussion had taken place the previous day in the Executive Committee about the potential or future role of WADA in conducting investigations. As his good friend had indicated, the USADA report underscored the importance of that method of uncovering cheating, particularly of the large-scale conspiracy type, but he did think that it was important that the Code outline in some way how this new responsibility would unfold. In relation to NADO capacity and assistance to NADOs, a little more information was needed as to how this would all work and, as indicated the previous day, the future resource commitment that WADA would be taking on with this new obligation. He thanked Mr Rowe for his comments and totally agreed with them.

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the four international standards. The members had a paper on them. The members would have read the paper and there was

no need to lead them through it, although he would welcome any comments that the members might have on it. This was the first time that a draft was going out on those standards so, it being a first draft, it would no doubt be a bit more relevant at a later date to see what the reaction of the constituency was, but it was based again on the information coming from submissions to date, and WADA would see the response to it, but he would not stop the members if there was something that they wished to raise on any of the international standards. Would the members be happy then for that first draft of the international standards to go out? He appreciated that.

DECISION

Code and international standards review noted.

8. Athlete Biological Passport

DR VERNEC said that he was very happy to have the opportunity to give an update on the ABP, as there had been some interesting developments over the past few months that he wished to highlight. There were currently 11 IFs and 21 NADOs using the ABP haematological module, and he knew that there was a difference in the degree of implementation, but things had been gaining traction over the past year, and WADA would even see things such as the JADA haematological mobile unit, which had been brought up earlier by the Director General and which just showed the initiatives of some organisations, and he congratulated the Japanese on their initiative to do ABP analysis on the spot. He had been asked at the previous meeting how many anti-doping rule violations there had been from the ABP, and he had mentioned that there had been nine the previous May. This figure had essentially doubled over the past few months and would continue to progress. He mentioned the NADO that had just come up with a positive anti-doping rule violation based on the ABP. The case involved a triathlete, and it had been announced just two weeks previously that there was now a four-year sanction. This had been an ABP that had led to a high level of suspicion, which had then been supplemented by intelligence and, at the end, there had been a positive sanction, so perhaps this was indeed leading to the new era of anti-doping. There had been absolutely no positive EPO in blood or urine tests. When talking about traditional analytical tests, these had been and would continue to play a huge part, so anti-doping rule violations were secondary only to ABP targeting and remained of utmost importance. A paper had come out that year from the UCI stating that there had been 26 positive EPO tests, of which 19 had been a direct result of ABP targeting, and that had been from 2008 to 2010. Since then, the trend had intensified. There had also been suggestions or indications that there might be some deterrence from the ABP, but he would not discuss that at that meeting, as there was not enough hard data to talk about at that point. A significant milestone had occurred in September 2012 when the ABP had been put into ADAMS. This had been a very significant step because, until then, software had existed, there had been a standalone program, everything had been very manual and there had been slow communication and so on, so it was not simply that the software and algorithm got put into ADAMS, but it was a very complex interplay, a database, with automatic calculations happening in real time, sharing mechanisms between the ADOs with one athlete, one passport and all of the cost savings that came with that, and the key point was this rapid evaluation and targeting. One could now see an atypical result and the ABP manager and ADOs could move rapidly rather than there being delays, which had been seen in the past.

Another key point about the fact that this was now in ADAMS and all of the laboratory data went into ADAMS was that WADA had an ability to see what was going on and it had been fairly blind to all of this information until recently; so, any time there was an atypical profile or a single atypical result, there were automatic notifications to the ABP managers, the ADOs and to WADA, so WADA was now in the process of analysing a fair

bit of data that had just become available and would be contacting different ADOs in the coming months to discuss the status of certain cases and plans for result management.

WADA planned to continue to develop the ABP in ADAMS; there were many layers that WADA was looking at, such as adding competition schedules, performance profiles and automating the affair so that it became more and more useful as a tool for evaluation and targeting. He said the word "ADAMS" a lot and he understood that not everybody used ADAMS. For those who did not use ADAMS, WADA would allow all users to continue to have the rights to the old algorithm and software program as it existed outside but, just like with any developer, WADA would place all focus and enhancements only in ADAMS. He thought that there would be a desire for ADOs to join at least for the passport to make sure that they were using ADAMS to have all of those benefits.

The adapter module evaluated the likelihood of normal physiological conditions, and one could not forget that experts, be they haematological, endocrine or laboratory experts, played an absolutely integral role in the entire process.

The last slide he had and final comment was on the steroid module. WADA had been talking or certainly hinting and suggesting that the steroid module was coming; for the first time, he could say confidently that the steroid module would be rolled out the following year. WADA had been waiting on the technical document on steroids, and that was finally in the final stages of being worked on and there were numerous documents that WADA was in the process of updating: guidelines, result management, a passport guide for the ADOs, sharing agreements and so on. There was still a lot of work to do, so it would not happen the following day, but WADA had to revise the steroid algorithm to be added into ADAMS, and he took a moment to mention the business of the 4:1 ratio, which was yet another thing that the passport might solve. In the future, looking at a longitudinal profile, one could have an athlete with 0:8, 1:2 and 1:3 and then, if the athlete popped up with a 2:3 T/E ratio, that would clearly raise an alert, and that athlete should then be further tested and IRMS testing carried out; nobody cared about 4:1 or 6:1. It remained to be seen how all of this would unfold, but he believed that there was a certain excitement as to how this would go down.

There were more expert groups and other groups that needed to be formed, so there were APMUs that would have to be developed in WADA laboratories, and steroid module expert groups that would be working with WADA. The steroid module in theory could open up to the entire world immediately, because everybody was doing urine testing, but WADA would probably go in a step-wise fashion in the first year and start bringing in organisations that already had some knowledge of the workings of the passport system and then work with them and build it up while moving into the consolidation phase.

That concluded his presentation; he was very thrilled to see the buy-in that WADA was now getting from different ADOs. He thought that, with the changes to ADAMS and the fact that the steroid module would be put in place the following year, this was a very promising tool that would be available for ADOs. He would be very happy to entertain any questions from the floor.

DR SCHAMASCH thanked Dr Vernec, who had provided a very accurate report. When would WADA give the green light regarding the implementation of the steroid module? He understood what underlay it; the increases that could happen during the Sochi Olympic Games that would be taking place very soon and, secondly, regarding the worldwide provider, where was WADA regarding transport of blood samples? Some research had been done, and the matter had been discussed at various prior meetings. Was there any progress on the matter? He saw that his Japanese friends had found a solution. Were there any solutions for privileged partners around the world? Was that something that WADA could consider?

MR SCULLY stated that the continued uptake of the ABP was welcomed by the EU and it would like to see more countries from Europe and the world advancing the use of the ABP; however, the EU wished to express some concern regarding the possible mandatory use of the ADAMS database or the fact that the existing biological profiling software, MATLAB, outside of ADAMS, would not be updated as stated by WADA, recalling also that data transfers from Europe to WADA remained problematic until the all issues were resolved, and it was a real problem for Europe given that a significant percentage of ABP tests took place within Europe.

DR VERNEC responded to Dr Schamasch that he was fairly confident that WADA would have everything rolling out in 2013 so, unless the Olympic Games were moved up, WADA should be ready.

As to transport, another department in WADA had been looking at savings and using one particular company and perhaps getting some savings. As far as he understood, that had not progressed; however, from the passport point of view, WADA was looking at extending the window in which analysis could be done on a particular sample, so the 36 hours from the time a sample was taken to the time it was analysed would hopefully be extended and that would solve some of the problems.

As to the response to the question about data protection, he would love to have answers and solutions for data protection. What happened was that WADA often saw ADOs transferring information through far less secure methods, be they e-mails or other, so all he could say was that WADA was doing its best to allow the program to be continued to be used outside of ADAMS and that was the best it could do.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the question of examining the opportunity to have a parcel courier company giving an exclusive contract for the transport of samples had been examined by the management and he thought that the Director General had reported back at the previous meeting in May that, unfortunately, because of the small number involved, the size of the samples, the economies of scale had not stacked up to a point whereby a less expensive alternative could be found with any particular company on the basis that it had exclusive rights to do the transport. The work had been done but the solution had not presented itself. WADA would continue to look at ways of saving money as and when suggestions came, but that one unfortunately had not worked.

DECISION

Athlete Biological Passport update noted.

9. Anti-Doping Administration Management System (ADAMS)

THE CHAIRMAN said that he did not propose to ask anybody to address the report, as it had already been brought up in the context of the Director General's report and Dr Vernece had covered a number of aspects related to ADAMS in his ABP report. He would give the members the opportunity, if there were any other question on ADAMS, to put that question; otherwise, he would simply ask the members to note the paper that they had in their folders.

MS BOKEL said that she had been wondering whether, since the previous Foundation Board meeting, there was a timeline for the development of a mobile phone app for ADAMS.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded that he had mentioned that matter in his report: the phone app contract had been signed and would be put in place the following year.

MS BOKEL asked the Director General to be a bit more specific. Would this be at the beginning or end of the following year?

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he would prefer to provide an update early the following year rather than specifying dates to avoid any problems; nevertheless, he had been told that it would be early the following year, and he had signed the contract just the other day.

DECISION

ADAMS update noted.

10. Departmental/area reports

– 10.1 Education and programme development

10.1.1 Education Committee chair report

MR JURITH said that it was a pleasure to be back working with the Foundation Board again as the Chairman of the WADA Education Committee.

Education was a crucial element in the fight against doping in sport, as the members all knew. At the May Foundation Board meeting, the members had been provided with a detailed update of the Education Committee meeting that had taken place in April that year in Montreal. He was pleased to say, as a result of that update, that the Education Department continued to fulfil the mandate set forth by the Executive Committee. Many advancements had been seen in the university project with the International University Sports Federation, and the Play True Generation programme continued to be expanded and would be present at the South American Youth Games in Natal, Brazil, later that year.

The new Digital Library had proved to be very helpful to stakeholders and would be expanded to include more information related to WADA activities and resources. He knew that the athlete representatives had expressed the need to have as timely and updated information in the hands of the athletes as possible and this was a further effort by the Education Committee and the Education Department at WADA to accomplish that goal. He was also pleased to note that a new online learning program was being developed for elite athletes. This program was intended to drive basic information as well as tools on moral decision-making. The Education Committee had agreed to adopt recommendations that regional education symposia be held to increase the education capacity in regions of need. This was based on a survey carried out in 2011. Recently, a highly successful Asian education symposium had been held with the support of the Chinese anti-doping agency in Shanghai, and there had been over 50 participants attending from 24 countries in the region. He knew that the President had been there and he understood that it had been a very successful event.

Regarding the social science research grant programme, the committee had held a telephone conference on it about a month previously and he had sat in on the conference as part of the transition at the ONDCP, and he could confirm that that year's programme had received 32 applications from 18 countries (two from Africa, two from Asia/Oceania, 22 from Europe and five from the Americas). Six projects had been approved for funding as mentioned earlier by the Director General. He trusted that these projects would further assist all stakeholders in developing evidence-based education programmes. He reinforced the need for continued efforts on prevention and education. Prevention needed to be primarily focused on youth and the best way of reaching that population was through schools. WADA needed to secure the assistance of all stakeholders including governments to gain access to schools to ensure values-based education in reaching a broad audience. He asked Mr Koehler, the Director of Education at WADA, to

provide the members with a short presentation looking at the future of anti-doping education.

10.1.2 Education report

MR KOEHER said that he would not address anything outlined in his report, but wanted to give the members some food for thought on the way forward. He wanted to make an observation. Looking at the Code as it was, it was heavily populated by testing and investigations and there was not as much information or content containing the need for information and education. Looking at ADOs globally, he would probably say that testing was one of the things being done most; there were some doing investigations, a few doing information programmes and very few doing substantive education programmes, and he raised the question: was this an effective approach? Maybe it had been at one time. He also wanted to step back and look at the current landscape and ask a question: what is doping? Some people would say that it was taking prohibited substances, injecting something and using performance-enhancing drugs, when in fact if one looked at what doping was, on a simple basis, it was cheating. He also wanted to take a look at society and what was happening there. In a lot of fields, there was a lot of cheating, lawyers padding out bills (of course, no lawyers in WADA would do that), doctors taking money from pharmaceutical companies, the finance industry cheating, many people evading taxes. There were also a lot of studies showing how much students were now cheating, and some of the studies showed that the students thought they were smart because they were not getting caught, so it was a game in itself. Looking at any school playground and any child, every child experimented with cheating but, a lot of times, they were called out and told not to cheat, which was why a constant social value compass was always needed for young athletes and young people. Looking at sport and cheating, sport was about playing within the rules, but everybody tried to see whether they could stretch the rules. He gave the example of ice hockey owners in North America, who had a salary cap but were always trying to find ways to manipulate that salary cap to get higher-priced athletes into the team. In fencing, some of the athletes were told to come back with a shoelace untied so that they could take a breather, and that was not permitted in the sport. Looking at badminton, at the Olympic Games in London, there had been people throwing matches to get a better buy in the competition. People were always trying to improve equipment to run faster and go higher, always trying to stretch the limits.

Looking at sport in society in general and what was happening in sport and society, similar things were happening. There was bribery, match fixing, trafficking and corruption. Was this old news, had it always been happening, or was it just more prominent and more noticeable because of access to information and mass communications?

He wished to take another look at society from a financial point of view. Studies would show that, if one were to look at the rich, 1% were rich, looking at the middle class in North America specifically, the middle class was shrinking, and the lower class was growing. Looking at sport, top athletes were making millions, some athletes were making a modest living, but the majority barely got by. This really was a mirror image of society. What had happened in society and was also perhaps happening in sport was something called the "me generation", for which self came first: regardless of how one got there, one looked after oneself. He raised the question of what sport had been in the past. What some athletes had made in their entire career, they were now making in one year and sport had not always been a billion-dollar industry, but it was now.

He referred to a project commissioned on moral disengagement. WADA was seeing that athletes who decided to cheat had moral justification and believed that they could do it; they had euphemistic labelling, and did not refer to anabolic steroids, for example, but called them something else (juice, the gear, tack) to make them sound less harmful. They used advantageous comparisons, saying that they were using only steroids, but

their neighbour was drinking and smoking, which was far worse. There was also a displacement of responsibility: everybody else was doing it, so they should too. There was a diffusion of responsibility: again, if everybody else was doing it, it must be right. Finally, some of the athletes had said that there was a distortion of consequences, and that it was not as bad as people said it was.

Another thing he wanted to raise was the issue of moral reasoning, and he referred to a study from the centre of ethics. A group of grade-six students comprising non-athletes and athletes had been taken, and the study had looked at their moral reasoning. For the grade-six students the moral reasoning had been pretty equal but, six years later, the athletes and the non-athletes had been compared, and he had been very surprised by the fact that the non-athletes had had stronger moral reasoning. The study went on to state that moral reasoning deteriorated the longer athletes stayed in sports, indicating that individual athletes scored much higher moral reasoning than team sport athletes, and saw that, the more money athletes made, the lower the moral reasoning scores.

He wanted to look at sport and government leaders. What were the incentives out there to catch cheats? Were there any? Taking a step back, if he were to tell the members that there was no problem with doping in sport, and that this was a new thing, what would the members do? Would they start a massive testing programme? Probably not. Would they carry out a lot of investigations? His guess was probably not. Would the members raise education awareness and start prevention to avoid it happening? He would say that this was probably most likely. Would the members focus attention on adults? Perhaps not, but they would definitely focus on parents, teachers, young people and children. Was this being done? Was substantive prevention really being done within anti-doping realms? He would say not so much, and his information was based on a survey carried out in 2011, when a lot of information had been given out but prevention had been limited.

Looking at the old versus the new, he referred to the new approach, which he had been pleased to see in the revised Code, which involved the strengthening of prevention and the need to have more people engaged in prevention, but how could WADA do that? This was a military approach, in which there had to be unity of object and unity of effort, and that was something WADA needed to do. Looking at unity of object, perhaps it was time for prevention campaigns that involved a moral set of values developed with athletes, coaches and entourage and made them accept a moral contract on an ongoing and yearly basis. WADA needed to develop a curriculum that was interactive and values-based, constantly evaluate the programmes, have pre-tests regarding moral values, because it all came down to making the right choices, whether to dope or not to dope, obtain feedback on whether it was working, and have post-tests, and one of the things WADA also needed was people to teach others how to make the right decisions. Teachers needed to be informed. If WADA was to have unity of effort, it needed a lot of people engaged and governments had to embrace the message and provide access to schools. One of the difficulties had been gaining access to schools because the curriculum was so overloaded. WADA was committed to developing tools with partners to be able to facilitate that education. NADOs needed to develop community-based local curricula and training. UNESCO needed to be more engaged; it had a group of associated school networks and WADA needed to work with UNESCO to gain easy access to schools. The IOC and IFs had to develop a community approach. WADA needed a "glocal" approach, a global programme with local feel, in order to make sure that it was giving moral reasoning and strengthening the morals of young people and athletes of tomorrow.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it was sometimes good to stop and have a look at what was behind a lot of what WADA did.

MR KONBAZ said that Mr Koehler had raised a very important matter, that testing took up a lot of efforts but education was minimal, and it was true, but he believed that,

if WADA were to ask why that was, WADA ensured the compliance of the NADOs and countries, and linked it to finance and in- and out-of-competition testing, UNESCO and others. Also, training courses could be 80% for DCOs and maybe 10% for education. He believed that it was necessary to think differently to enhance education, as it would be an effective tool in the future to prevent doping among athletes.

MR AZIZ said that he had been very much taken by Mr Koehler's presentation. Sport was, after all, a cross-section of society at large, and sometimes there was talk about intelligent testing and the methods and menus and all that when, in fact, the most intelligent approach would be to go to the heart of the matter and look at the root of the problem.

10.1.3 Programme development report

MR KOEHLER said that the video he was about to show was linked to the RADOs. WADA was investing more resources and putting more effort into elevating the RADOs and the video had been developed for the RADOs.

DECISION

Education and programme
development update noted.

– **10.2 Communications**

10.2.1 Athlete Committee chair report

MS MORIN said that she had had the pleasure of attending the WADA Athlete Committee meeting in St Petersburg on 18 and 19 September. The main objective of the meeting had been to discuss the latest draft of the 2015 Code and collect members' comments for the Athlete Committee's official submission to the Code review which could be found in the Foundation Board papers. She would highlight only a few key topics that had been discussed during the meeting.

The ABP was recognised by athletes as an important tool in the fight against doping in sport and its data needed to be shared universally with ADOs. It was recommended that the result management process be standardised. It was also strongly felt that the athletes needed to be able to see their results in the program. Although material did exist for administrators, it was suggested that a more universal resource be created for athletes to explain the purpose and details of the ABP. The active athlete members had commended the new ADAMS whereabouts module and confirmed that it was a great improvement on the previous version. They described it as a very user-friendly platform, and WADA was reminded that one of the next priorities should be developing iPhone and Android and other apps for the whereabouts module.

On data protection, the Athlete Committee felt that these laws should not prevent ADOs from functioning effectively.

The members also continued to encourage governments to better fund RADOs and NADOs to help increase the quality and breadth of their anti-doping programmes. Too many athletes were still not tested out of competition and better education was also needed.

The Athlete Committee stressed that sport needed to be tough on members of the entourage who assisted in doping and hold them accountable for actions that directly influenced athletes. A cultural shift needed to take place so that more responsibility was placed on these influential groups.

Committee members questioned the cost of the CAS and the potential difficulty for athletes to get a fair hearing when they had limited means. Additional information had been requested to address these concerns for the next meeting.

It was strongly suggested that the 2015 Code be communicated in concepts, and subjects broken down into smaller pieces for each target group to help better understand the major changes. Members had discussed ways to engage with other athlete groups in order to explain the Code review and the committee's views.

The Athlete Committee would meet twice the following year on dates to coincide with the Code review process to allow the members to contribute again. The meetings would be held in January and June. The Athlete Committee extended its sincere appreciation to the Athlete Committee Chairman, Mr Fetisov, for hosting the meeting in St Petersburg.

MR MCQUAID wished to strike a note of caution in relation to allowing the athletes to see their passport details because one of the strengths of the passport was that the athletes did not know what the authorities knew, and if they were to be allowed to access their passport details, some of them could use that information to augment their doping programme.

DECISION

Athlete Committee Chair report noted.

10.2.2 Communications report

THE CHAIRMAN said that the members had a written report that provided them with a great deal of information on what had been happening in the area of communications.

MS MASSE said that she would be brief. She had a video to present to the members on the Outreach programme at the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in London. On that occasion, individuals from 12 ADOs had made up the teams and had greeted the thousands of athletes who had gone to the centre, which had been very well located in the dining hall. These individuals had gone back home having gained the experience to be able to implement an Outreach model in their national activities.

THE CHAIRMAN observed from the video that Dr Schamasch was shameless and that Her Majesty had obviously been encouraged by her leap out of the helicopter to visit the Outreach booth.

DECISION

Communications update noted.

– 10.3 Regional offices

10.3.1 Tokyo report

MR HAYASHI said that the members might have read his regional report providing information on the office's ongoing activities for the year. He wished to highlight some specific activities through which the regional office had assisted various stakeholders in cooperation in the region. The list on the slide included highlights since the May meeting of the Foundation Board. RADOs, NADOs and the OCA had taken the initiative to promote support to regional development. The OCA had continued with the international DCO training exchange programmes on the occasion of the Asian Beach Games in China, giving an opportunity to DCOs trained through RADO programmes in the region to cooperate with CHINADA.

The Japanese ADO had sent an education team to assist the newly established Sri Lankan anti-doping agency with the Outreach programme at the IAAF Junior World Championships. Selected RADO DCOs representing the region had had a chance to

attend the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games as part of the doping control team. As reported by the Chairman of the Education Committee, CHINADA had hosted a WADA education symposium in Shanghai the previous month with over 50 experts from the region to develop the education programme, expecting to help applications to the UNESCO voluntary fund.

Following up the Central Asian RADO activities, the Korean anti-doping agency had provided a special training course for Central Asian RADOs in Seoul to promote capacity building. He highlighted some of the activities in the region. Lastly, he wished to take the opportunity to show the members a unique initiative by the South East Asian RADO, a song entitled "Levelling up the playing field", composed by the chairman of the RADO and presented by his hospital nursing team for the Outreach programme.

MR AZIZ wished to remark on progress made in Malaysia recently. There had been something of a wild ride over the past few years, with the laboratory losing its accreditation, and there had been some hard lessons to learn from such an episode and, now that the dust appeared to be settling on that, he wished to continue talking about it among Asian office colleagues and colleagues at the headquarters, in terms of looking at the case per se to avoid some of the pitfalls that ought to have been recognised. Losing accreditation meant that Malaysia had been unable to carry out its national programmes fully, able to afford testing for elite athletes only. The implication of that was simply that some of the athletes below the international rankings had perhaps escaped the net and, at one point, there had been a point raised by some people in Malaysia that perhaps, for the national anti-doping programmes, there was no need for WADA accreditation. As worrying as that notion might be, it was necessary to at least recognise that the notion had been reached simply because it was of paramount importance to continue the fight against doping in sport in Malaysia. Of course, it was necessary to harmonise but, with such a difficult situation, if it continued, it might be necessary to take such recourse. Fortunately, there had been a high level of cooperation and motivation and friendship shown by colleagues at the Tokyo office and at the WADA headquarters. There were still some issues to be sorted out because the laboratory belonged to a ministry that was not the youth and sport ministry. He hoped that the matter would be sorted out by the end of the year. On a positive note, the government had approved an additional grant for anti-doping and there would be a reorganisation of the NADO and, perhaps, by the middle of the following year, there would be an enhanced anti-doping organisation.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Aziz for that update. He hoped that Malaysia would apply for reaccreditation and WADA would do what it could to assist as and when that process commenced. It was one that took some time to play out. Nevertheless, the decision to remove the accreditation had not been made lightly. If there were an opportunity for the laboratory to be reaccredited, WADA would welcome that.

10.3.2 Montevideo report

MS PESCE said that she wished to share some pictures of an activity that had taken place in the region, the South American Anti-Doping Legal Seminar, co-organised by the regional office and the sport ministry of Colombia, Coldeportes. With the participation of lawyers from the NADOs of ten South American countries, it had been held in Bogotá, Colombia on 3 and 4 October. She had received an article from one of the countries describing views about doping, written in 1952, stating that, "Doping is inadmissible from an ethical and a health point of view. Sport and physical education should at all times seek to preserve and improve health and values; any action that jeopardises this goes against it, its fundamental principles and the reasons for its existence". The right idea had been there for many years. Results did come; it was a matter of balancing the strategies in terms of how and when, taking into consideration the diverse cultures with which the office dealt. A lot had been done, so there was undoubtedly a lot to come. The seminar had been a good example of that and she expected to organise a similar one in Paraguay in 2013.

MR IRURUETA said on behalf of the South American Sport Council (CONSUDE) that he wanted to thank WADA for giving him the opportunity to share at this important meeting. His region was clearly growing in the fight against doping in sport in different aspects, not only increasing the number of samples per year taken during in- and out-of-competition testing, but also in terms of legal issues, institutional commitments and education programmes. In education, 80% of CONSUDE countries had developed education projects with UNESCO funds and, in some cases, there were two or three projects per country. CONSUDE would be hosting the next education seminar for Latin America and the Caribbean countries, and his own country, Uruguay, would be hosting the event, and he was very happy about that. This would take place in April 2013. One of the important things happening was that education programmes were focusing on physical education teachers and trainers, and it was an excellent idea to work with children on values in sport. There had also been comments the previous day on laboratory issues that should be considered in the review process of the Code. He also transmitted satisfaction regarding the excellent work done by the WADA regional office in Montevideo, headed by Ms Pesce. He thanked Canada for its hospitality once again.

10.3.3 Cape Town report

MR SWIGELAAR said that, in September and October, the regional office had undertaken missions to two key African states; the first had been to Accra, Ghana to discuss with the government and NOC matters related to the development of the national anti-doping programme; for the second, the ARO director had accompanied WADA's President to Kenya in the Horn of Africa for deliberations with the government and the NOC after receiving an invitation from the authorities.

Ghana was one of the most active countries in the region, and for the past few years the ARO had been working with Ghana assisting it in developing and implementing the national anti-doping programme. Ghana, like so many other African states, did not have an abundance of resources and also had many conflicting priorities; however, it was keen to ensure that there was an anti-doping programme in place, and had agreed to work towards the establishment of one. The authorities had reaffirmed their commitment to use the Zone VI RADO to build capacity, implement education programmes and consider ways to increase testing. The ARO was confident that it would make headway through involvement with the RADO and would assist as it progressed.

In October, he had accompanied WADA's President to Kenya. Kenya had been a force in middle- and long-distance running and continued to spearhead Africa's medal tally at the Olympic Games. Kenya held a leadership role in East Africa. Members would recall much-publicised media allegations against Kenyan athletes and a recent confession from a sanctioned athlete acknowledging the existence of widespread doping practices in Kenya. This had put Kenya in the doping spotlight. The visit by WADA had therefore been timely, and productive discussions had been held by WADA and the Kenyan Government and NOC. Three issues had been discussed: the establishment of an independent enquiry to investigate the allegations of widespread doping amongst elite Kenyan athletes, progress with regard to the fact that Kenya was hosting the RADO in Nairobi, and it had agreed at that stage that it did not have the required resource to establish a fully-fledged NADO and had therefore agreed to strengthen its role within the Zone VI RADO whilst seeking ways and means of supporting a fully-fledged NADO. The UNESCO convention had been discussed along with a possible application for funding from the voluntary fund, as well as the obligations under the UNESCO convention.

In conclusion, this had taught him that, by assisting the RADOs to the extent that WADA had and providing further support and resources, WADA was creating a vehicle through which countries such as Ghana and Kenya could give expression to their anti-doping aspirations whilst working on long-term plans. Support of the RADOs in Africa continued to be critical.

MR MERITON reiterated the fact that much progress had been achieved over the years, as had been shown on the last slide. He wanted to highlight the fact that RADOS were the regional and local efforts to achieving global objectives and they had to be supported if they were to be able to play that role effectively, and the appointment of a full-time RADO manager to ensure quality service delivery and taking that development to the next level was seen in a positive light. The issue of increasing testing and education programmes as highlighted by the gentleman from the education group was critical. Many would have seen the film Chariots of Fire, which displayed the fact that athletes competed for honour and glory, to respond to challenges but, over time, this had been inundated by other factors and, as had been stated earlier, sport was a multi-billion dollar industry, and values were being eroded. If the question of doping touched the elite athletes and was also trickling down, he thought that WADA would be in deep trouble and needed to ensure that it continued to promote values education. WADA needed to ensure that the social value compass was reinforced so that young people did not fall prey to greed and the rat race, running after millions of dollars. It was very important to continue to get the support and he thanked the office for supporting powerhouses such as Kenya and Ghana to identify and establish effective NADOs. He was grateful for the support given to date and looked forward to that continuing in the future.

DR SCHAMASCH said that the IOC had developed an interesting programme called Sport for Hope with a first campus in Zambia, with the help of the IFs and the Zambian Government. Might it be a good idea to have on the campus a small WADA booth in order to provide education on-site? The second programme would be developed in Haiti in coming years, and this new campus could be a good place for education.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Dr Schamasch for that suggestion; WADA would certainly take it on board.

10.3.4 Lausanne report

MR DONZÉ said that, as usual, he would combine the reports of the European regional office and the area of relations with IFs. This, as most of the members would know, was explained by the fact that the office was based in Lausanne, the Olympic capital, home of the IOC, and the main mandate was to liaise and support the more than 90 IFs that were members of SportAccord, as well as their umbrella organisations, the majority of which were based in Switzerland.

The members had an extensive report on the activities of the office in their folders, so he would be brief. He wished to highlight two specific projects on which the office had been working over the past few months which might be of interest.

The first project was the Better Practice project, and those present would remember from his presentation in May that year that WADA had initiated pilot projects with two IFs and a major event organiser to help them enhance the quality of their anti-doping practice in a sustainable manner and to incorporate the lessons learnt from the project in the ongoing review of the World Anti-Doping Code and the international standards. This was in fact very much an extension of the day-to-day support that WADA provided to IFs but with a view to sharing the lessons and outcomes of the projects with the rest of the anti-doping community in a more systematic manner, through the potential upcoming development of new models of best practice and guidelines, or the enhancement of existing tools.

As the members would have seen from his report, WADA had worked with two IFs, the Badminton World Federation and the International Korfball Federation. The two IFs had volunteered to partake in the project, and WADA had worked with them to look at a number of specific areas in which it had been thought that there could be progress in terms of day-to-day practice. Regrettably, the project had not progressed as quickly as he would have hoped, and there were a number of reasons for this, mainly the lack of

time and availability of the IF staff with whom WADA worked. It was clear that IFs sometimes had competing priorities and WADA was pushing to speed up the process but this was very much something that would continue over the next few months.

WADA had been working with the International World Games Association on a third project in the lead-up to the World Games to be held in Cali, Colombia, in July 2013. The objective of the project was to try to ensure the optimal planning and advance coordination so that the anti-doping programme delivered at the event would be of optimal quality. This was an evolution of the Independent Observer programme, and involved trying to work as much as possible in advance of the event to ensure quality programmes when the event took place. Over the coming months, the three projects would continue, and WADA would continue to work with the organisations involved in the project to identify further areas in which the Code and international standards review could enhance better practice of IFs and major event organisations, and the members would hear an update over the next few months from him, starting at the next meeting of the Foundation Board in May.

The second and final activity he wished to highlight was also tied into the area of better practice: the anti-doping organisation symposia, with which most of the members would be familiar. WADA had been working on the initial preparations for the 2013 ADO symposium, with an emphasis on better practice. The next edition of the symposium, which continued to grow in popularity, would be held at the Palais de Beaulieu in Lausanne, on 19 and 20 March. The agenda would be published over the next few days, and WADA intended to launch the registration process towards the end of November. The focus of this particular edition of the ADO symposium would be on the Code and international standards review, but also on a number of developing strategies and approaches that had been heard about that day, such as intelligence and investigations, as well as the steroid module of the ABP, which he thought would be of great interest to numerous ADOs around the world.

He took the opportunity to invite all of the interested ADOs to the symposium in March; they would receive official notice over the coming days.

DECISION

Regional offices update noted.

– **10.4 International Federations**

DECISION

International Federations update (provided as part of the regional offices update) noted.

– **10.5 Governments**

MS JANSEN said that the approval committee of the UNESCO voluntary fund had met on 8 November and had approved seven applications, from Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Georgia, Bulgaria, Malta, Eritrea and Paraguay. One country had been asked to resubmit the following time: Malawi. For 2013, UNESCO had asked that applications be received by it by 15 March, and she advocated that anybody submitting an application get it in well before that time, as there was a lot of back and forth to ensure that the applications met the necessary requirements to go forward to the approval committee. The date had not yet been set for the approval committee to meet, but it would be prior to 10 April.

To date, 80 applications had been approved from the fund over the life of the fund and, in 2012, 795,000 US dollars had been committed to the fund by six governments: Australia, the Russian Federation, Finland, Kuwait, Monaco and France.

In relation to Dr Schamasch's Sport for Hope query regarding Haiti, she knew that there had been an application in previously and perhaps there might be a good net there with that country.

DECISION

Governments update noted.

– **10.6 Science**

10.6.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee chair report

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said that he did not have much to say, as the members had all the necessary details in their files. He was happy to chair a committee full of high-level competence in science and sport medicine in particular. The committee had completed the main tasks over the past half a year, including the completion of the List for 2013 and the distribution of research money to research centres around the world, supported by external specialists to a large extent. For the details, he referred the members to the papers in their folders.

10.6.2 Science report

DR RABIN wished to talk about the international conference of the pharmaceutical industry and the fight against doping in sport that had been held earlier that week. Several comments had been heard about it, and he thought that it had been a significant step in exposing the work achieved over the past eight years between the pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries and WADA. From the industry perspective, it showed that WADA was a credible partner for the industry to work on the risk management of drugs in development with doping potential. From the WADA perspective, the mechanism was in place for the industry to share information on drugs with doping potential with WADA and all this had been the subject of a campaign released just prior to the Olympic Games called Two Fields, One Goal, showing how the industry could work with WADA, so he thought that the conference would convince more pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies to work with WADA to join the process and collaborate fairly openly. He had had a debriefing session with representatives of the industry the day after the conference and he assured the members that the conference would strengthen the interest of the industry and its motivation regarding this new form of partnership. He concluded by thanking some of the people who had been pivotal in the delivery of the conference, starting with Jean-Pierre Bourelly, Jean-Marc Julien and Charlotte Bourdel at the French Ministry of Sport, who had covered many aspects of the logistics and site organisation as well as financially supporting the conference, continuing with Alexander Schischlik and April Tash at UNESCO for their administrative support in the preparation and conduct of the conference and, last but not least, he gave special thanks to Pierre Masson at the Council of Europe who had been absolutely pivotal in the preparation and success of the conference.

DECISION

Science update noted.

– **10.7 Medical**

THE CHAIRMAN referred the members to the paper in their files. Dr Vernec had indicated that he did not intend to speak but would respond to any questions that the members might have.

DECISION

Medical update noted.

– 10.8 Standards and harmonisation

THE CHAIRMAN referred the members to the paper in their files. Mr Andersen had indicated that he did not intend to speak but would respond to any questions that the members might have.

DECISION

Standards and harmonisation
update noted.

11. Any other business/future meetings

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the meeting schedule before them. WADA had decided to work in with the IOC and the IOC meeting that would be taking place in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in September, which meant that the sport representatives who would be in Buenos Aires would be joined by the government members of the Executive Committee and WADA would hold its meeting there. He asked the members to save the dates in respect of the important World Conference on Doping in Sport and the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings that would top and tail that conference in November, commencing on Tuesday 12 November.

Before closing the meeting, he acknowledged firstly the contribution that Dr Schamasch had made to the organisation. Dr Schamasch was due to finish his formal contact with the IOC at the end of December. He might well get a cameo role to come back to the WADA meeting to use his expertise as an alternate to some other member in the future but, if that was not the case, he acknowledged on the members' behalf the very significant contribution that Dr Schamasch had made to WADA, always with a very happy disposition, and he had demonstrated that with the funny hat he had been wearing in the slides earlier, when he had visited the Outreach booth in London. WADA had valued Dr Schamasch's contribution; it had been good to work with him. Whatever Dr Schamasch sought for himself in the way of work or pleasure in the future, Dr Schamasch took with him WADA's sincere thanks and very best wishes.

He said that he should probably say similar words to Professor Gerrard but he was confident that he would be back, so he was sure he would have another occasion to thank Professor Gerrard.

WADA would not be able to hold its meetings without the support of the interpreters, the technicians and professionals who backed up the meetings of WADA. It was a huge exercise for the WADA staff; simply looking at their folders, the members would recognise that, and the staff did it in real time as had been seen the previous day on decisions taken in respect of the finance report. It had been on the table in its corrected form almost as soon as the members had stopped talking about it. That required some real skill and dedication, so he asked that the members acknowledge the sacrifice of the staff, who had given up their weekend, and all the efforts that they had made.

He thanked WADA for the trilby hats that were in front of the members and had been given out at the Outreach centre during the course of the London Olympic Games. He trusted that the members would use them and remember WADA and London. He also thanked Mr Ghoniem, who had given the members a small present that was an indication of where he came from.

He concluded by saying that it was the end of another calendar year. Christmas was a time to stop and think and hopefully spend time with family and friends. He thanked the members for their contribution throughout the year and wished them a very happy festive season and a safe holiday and travel. He looked forward to seeing them again the following year, another important year. WADA continued to think about what it was

doing and test itself with the need to do things better and he believed that there would be some breakthroughs during the course of the following year with the Code review and other matters that would come to light.

DECISION

Executive Committee - 11 May 2013, Montreal;
Foundation Board - 12 May 2013, Montreal;
Executive Committee - 11 September 2013,
Buenos Aires, Argentina;
Executive Committee - 12 November 2013,
Johannesburg, South Africa;
World Conference - 12, 13, 14 and 15
November 2013, Johannesburg, South Africa;
Foundation Board - 15 November 2013,
Johannesburg, South Africa.

The meeting adjourned at 2.00 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

JOHN FAHEY, AC
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA