



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

Conference of Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport

1CP

First Session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room IV
5-7 February 2007

ICDS/1CP/Doc.9
15 March 2007
Original: English
and French

Draft Final Report

The first session of the Conference of Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 5 to 7 February 2007. Representatives of 36 States Parties attended the meeting, and representatives from 55 Member States and two intergovernmental organizations attended as observers. The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) attended as an advisory organization to the Conference.

The Section for Youth, Sport and Physical Education, Division of Social Sciences Research and Policy, Sector for Social and Human Sciences, UNESCO provided the secretariat of the meeting.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Opening of the First Session by the Director-General and Statements by Guests of Honour | 3 |
| Statements by States Parties | 5 |
| Election of a Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur | 10 |
| Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable | 12 |
| Adoption of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of Parties | 13 |
| Report of the World Anti-Doping Agency on the implementation of the World Anti- Doping Code | 15 |
| Approval of the 2007 Prohibited List International Standard | 18 |
| Monitoring Framework for the International Convention against Doping in Sport | 20 |
| Administration of the Fund for the Elimination of Doping in Sport | 23 |
| Any Other Business | 28 |
| Date and Venue of the Second Session of the Conference of Parties | 31 |
| Oral Report of the Rapporteur of the First Session of the Conference of Parties | 32 |
| Closure of the First Session of the Conference of Parties by the Chairperson | 32 |
| Annex I: List of Participants | 33 |
| Annex II: Rules of Procedure | 36 |
| Annex III: List of Documents before the Conference | 40 |

Agenda Item 1.1

Opening of the First Session by the Director-General and Statements by Guests of Honour

1. The first session of the Conference of Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport (hereinafter referred to as “the Conference”) was opened by the Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, and Mr Pierre Sané, Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences. Guests of honour from the anti-doping and sporting movement attended the ceremony.
2. In his opening speech, the **Director-General** expressed his great satisfaction to be able to convene the first session of the Conference only 16 months after the International Convention against Doping in Sport (hereinafter referred to as “the Convention”) was unanimously adopted by the 33rd session of the UNESCO General Conference. Accordingly, this was the most successful international convention in the history of UNESCO in terms of the speed of its development and entry into force. The Convention gives effect to the World Anti-Doping Code (hereinafter referred to as “the Code”) and formalizes global anti-doping rules to provide an honest and equitable playing environment for all athletes. The Director-General was encouraged to have participating States Parties from all the regions of the world. This demonstrated the steadfast commitment of all governments to anti-doping and illustrated the principles of harmonization and cooperation enshrined in the Convention. It also showed considerable progress in the fight against doping in sport.
3. Mr Matsuura expressed his profound gratitude to the International Olympic Committee (IOC), International Paralympic Committee (IPC) and the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) for their support throughout the development of the Convention and for being advocates of this international instrument. An enduring partnership between governments and the sporting movement was essential to ensure that future generations are able to enjoy and excel in doping-free sport. He also paid tribute to Mr Adolf Ogi, Special Advisor to the United Nations Secretary-General on Sport for Development and Peace.
4. The Director-General observed that the first session of the Conference marked the moment when UNESCO’s attention would shift away from normative development towards the challenge of implementation. The Director-General pledged that UNESCO would redouble its efforts to strengthen ethics, personal responsibility and integrity in sport. Governments were called upon to work within their considerable spheres of influence to remove doping from sport and, through contributions to the Fund for the Elimination of Doping in Sport (hereinafter referred to as “the Fund”), to assist other States Parties develop effective anti-doping programmes. He also urged Member States that have not yet become States Parties to the Convention to do so quickly.
5. **H.E. Mr Musa Bin Jaafar Bin Hassan** opened his speech by emphasizing the benefits of sport. Sport is a universal language with a unique capacity to bring people together and where ethical values such as integrity, fair play, cooperation and respect should be to the fore. However, in recent years, the use of performance enhancing drugs and methods has become more pervasive and insidious. The Convention provided governments with the tools and legal framework to restore the credibility of sport. He confirmed UNESCO’s determination to lead the fight against doping in sport and urged all governments to contribute to the Fund. Mr Bin Hassan also called upon all States Parties to invest in the education of young people about the health consequences and ethical facets of anti-doping.

6. **Sir Philip Craven**, IPC President, congratulated UNESCO for making the Convention a reality in record time. He stressed the importance of the Conference as the only global anti-doping forum where governments could cooperate to combat doping. Sir Philip observed that it was every athlete's fundamental right to participate in doping-free sport, but acknowledged that in the modern world some were tempted to cheat. He spoke of the IPC's strong involvement in anti-doping activities, particularly the education of its athletes, and of the close working relationships forged with WADA and UNESCO.
7. **Mr Jean-François Lamour**, Vice President of WADA, welcomed the Convention's entry into force, saying that it confirms the unprecedented mobilization of governments and the sporting movement against doping. The Convention reinforces the actions of WADA, positioning the Code at the heart of international cooperation to eliminate doping. The Minister stressed the importance of carrying out the fight against doping on a global scale. All athletes should be treated equally, irrespective of their discipline, nationality or place of residence. The rules must be simple, known by all, harmonized and dissuasive. He also argued that anti-doping should be founded on three main pillars: prevention, multiplication of controls and reduction of product availability.
8. **Mr Viacheslav Fetisov**, UNESCO Champion for Sport and Head of the Russian Federal Agency for Physical Culture and Sport, thanked the Director-General for his work in developing an effective anti-doping international instrument. Doping damages sport and detracts from the important role sport plays in ameliorating many social and economic problems. Mr Fetisov emphasized educational work with young people based on ethical principles as the cornerstone of the fight against doping. He offered to share the rich experience of his country in this field and stated that the Russian Federation would make a substantial contribution to the Fund to allow less developed countries to develop effective anti-doping programmes.

[Room IV, 5 February 2007, 11.15 a.m.]

9. **Professor Jiri Dvorak**, Chief Medical Director, Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), outlined his organization's tough stance on doping and expressed its willingness to collaborate with UNESCO, WADA and all governments to remove doping from sport. FIFA's anti-doping strategies, as outlined in the document *Fight against Doping in Football*, were focused on education and prevention, not only among top football professionals but at the grassroots level. FIFA sought to maximize the popularity of sport to disseminate educational messages and to have a positive impact on the health status of individuals and society in general. Professor Dvorak affirmed FIFA's commitment to help promote sport as a health-enhancing leisure activity, where it was nonsensical to improve performance by artificial means such as doping.
10. Mr David Winiger delivered a speech on behalf of **Mr Adolf Ogi**, which highlighted the importance of the Convention in providing the legal framework to preserve the positive values of sport. The United Nations increasingly recognizes the value of sport as an instrument for development, which can be used amongst all social, religious and cultural groups to teach essential life skills and to improve the quality of life for all. He thus urged the Conference to increase international cooperation so that sport remains a clean and healthy pursuit for individuals around the world, and a tool to assist in the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.
11. The opening ceremony concluded with a video message from **Ms Justine Henin**, UNESCO Champion for Sport, in which she spoke of the importance of the Convention. She expressed her wish as a professional athlete for a level playing field and her regret that the image of sport continued to be tarnished by doping. Ms Henin also spoke about the need to sensitize young people to the harm caused by doping. She implored the sports movement and governments to work together to remove doping from all levels of sport.

Agenda Item 1.1

Statements by States Parties

12. Following the opening ceremony, statements were made by the Delegations of Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Bolivia, Canada, China, Denmark, Greece, Jamaica, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mauritius, Monaco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Romania, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Sweden and Tunisia. Brazil, the Council of Europe (COE) and the Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport (CIGEPS) took the floor as observers to the Conference.
13. The Delegation of Spain noted that this date would be significant in the history of the fight against doping in sport. However, in spite of the progress made, more work was required. States Parties need to collaborate with enforcement agencies to target the producers and traffickers of performance-enhancing substances and methods. Greater scientific capacity is required to cope with an ever-increasing range of doping substances and technological developments which are tending towards gene doping. Mr Jaime Lissavetsky Diez explained that the Spanish Government had adopted a zero-tolerance approach to doping and had put in place a series of stringent measures, including enacting new legislation designed to protect the health and welfare of athletes and the ratification of the Convention. Spain will also host the 3rd World Conference on Doping in Sport on 15-17 November 2007. The State Secretary for Sport concluded by announcing a contribution to the Fund established under Article 17 of the Convention.
14. The Delegation of China stated that it attaches great importance to anti-doping. It had moved rapidly to become a State Party to the Convention, strict national legislation had been introduced and doping controls extended to include over 1,000 tests annually. The Government of China was working closely with the Beijing Organizing Committee for the 2008 Olympic Games (BOCOG) to ensure that a world-class anti-doping programme was in place. The Delegation recognized the importance of coordinating anti-doping activities at the international level, which led them to convene a regional intergovernmental anti-doping conference, and welcomed the opportunity for further cooperation provided by the Conference.
15. The Delegation of Japan highlighted moral and ethical issues, noting that doping violates the spirit of sport, harms the health of athletes and is a negative influence on younger generations. In accordance with the Convention, the Government of Japan had established guidelines in cooperation with national sports federations, implemented education and training programmes, prepared a code of conduct for professional sports and put in place an effective anti-doping control system. Japan was determined to eradicate doping from sport and will actively cooperate with UNESCO and other governments in pursuing this objective.
16. The Delegation of Greece thanked UNESCO for its work in developing and promoting the Convention. This international instrument would reinforce the actions of the sports movement. Greece was proud of its contribution to the development of the Convention as hosts to the Fourth International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (MINEPS IV), where a consensus was forged. The task now was to ensure the effectiveness of the Convention in protecting fair play so that sport could achieve Olympic ideals. The Delegation of Greece outlined the measures taken since 1999, for example, new legislation had been enacted and a state-of-the-art national anti-doping centre established.

17. The Delegation of Barbados congratulated UNESCO and other States Parties for the expeditious development and entry into force of the Convention. Mr Anthony Wood, Minister of Education, Youth Affairs and Sports, expressed the commitment of Barbados to eliminate doping from sport at all levels. He outlined the measures adopted in Barbados which included the formation of a national anti-doping organization in March 2000. Barbados was also the host of the Caribbean Region Anti-Doping Organization, which provides assistance to 14 countries with anti-doping education, drug control and training programmes, and is working to establish a WADA accredited laboratory. The Delegation noted that these actions demonstrate that Barbados is at the forefront of anti-doping activities in the Caribbean region.
18. The Delegation of Bolivia expressed its satisfaction on the rapid entry into force of the Convention. Bolivia has been working actively in the field of anti-doping over the last seven years, in particular within the sports of cycling and football. During that time there had been a decrease in the number of positive drug tests, yet a high incidence of the tests indicated the presence of cocaine. The Delegation of Bolivia raised concerns about the costs of undertaking the analysis of samples at WADA-accredited laboratories and requested assistance from UNESCO and WADA with the preparation of educational materials for distribution amongst athletes and young people.
19. The Delegation of Argentina noted that it was at the forefront of anti-doping efforts in South America, having established the National Anti-Doping Commission in 1997 and introduced specific legislation. However, macroeconomic issues had diminished the resources dedicated to anti-doping. Attention was placed on promoting justice and dignity as well as sport conducted in the spirit of fair play and respect. These ethical considerations helped to raise awareness about doping in sport and provided a framework for education programmes. Argentina was committed to the Convention as a tool to protect the spirit of sport and to ensure international harmonization of all aspects of anti-doping. However, the Delegation requested that a second tier of laboratories be established to conduct the analysis of samples, limited to only certain types of substances, as a means to reduce costs.
20. The Delegation of Luxembourg proudly noted that its government, the 30th State Party to the Convention, provided the impetus for the Convention to enter into force. The momentum behind the Convention and the commitment of States Parties augured well for its effective implementation despite the fact that there had been an increase in the number of doping infractions, including a number of high-profile cases or examples where retired athletes had admitted to doping. Luxembourg had taken a zero-tolerance approach to doping, and was seeking greater cooperation with law enforcement agencies to deal with the sale and supply of drugs. In announcing a contribution to the Fund, the Delegation of Luxembourg spoke of the need to invest this funding to advance the anti-doping cause globally.
21. The Delegation of Malaysia outlined its strong anti-doping credentials. Malaysia was a signatory to the Copenhagen Declaration and was the second Asian country to ratify the Convention. It had also previously served as a member of the WADA Foundation Board and was recognized for having an effective domestic anti-doping programme, managed by the Malaysian National Sports Council. Malaysia also possesses an accredited WADA laboratory.
22. The Delegation of Mauritius expressed its commitment to international efforts to combat doping. While it was a small island developing country with few resources, it was collaborating with WADA to play a leading role amongst countries in the Indian Ocean. Mauritius had established a national anti-doping unit in 2005 and new legislation, taking into account the provisions of the Code, and the Convention would be introduced in 2007 to promote drug-free sport.

23. The Delegation of Tunisia congratulated UNESCO for its efforts to eliminate doping through the development of the Convention. Tunisia is conscious of the harm caused by doping and is working to protect young people from being exposed to this scourge. It has instituted a national anti-doping programme over the past 10 years, including drug control and education programmes and the establishment of an accredited laboratory. Tunisia was committed to participating in anti-doping efforts at the international level and it was a State Party to the COE and UNESCO Conventions. Tunisia concluded its statement by announcing that it was partnering with UNESCO to host a regional conference targeted at raising awareness among Arab States.
24. The Delegation of Canada was very satisfied with the rapid entry into force of the Convention. Canada has contributed greatly to this outcome through the work of Mr Jean-Pierre Blais who presided over the Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts. The Delegation of Canada spoke about the issues before the Conference for resolution. It hoped for the development of a cost-effective, low-maintenance monitoring mechanism that complemented the efforts of WADA and the COE. Approving the Prohibited List was essential to ensure that athletes worldwide were bound by a single international standard. Canada hoped that its financial contribution would lead to a world of doping-free sport, however, it cautioned that the Fund should be well resourced and effectively managed so that it could have a global reach.
25. The Delegation of Jamaica stated that it was deeply committed to anti-doping as a means of preserving the integrity of sport. Accordingly, Ms Portia Simpson-Miller, Prime Minister and Minister of Sport, had taken steps to quickly ratify the Convention and to introduce an anti-doping programme focused on detection, deterrence and prevention. The Delegation of Jamaica noted that it would pay particular attention to the monitoring mechanism for the Convention and the priorities for the Fund over the coming days. It also wished to propose an additional agenda item concerning the relationship with WADA and the mechanisms of funding the agency's annual core budget, as outlined in Article 30.1(b) of the Convention.
26. The Delegation of South Africa congratulated UNESCO for tackling the doping menace with energy and vigour. Doping was a tragedy, especially in Africa where the limited resources available to invest in the development of sport had to be diverted to anti-doping – all because of the greed of a few individuals. South Africa was part of the pioneering group of governments that had quickly recognized the need for a global campaign against doping. It had established an accredited laboratory and the South Africa Institute for Drug-Free Sport. South Africa is also the host of WADA's regional office in Cape Town. The Delegation of South Africa closed its statement by announcing a contribution to the Fund.
27. The Delegation of Algeria welcomed the entry into force of the Convention noting that the promotion of an anti-doping culture in sport was a priority for its government. In this regard, it had established a strong relationship with WADA and was working to establish a laboratory to undertake sample analysis.
28. The Delegation of the Russian Federation highlighted the significant threat posed by the trafficking of performance-enhancing drugs, noting that there were vast criminal networks involved. Coordinated action was required by all governments to address this problem. Scientific research, education programmes and preventive measures were other priority areas. The Delegation of the Russian Federation expressed its desire to work with all States Parties, WADA and UNESCO to progress on these issues.
29. The Delegation of Sweden noted that the Convention was for those clean athletes who wished to compete fairly. While doping was the responsibility of the sporting movement, governments had a duty to create the appropriate legislative and administrative instruments to facilitate its eradication. The Delegation of Sweden also called for

effective cooperation between UNESCO and the COE and the harmonious development of both conventions. In announcing a US \$50,000 contribution to the Fund, participants were reminded that external resources were needed to make the fight against doping in sport more effective. Sufficient funding should also be allocated under the regular budget of UNESCO.

30. The Delegation of Lithuania outlined the measures it was taking to comply with the Convention, including the establishment of a national anti-doping commission. Action was also being taken to address the sale and supply of performance enhancing substances and methods. The Delegation welcomed the entry into force of the Convention as it would allow for greater coordination and cooperation between governments.
31. The Delegation of Denmark was very impressed with the momentum behind the Convention which reflected the steadfast commitment of the international community to anti-doping. The important role played by WADA in leading the fight against doping in sport was also recognized. The Delegation announced a contribution to the Fund and proposed that all States Parties should provide assistance. UNESCO needed funding in order to improve anti-doping capacity in least developed or low income States Parties.
32. The Delegation of Monaco congratulated UNESCO and affirmed its intention to actively support the Secretariat. The Delegation transmitted a message from Prince Albert II, who is a staunch advocate of sporting ethics and Olympic ideals. Doping is cheating and a perversion of the nature and spirit of competition. It weakens the moral principles that underpin sport, such as equity, integrity and respect and also puts at risk the health of athletes. Monaco had adopted national legislation compliant with the Code and a national anti-doping committee was established in 2003.
33. The Delegation of the Netherlands stated that the Convention was vital for the future of sport. The Netherlands participated in the Convention's drafting process because it believes that involvement of governments was crucial and it recognized the utility of the Fund. If governments did not succeed in tackling the problem of doping, sport and its values would lose their significance. The Netherlands was confident of success due to the enormous progress already made in the international fight against doping. The entry into force of the Convention showed the strong commitment to anti-doping.
34. The Delegation of Australia noted that the Convention represents the culmination of a concerted effort over a number of years to harmonize anti-doping policies and practices internationally. The recent creation of the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority (ASADA) allows Australia to meet its obligations under the Code and the Convention. ASADA's functions are wide-ranging, combining advocacy, education, and sample collection with investigation, prosecution and policy functions. ASADA was also empowered to exchange sensitive information with other Australian Government agencies in recognition that an increasing number of anti-doping rule violations would be identified through means other than drug testing.
35. The Delegation of Romania affirmed its strong commitment to eliminate doping from sport. Romania had set up an independent national anti-doping agency and enacted new legislation, harmonized with the provisions of the Code and the Convention. In 2007, the government will be working on preventing illegal trafficking of doping substances and on the issue of nutritional supplements.
36. The Delegation of Albania congratulated the Director-General of UNESCO, States Parties and all experts who contributed to the preparation of the Convention. As a member of CIGEPS, Albania has been collaborating on anti-doping issues and was very committed to the success of the Convention. It will take the legislative and administrative measures needed to implement the Convention, including multiplying

efforts in the area of education, putting in place training and prevention programmes and awareness-raising campaigns.

37. The Delegation of Nigeria congratulated UNESCO and all States Parties for the prompt entry into force of the Convention. Such actions were a clear demonstration of the eagerness of the international community to combat the problem of doping and to protect the health of future athletes. Nigeria is very committed to the fight against doping and will apply the provisions set forth in the Convention.
38. The Delegation of Brazil expressed its commitment to anti-doping. Brazil had participated actively in international efforts and has adopted national anti-doping measures. The Pan-American Olympic Games, which will be held in July 2007 in Rio de Janeiro, will include doping control and prevention activities in conformity with the Code and other international standards. The Brazilian Government expected that it would ratify the Convention very soon.
39. The Delegation of the COE welcomed the entry into force of the Convention. The existence of this international instrument alongside its Anti-Doping Convention 1989 was a sign of the strength of governments' resolve. The Delegation offered to collaborate with UNESCO in the development of an effective monitoring system so as to avoid any duplication of effort or expense and expressed its desire for harmonious development of both conventions. In this regard, Member States of UNESCO were invited to participate in the work of the Council. The development of a platform for dialogue between public authorities and the sporting movement, aimed at identifying solutions to the current challenges of governance in the area of sport, was highlighted as an opportunity for enlarged cooperation.
40. The Chairperson of CIGEPS called for all governmental or intergovernmental organizations and international sporting associations to collectively fight doping. Article 16 of the Convention, regarding international cooperation, must be vigorously implemented, not only to facilitate the work of WADA, but also to allow for global harmonization. However, this will only be possible if contributions are made to the Fund. CIGEPS welcomed the initiatives taken by UNESCO to promote anti-doping, but stressed the fact that a range of approaches were required to attract the attention of young people. For example, cultural activities might facilitate uptake of anti-doping messages.

Agenda Item 1.2

Election of a Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur

41. The Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences introduced agenda item 1.2 and drew attention to document ICDS/1CP/Doc.1. He reminded the Conference that one Chairperson, four Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur were required, ideally representing the six electoral groups of UNESCO. The Delegations of the following States Parties: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Bolivia, China, Finland, Greece, Japan, Malaysia, Nigeria, Romania, South Africa, Spain and Tunisia took the floor during the ensuing discussions.

DELIBERATION

42. The Delegation of Greece took the floor to propose that Spain represent Electoral Group I. This proposal was seconded by the Delegation of Finland and Mr Jaime Lissavetzky, Secretary of State for Sport, was elected by acclamation.
43. The Delegation of Romania proposed that the Russian Federation represent Electoral Group II. The Romanian Delegation also suggested that Mr Viacheslav Fetisov be considered for the role of Chairperson given his strong sporting credentials and his experience as the Head of the Russian Federal Agency for Physical Culture and Sport. The Delegation of Albania seconded this proposal and supported Mr Fetisov's candidature for the role of Chairperson. Mr Fetisov was elected by acclamation.
44. The Delegation of Argentina nominated the representative of Jamaica to represent Electoral Group III in recognition of their rich sporting history and the fact that it was the first Member State from the Electoral Group to become a State Party to the Convention. This nomination was seconded by the Delegation of Barbados and Ms Renee Anne Shirley, Senior Advisor to the Prime Minister of Jamaica, was elected by acclamation.
45. The Delegation of Japan nominated China, host of the 2008 Olympic Games, as the representative of Electoral Group IV. This nomination was seconded by the Delegation of Australia and endorsed by the Malaysian Delegation. Mr Jiang Zhixue, Director-General, General Administration of Sport in China, was elected by acclamation.
46. The Delegation of Nigeria nominated South Africa to represent Electoral Group V(a). However, the Delegation of South Africa took the floor to nominate Mozambique which was seconded by Nigeria. Mr Carlos Sousa, Vice Minister of Youth and Sport, was elected by acclamation.
47. The Delegation of Tunisia nominated Algeria to represent Electoral Group V(b). In the absence of other States Parties from this region to second the nomination, Mr Kamal Guemmar, Director, National Institute for Sports Science and Technology, Algeria, was elected by acclamation.
48. Following the election of the Vice-Chairpersons, nominations were sought for the role of Chairperson. The Delegations of Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Greece, Nigeria, Romania and Spain supported the nomination of Mr Fetisov in recognition of his outstanding achievements in sport and his exemplary efforts to promote the values of physical education and sport. Mr Fetisov was elected Chairperson of the first session of the Conference by acclamation.

49. Mr Fetisov thanked all States Parties for the honour they bestowed upon him in electing him Chairperson of the Conference. He paid tribute to the Director-General for the rapid development and entry into force of the Convention and reminded all participants that the fundamental principle behind the Convention was the harmonization of international anti-doping efforts. Accordingly, he expressed the wish that all deliberations be conducted in an atmosphere that was harmonious and conducive to the resolution of the issues on the agenda, ensuring that the decisions of the Conference help to move forward the fight against doping in sport.
50. The Chairperson announced that Mr Kamal Guemmar of Algeria agreed to act as Rapporteur to the Conference. The Conference adopted resolution 1CP/1.2.

RESOLUTION 1CP/1.2

The Conference of Parties,

1. *Elects* Mr Viacheslav Fetisov (Russian Federation) as its Chairperson,
2. *Elects* Mr Kamal Guemmar (Algeria) as its Rapporteur,
3. *Elects* Mr Jaime Diaz Lissavetzky (Spain); Mr Carlos Sousa (Mozambique); Mr Jiang Zhixue (China); and Ms Renee Anne Shirley (Jamaica) as its Vice-Chairpersons.

[Room IV, 5 February 2007, 5.20 p.m.]

Agenda Item 2

Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable

51. The Chairperson called upon the Conference to adopt the provisional agenda and timetable as outlined in document ICDS/1CP/Doc.2/Rev.1. The Delegations of Jamaica and Nigeria took the floor to propose an amendment to the provisional agenda and timetable.

DELIBERATION

52. The Delegation of Jamaica reiterated its proposal for an additional agenda item. In making this proposal it was highlighted that, under Article 30.1(b) of the Convention, one of the functions of the Conference was to discuss the relationship with WADA and study the mechanisms of funding the agency's annual core budget, yet there was no specific agenda item for this purpose. The Delegation of Jamaica noted that it would be opportune to benefit from the presence of WADA to begin discussions on the relationship between the Convention and WADA. Nigeria seconded the proposal noting that an item titled "Any Other Business" would allow for discussion of issues arising during the deliberations. Accordingly, the Conference agreed to add a new agenda item, number 8, and the revised agenda and timetable were adopted. The Conference adopted resolution number 1CP/2 as amended.

RESOLUTION 1CP/2

The Conference of Parties,

1. *Having examined* document ICDS/1CP/Doc.2/Rev.1,
2. *Adopts* the agenda and timetable included in the above-mentioned document, as amended.

Agenda Item 3

Adoption of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of Parties

53. The Chairperson introduced agenda item 3, as outlined in document ICDS/1CP/Doc.3, and noted that the provisional rules of procedure were based on the model of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of the States Parties to other UNESCO conventions.¹ The Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences also provided comment on the provisional rules of procedure. The Secretariat proposed an amendment to cover the decisions by the Conference concerning the annexes to the Convention. It was important to have a specific rule outlining the procedure because the decision-making on this issue differed to all other matters before the Conference.
54. The Delegations of the following States Parties: Argentina, Canada, Greece, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Monaco, and Tunisia took the floor during the ensuing discussions. Côte d'Ivoire also took the floor as an observer to the Conference.

DELIBERATION

55. The Conference considered the provisional rules of procedure article by article. The first comments were raised by the Delegation of Argentina in reference to provisional Rule 2.3. The Delegation questioned the references to the IOC, IPC, COE and CIGEPS, who were invited to participate in the Conference as observers, while other regional intergovernmental sporting organizations were not so named. Argentina proposed that other regional intergovernmental sporting organizations should be added to the list of observers, including the American Council on Sports (CADE). This position was supported by the Delegation of Canada and others who recognized the important role CADE plays in the Americas in the fight against doping in sport.
56. However, the representative of the Director-General noted that this wording was taken directly from Article 29 of the Convention. Moreover, the COE was named specifically because it was responsible for the development and implementation of the Anti-Doping Convention 1989. The Delegations of Côte d'Ivoire, Greece, Jamaica and Luxembourg shared this perspective and observed that this issue had been the subject of considerable discussion by the Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts during the development of the Convention and that this wording represented the consensus position.
57. The Conference, following the advice of the Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences, considered the potential to amend provisional Rule 2.4 in light of the questions raised by the Delegation of Argentina and others. In this regard, the Delegation of Jamaica suggested that CADE could be included as an example of an intergovernmental organization. However, the Delegation of Tunisia questioned the attention being given to one regional intergovernmental organization, and if this amendment was adopted, it would like other regional intergovernmental organizations to be listed. Moreover, the Delegation of Monaco observed that the provisional rules did not contain an exhaustive list of observers to the Conference and perhaps a specific mechanism to allow other relevant organizations to attend future conferences was needed. Accordingly, Monaco proposed that the Conference issue a resolution calling upon the Director-General of UNESCO to invite other relevant organizations to the meeting. The Delegations of Argentina, Monaco and Tunisia agreed to draft this resolution for consideration under item 8 of the agenda.

¹ For example, the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

[Room IV, 6 February 2007, 10.10 a.m.]

58. On 6 February 2007, the Conference recommenced its discussion of the provisional rules of procedure. Rules 3 to 12 were unanimously adopted without discussion.
59. The Representative of the Legal Adviser provided clarification on the proposed new provision "*Rule 14 - Decisions on amendment to the annexes of the Convention*". The first part of this new rule replicated Article 34.2 of the Convention, reaffirming that amendment to the annexes shall be deemed to be approved by the Conference unless two thirds of States Parties expressed their objection. The second paragraph of the new rule provided that voting on amendments to the annexes to the Convention be conducted by roll-call. In practical terms, this meant that the adoption of the amendments to the Annexes would be taken by roll-call if there was no consensus or if there was an objection by any State Party. Voting by roll-call would allow the Secretariat to record any objections, which was important given that States Parties that do not accept an amendment, either during the Conference (Article 34.2) or in the 45 days following the notification by the Director-General (Article 34.3), are bound by the annexes as not amended (Article 34.4). The roll-call would thus provide a degree of clarity as to which States Parties were bound by what version of the annexes.
60. The new Rule 14 was accepted by the Conference as were the consequential amendments to Rule 13 (paragraphs 13.2 and 13.5).
61. The remaining rules of procedure were adopted by the Conference as amended without debate. The Conference adopted resolution number 1CP/3 as amended. The Rules of Procedure incorporating the amendments outlined above are enclosed herewith as Annex II.

RESOLUTION 1CP/3

The Conference of Parties,

1. *Having examined* the provisional Rules of Procedure provided in document ICDS/1CP/Doc.3,
2. *Adopts* its Rules of Procedure, as contained in that document, as amended.

Agenda Item 4

Report of the World Anti-Doping Agency on the implementation of the World Anti-Doping Code

62. The Chairperson introduced agenda item 4, and called upon Mr David Howman, Director-General of WADA, to provide a report on his organization's activities and the implementation of the Code. At the conclusion of the presentation, the Delegations of the following States Parties: Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Finland, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Namibia and Spain put questions to Mr Howman. Brazil, the Republic of Korea, India, Indonesia and Austria also raised questions as observers to the Conference.

DELIBERATION

63. In his opening remarks, Mr Howman noted that WADA was a unique organization, formed on the basis of an equal partnership between governments and sport. Accordingly, 50% of positions on WADA's governance committees, the Executive Committee and Foundation Board, are held by government representatives and 50% of its total funding comes from governments. The sporting movement holds an equal number of positions and matches the financial contributions of governments. This arrangement is essential because the fight against doping in sport can only be sustained and ultimately be successful through the combined efforts of these two stakeholders.
64. Mr Howman discussed acceptance, implementation and compliance with the Code. WADA is responsible for tracking and reporting on acceptance, reviewing the rules of signatories, preparing models of best practice and reviewing all decisions taken under the Code. Government acceptance, because governments cannot be legally bound by the Code, is achieved by signing the 2003 Copenhagen Declaration on Anti-Doping in Sport and by becoming a State Party to the Convention. As of 7 February 2007, there were 186 government signatories to the Copenhagen Declaration and 47 States Parties to the Convention. There were also 572 signatories to the Code across the sports movement. These sporting organizations were required to accept the Code prior to the 2004 Athens Olympics and to have brought their rules into compliance with the Code including incorporating the mandatory articles. They are now required to demonstrate compliance.
65. The web-based monitoring system in place to assess compliance with the Code (*WADALogic*) was outlined. This system allows WADA, as per its responsibilities under Article 23.4.4 of the Code, to report to the WADA Foundation Board. One such monitoring report had been prepared which showed that of the 176 respondents to the questionnaire, 60 signatories were fully compliant with the Code. While this response rate and the outcome were disappointing, a large majority of signatories to the Code, namely National Olympic and Paralympic Committees are not involved in day to day anti-doping activities. On the basis of these results the WADA Foundation Board deferred its compliance reporting to 2008.
66. The Director-General of WADA explained that the Code was currently under review. Three phases of consultation are being undertaken with all stakeholders and this process will conclude at the 3rd World Conference on Doping in Sport on 15 to 17 November 2007 in Madrid, Spain where the amendments will be submitted to the WADA Foundation Board for approval. Several changes had been proposed during the initial phases of consultation, including: (1) greater flexibility to increase or decrease

sanctions; (2) increased incentives for those who admit to anti-doping rule violations or cooperate with investigating authorities; (3) clarification of investigative procedures and strengthening of evidentiary rules; (4) increased harmonization of certain provisions; and (5) strengthened reporting and confidentiality requirements. In response to a question from the Delegation of Finland, Mr Howman confirmed that no changes were anticipated to the principles included in the Code.

67. Mr Howman gave an overview of WADA's considerable work in the fields of science and medicine, which involved research, the accreditation of laboratories and the review of Therapeutic Use Exemptions (TUEs). In response to a question from the Delegation of Spain, it was clarified that a new protocol for human growth hormone (hGH) would be completed by mid 2007 and circulated to all laboratories. A new project to explore the feasibility of recording the biological parameters of athletes was also outlined and Mr Howman gave a detailed explanation of the procedural steps governing the development of the 2007 Prohibited List. The Director-General of WADA explained the need for a single Prohibited List so that athletes and athlete support personnel are fully aware of the prohibited substances and methods and so that uniform standards are applied by the competent national authorities and the sports movement throughout the world.
68. WADA had developed Regional Anti-Doping Organizations (RADOs) to assist small or less developed countries in a distinct geographical region in establishing effective anti-doping programmes through the coordination of testing, as well as the training and funding of a limited number of doping control officers. RADOs are also responsible for results management and appeals as well as the dissemination of education and information materials. To date, ten RADOs have been established across the 91 countries from Central and South America, East Africa, West Africa (Francophone countries), Southern Africa, Central and South East Asia, the Caribbean, Gulf States and Oceania. Future RADOs are planned for remaining countries in West Africa, South and West Asia, the Indian Ocean and Eastern Europe, involving a further 31 countries with a view to ensuring global coverage in 2010.
69. Education was another important area of focus for WADA where a number of projects had been undertaken in collaboration with UNESCO, the COE and the IOC among others. WADA was working to catalog the variety of education materials that had been developed across the globe in a digital library. It also manages a content-sharing programme encompassing a number of education materials which could be freely accessed by competent national authorities, sports organizations and anti-doping agencies. In this regard, both WADA and UNESCO offered their assistance with the development of education programmes in response to a request from the Delegation of Barbados. Travelling seminars, athlete outreach programmes and a social science research fund were other key projects. In response to a question from the Delegation of Namibia, Mr Howman explained that grants for the social science research programme were allocated in September every year and that sometimes key areas of research were identified.
70. Mr Howman concluded his presentation by highlighting recent developments in the fight against doping in sport. In particular, he highlighted the importance of government action to target organized doping, noting that the major breakthroughs (Festina in 1998, 1998 FINA World Swimming Championships, BALCO in 2003, Operation Gear Grinder in 2005 and the ongoing Operation Puerto) had all been driven by government agencies working in the domains of law enforcement, health, or internal revenue collection. Thus non-analytical investigations and the targeting of the athletes' entourage can have a significant impact on removing doping from sport.

71. The Delegations of Spain and Austria observed that curtailing the supply of doping substances was also essential, to which Mr Howman stated that WADA was currently in discussions with INTERPOL over the signing of a memorandum of understanding to coordinate action in this area.

72. The Director-General of WADA responded to a number of other questions from States Parties and observers. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea requested the establishment of a hotline to assist with technical questions relating to the approval of TUEs, particularly during major events. This suggestion was well received by WADA. The Delegations of Algeria, India and Indonesia requested assistance from WADA with the development of anti-doping programmes, training and the accreditation of laboratories. The Delegations of Bolivia and Argentina reiterated concerns about the high cost of undertaking analysis in accredited laboratories. In response, Mr Howman explained that the cost of analysis was set by individual laboratories; however, WADA could look at this issue during the accreditation process. The Delegation of Bolivia also observed that athletes who resided at high altitude possessed different blood parameters and raised the potential for the traditional consumption of coca leaf to contribute to positive test results. Mr Howman suggested that the development of the athlete passport would allow for the individual biological characteristics of athletes to be recognized. Moreover, the social science research programme would be an appropriate vehicle to investigate the impact of coca use. The Delegation of Jamaica expressed disappointment about the lack of practical information to assist signatories to meet their obligations under Article 5 of the Code, dealing with testing, in particular target testing or “intelligent testing”. The Jamaican Delegation also noted that care needed to be taken with respect to locating athletes for testing (whereabouts) in areas where precise physical addresses may not exist. The Delegation of Luxembourg concurred with this position, noting that it was dependent on the input of quality data under the ADAMS system developed by WADA. Mr Howman stated that these issues would also be considered during the review of the International Standard for Testing.

Agenda Item 5

Approval of the 2007 Prohibited List International Standard

73. The Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences introduced agenda item 5, as outlined in document ICDS/1CP/Doc.4, and reminded the Conference that the Prohibited List is an integral part of the Convention by virtue of its Article 4.3. Adoption of the 2007 Prohibited List is essential for a uniform application of anti-doping standards and to ensure a consistent global approach. The Legal Adviser provided clarification of Article 34 of the Convention. The Delegations of the following States Parties: Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Canada, Finland, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg and Sweden took the floor during the ensuing discussions. The Delegation of France and CIGEPS also took the floor as observers to the Conference.

DELIBERATION

74. The Delegation of Japan raised a procedural question with respect to the draft resolution. While the Delegation had no objection to the approval of the 2007 Prohibited List substantially, their understanding of the process under Article 34 of the Convention differed. The Delegation observed that under Article 34.1 of the Convention, the Director-General was required to notify States Parties of any changes made by WADA to the Prohibited List and the Standards for Granting Therapeutic Use Exemptions and that these changes should be proposed as amendments to the annexes. However, the report submitted by the Secretariat called for the adoption of the 2007 Prohibited List as an amendment to the annex. That is to say the Conference was not being asked to approve the changes, but to approve amendment of the Annex I by replacing the 2005 Prohibited List with the 2007 version.
75. The Delegation of Sweden suggested that this was a question of semantics. The 2007 Prohibited List was not a new list *per se* but included the changes made in 2006 and during the preparation of the 2007 Prohibited List. He also argued that this was a reference document under the notification provided by the Director-General. Moreover, in his opinion it was important to take a pragmatic approach, noting that the 2007 Prohibited List had come into effect on 1 January 2007 and was being utilized by all competent national authorities and sporting organizations. The Delegation of Luxembourg agreed with this perspective and stressed that the Convention had only just entered into force on 1 February 2007 and that it was necessary to immediately update Annex I. The representative of the Director-General concurred and noted that the changes made to the Prohibited List between 2005 and 2007 were outlined in paragraph 9 of the report prepared by the Secretariat.
76. The Delegation of Canada took the floor to clarify its understanding of Article 34 of the Convention. Canada took the position that Member States were able to indicate their objection to an amendment to the annexes at any time during the 45-day period following the notification by the Director-General under Article 34.3 of the Convention and that this position could potentially differ from the position taken during the Conference. In other words, the Conference would take a vote in principle concerning amendments to the annexes, however, all States Parties could reconsider their position following the notification by the Director-General and, if they so decided, inform the Secretariat of UNESCO that they did not accept the amendments. Accordingly, it interpreted the word “previously” in Article 34.3 as meaning *prior to* the entry into force of the amendments.

77. The Legal Adviser of UNESCO, Mr Yusuf, suggested that the Conference might benefit from clarification of Article 34 in its entirety. This provision was perhaps difficult to understand, except for those who had participated in the drafting of the Convention. He explained that the Conference, as the sovereign body of the Convention, would always be responsible for the approval of amendments to the annexes, either in session or via written procedure. Moreover, positive confirmation was not required for the amendment of the annexes, as two thirds of States Parties had to reject the amendments to prevent them from entering into force. He also noted that Article 34.3, as indicated by the Delegation of Canada, contained an opt-out provision, allowing States Parties 45 days to reflect on the decision of the Conference and, if they wished to do so, to express an objection in writing to the Secretariat of UNESCO. These elements were part of a fast-track procedure which allowed the Convention to be quickly amended to keep pace with changes made by WADA to the Prohibited List and the Standards for Granting TUEs. Further, the Legal Adviser clarified that those States Parties that did not accept the amendments would be bound by the annexes as not amended. In answer to a question from the Delegation of Argentina, the Legal Adviser confirmed that States Parties would be bound by the 2005 Prohibited List if they did not approve the 2007 Prohibited List. This was Annex I of the Convention when it was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO and when all States Parties concluded their constitutional processes and adhered to the Convention.
78. The Delegation of Japan, supported by the Delegations of Jamaica, France and CIGEPS, proposed an amendment to the draft resolution, calling for the Conference to approve the changes from the 2005 Prohibited List to the 2007 Prohibited List. This amendment was adopted by the Conference and it was noted that the 2007 Prohibited List would become Annex I of the Convention. The Conference adopted resolution 1CP/5 as amended.

RESOLUTION 1CP/5

The Conference of Parties,

1. *Having examined* document ICDS/1CP/Doc.4,
2. *Acknowledges* that the 2007 Prohibited List International Standard has been prepared by the World Anti-Doping Agency in accordance with the guidelines for the annual review and consequent publication of the Prohibited List, involving the circulation of a draft Prohibited List and consultation with government and sports movement stakeholders, as outlined in the World Anti-Doping Code,
3. *Recognizes* that the elimination of doping in sport is dependent upon harmonization of anti-doping standards in sport so that they are uniformly applied by competent national authorities and the sports movement,
4. *Approves* the changes from the 2005 Prohibited List International Standard to the 2007 Prohibited List International Standard.

Agenda Item 6

Monitoring Framework for the International Convention against Doping in Sport

79. The Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences introduced agenda item 6 and suggested that the Conference consider the structure and format of the monitoring system for the Convention. The primary objective was to establish a system that would allow all States Parties to report on measures taken by them for the purpose of complying with the provisions of the Convention at the second ordinary session of the Conference in 2009. During the discussion of this item interventions were made by the Delegations of the following States Parties: Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Canada, Finland, Jamaica, Japan, Lithuania, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Delegations of Mexico, Poland and the COE also made interventions as observers to the Conference, as did WADA as an advisory organization.

DELIBERATION

80. The Delegation of Japan expressed its desire to limit, as far as possible, the duplication of reporting requirements, noting that the competent national authorities of States Parties already had reporting obligations as signatories to the Code. Some States Parties also had obligations under the Anti-Doping Convention 1989. Subsequently, clarification was sought from WADA and the COE on the mechanism and costs of the monitoring systems they had established. The Delegation of WADA noted that they operated a computer-based system to monitor the Code and reiterated its willingness to collaborate with UNESCO to develop a monitoring system for the Convention. The Delegation of the COE observed that it too utilized a computer-based system, which cost €150,000 euros to establish. The COE also expressed willingness to cooperate with UNESCO to establish an effective monitoring tool.
81. The Delegation of Jamaica expressed its wish for a simple and effective computer-based monitoring tool, which would provide an overview of anti-doping policies within each State Party. This position was endorsed by the Delegation of Mozambique and other States Parties. However, the representative of the Director-General of UNESCO observed that it would be difficult to establish a computer-based system relying solely on funding under the regular budget of UNESCO. The funding allocated to the implementation of the Convention was on a strictly minimal basis in accordance with Article 32 of the Convention. Therefore, if the Conference wished to consider this option, additional funding would be required. The Fund could be used to cover the functioning costs of the Convention in this regard.
82. The Delegations of Canada and Sweden, whilst expressing a preference for an internet-based system, agreed that the Conference was unable to reach any final conclusions on this matter without understanding the financial implications of the various options. The Delegation of Barbados also observed that the Conference did not need to make a definitive decision on the monitoring system at this time, given that the second ordinary session of the Conference will be held in 2009. There was sufficient time to obtain detailed costings and for a thorough examination of this issue. The Delegation of Jamaica supported this intervention requesting a detailed financial analysis of the options to establish a monitoring system, which would meet the needs of States Parties in the foreseeable future. The Delegation of Mexico also asked the Secretariat to obtain further information on various funding options, including the possible use of the Fund.

83. As a means to resolve this issue, the Delegation of Sweden proposed an amendment to paragraph three of the resolution to include reference to the words “cost effective”. It suggested that this amendment would allow for either a paper-based or computer-based system, whilst providing clear direction to the Secretariat to give due consideration to costs. The Delegations of Argentina, Australia, Canada and Poland took the floor in support of this proposal and the Conference agreed to amend the resolution accordingly.
84. While the above decision helped to define the general parameters of the monitoring system, the Secretariat requested that the Conference provide clear direction on how the final decision on this matter should be reached. Two options were proposed to address these governance issues. The first option was the establishment of a small working group, composed of the officials elected under item 1.2 of the agenda, to work with the Secretariat to examine the monitoring options. The Delegations of Jamaica, New Zealand and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland supported this idea. The working group could help to crystallize the issues and support the work of the Secretariat. It was also clarified that any costs associated with convening this group would be borne by the participants in response to an observation from the representative of the Director-General that there was no identified source of funding.
85. The alternative was to direct the Secretariat to prepare a report on the monitoring options for the consideration of all States Parties. This option was favoured by the Delegations of Barbados, Spain and others. They argued that all States Parties needed to agree on the monitoring system and to approve any expenditure, particularly if additional funding was required. They also raised legal questions about the constitution of a working group. In this regard, the representative of the Legal Adviser noted that the Rules of Procedure adopted under item 3 did not establish a bureau and there were no provisions allowing the Conference to delegate its decision-making authority to a subsidiary body. As the sovereign body of the Convention, the Conference needed to reach a decision on this matter, either in session or via written correspondence. On the basis of this advice, the Delegation of Barbados proposed an amendment which directed the Secretariat to undertake a cost-benefit analysis of the options and to submit a report to all States Parties out of session for a decision. This amendment was widely accepted.
86. The Chairperson concluded the discussion of agenda item 6 by adopting the draft resolution as amended during the debate on this item. However, there were several questions of clarification following the approval of the resolution. The Delegation of Finland called upon the Secretariat to give an indicative time frame for the report. In response, the representative of the Director-General indicated that this report could be circulated for a decision in autumn 2007. The Delegations of Sweden and Barbados also questioned the utility of paragraph 3 of the resolution, given that paragraph 4 outlined the process for the establishment of the monitoring system. It was noted by the representative of the Director-General that it remained the responsibility of the Secretariat to prepare the questionnaire, regardless of the form it would take, and that it was tasked with facilitating the reporting of States Parties under the Convention. There was no overlap between these paragraphs; they described the duties arising under the Convention for the Secretariat and the States Parties. Resolution number 1CP/6 was adopted as amended.

RESOLUTION 1CP/6

The Conference of Parties,

1. *Having examined* document ICDS/1CP/Doc.5,

2. *Recognizing* that the system established by the World Anti-Doping Agency for monitoring compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code and the monitoring system developed by the Council of Europe to monitor compliance with the Anti-Doping Convention 1989 are deemed to be good practice models in the fight against doping in sport,
3. *Requests* the Secretariat to prepare a simple and cost-effective questionnaire on the measures taken by States Parties for the purpose of complying with the provisions of the Convention to facilitate reporting under Article 31 of the Convention;
4. *Requests* the Secretariat to prepare those options for a simple and cost-effective monitoring system and to circulate those options to States Parties for a decision through written procedure;
5. *Requests* the Secretariat to enter into discussions with the World Anti-Doping Agency in the first instance, but also with the Council of Europe, on options for harmonizing questions and options to develop a computer-based monitoring tool;
6. *Requests* the Secretariat to prepare a detailed report for the next ordinary session of the Conference of Parties on measures to improve the monitoring framework.

Agenda Item 7

Administration of the Fund for the Elimination of Doping in Sport

87. The Chairperson called upon the Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences to introduce agenda item 7. Mr Sané asked the Conference to consider a framework for the Fund as outlined in document ICDS/1CP/Doc.6, which articulated basic principles of operation, including giving priority to projects from least developed States Parties or low-income countries. It was also suggested that each State Party may submit only three requests during any biennium and that no new financial contribution be paid until the applicant has submitted all the financial and evaluation reports for previous projects. The Conference was asked to concentrate on the forms of assistance proposed by the Secretariat and to prioritize areas of expenditure.
88. During the discussion of this item, interventions were made by the Delegations of the following States Parties: Australia, Barbados, Canada, China, Denmark, Greece, Jamaica, Finland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Monaco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Several States Parties outlined contributions to the Fund. The Delegation of Spain stated its intention to contribute US \$40,000 and the Delegation of Greece announced a contribution of 40,000 euros per annum. The Delegation of China also agreed to contribute, while Finland, New Zealand and the United Kingdom were considering their abilities to make financial contributions.

DELIBERATION

89. The Delegation of Jamaica opened the discussion by observing that the resources in the Fund could be used to cover some of the functioning costs of the Convention under Articles 18 and 32.3 of the Convention. The latter article in particular states that "the financing for the secretariat from the regular budget shall be done on a strictly minimal basis, it being understood that voluntary funding should also be provided to support the Convention." The Delegation also observed that under Article 30.1(e) of the Convention, the Fund should be used for any monitoring mechanism or measure that goes beyond Article 31. These two aspects should be kept in mind by the Conference in reaching any conclusions on this use of the Fund.
90. In response to this intervention, the Representative of the Director-General outlined the structure of the document prepared by the Secretariat. He drew particular attention to the paragraphs outlining the possible forms of assistance including: (1) participation; (2) testing programmes; (3) policy advice; (4) education; and (5) mentoring or capacity-building. Paragraphs 20 to 23 also mentioned the possible use of the Fund to cover some of the functioning costs of the Convention. The representative of the Director-General also explained that UNESCO would work in partnership with other agencies in response to a question from the Delegation of Spain.
91. The Delegation of the Russian Federation took the floor to seek clarification about the ability of the Conference to establish subsidiary bodies or for a Bureau to oversee the allocation of the Fund. However, the representative of the Director-General noted that there were neither provisions within the Convention or the Rules of Procedure on this matter nor funding to establish working groups. Therefore, the Conference should decide on the principles for the administration of the Fund and the priority areas and the Secretariat will manage allocation of the Fund in accordance with these decisions.

92. The Delegation of Australia thanked the Secretariat for the production of a comprehensive document. It also acknowledged that every effort had been made to ensure the transparency of decision-making around projects initiated by the Secretariat, in that these would need the prior approval of the Conference. The Delegation questioned reporting arrangements for the Fund, noting that States Parties would benefit from annual financial statements particularly as the Conference would meet only once every two years and it questioned why the report did not indicate the priorities for investment. The Representative of the Director-General indicated that the reporting issues could be looked at further, however, it was the function of the Conference under Article 30.1(c) to adopt a plan for the use of the Fund. The Delegation of Sweden concurred noting that it was the responsibility of the Conference to select from the “smorgasbord” of options presented in the document.
93. The Delegation of Barbados supported the allocation of funding for all forms of assistance except the participation in the Conference. Putting aside the questionable benefits of such an investment, allocation of funding in this regard would be highly subjective without robust criteria. A number of delegations including Australia, Finland and Jamaica shared concerns about the use of the Fund to allow some States Parties to attend the Conference, arguing that this would do little to enhance global anti-doping efforts.
94. The Delegations of Australia, Denmark and Sweden called for priority to be given to projects which contributed to the establishment of effective anti-doping programmes in low income or developing States Parties. The Delegation of Denmark, which confirmed a contribution of US \$35,000, suggested that education, policy advice and doping controls were its priority. The Delegation of Canada agreed with these priorities and urged that the use of the Fund be complementary to the actions being undertaken by WADA, the COE and others. The Delegations of Finland and Norway concurred and placed special emphasis on education and policy advice. The Delegation of Tunisia stated that education was of the utmost importance. It was precisely because of UNESCO’s mandate in education that the Convention was elaborated by the Organization. The Fund should therefore seek to build on this platform and possible synergies. The Delegation of Jamaica agreed that education was a priority, but requested that any education programmes recognize oral as well as written traditions.
95. The Delegation of Barbados took the floor to suggest that there was a degree of consensus emerging on the priority areas. It proposed that an informal group meet in the margins of the Conference to clearly articulate the principal areas for investment. The Delegation also suggested that a mechanism needed to be established for the approval of projects in the two-year period between the meetings of the Conference. Subsequently, an informal group, including those States Parties that had announced contributions to the Fund, was requested to report back to the Conference the next day.

[Room IV, 7 February 2007, 10.54 a.m.]

96. On 7 February 2007, the Conference recommenced its discussion on the Fund with the recommendations of the informal group, which included the Delegations of Australia, Canada, Denmark, Spain and Sweden. This group identified three priority areas: (1) education projects focusing on youth and sports organizations; (2) policy advice; and (3) mentoring or capacity-development programmes. The group also proposed a number of amendments to the draft resolution. One amendment stated that the operation of the Fund should complement existing projects undertaken by WADA and other organizations and avoid duplication. Further, recipients of funding should be required to provide financial or non-financial contributions to the projects. Finally, the Delegations requested the preparation of an annual report on the status of the Fund, including requests received, the projects funded and the results achieved, as well as an itemized statement of accounting. The members of this group took the floor to explain

the basis on which they had identified these priorities. It was noted that these should be reviewed at the next ordinary session of the Conference.

97. The Delegation of Luxembourg spoke in support of the priorities identified above. It noted that a large number of doping controls were being undertaken by WADA and by sporting organizations, whereas education, policy and legal issues within governments attracted less attention. The Delegations of Monaco, China and Tunisia were very supportive of the priorities identified and emphasized the need for school-based education programmes. The Delegations of Jamaica, Greece, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and others also spoke in support of the priorities identified by the working group. The Delegation of New Zealand agreed with the three priority areas which accorded with the objectives behind its support of the Fund, particularly that it would be spent in country rather than on administration and that there were robust reporting mechanisms.
98. The Delegation of Barbados, while supporting the three priority areas, also wished to retain testing. Drug control is an important part of the fight against doping in sport and a key obligation under Article 11 of the Convention, however, the costs of testing were preclusive for some States Parties. The use of the Fund for this purpose would also complement the activities of WADA in establishing regional anti-doping organizations. The Delegation of Mauritius also supported the allocation of resources to testing programmes alongside the three other areas. The Delegation of Denmark explained that testing was excluded from the priority areas because of the sheer number already being undertaken in the world; a similar level of investment was now required in prevention through education. The Delegation of Barbados welcomed this explanation but reiterated its wish for testing to be included in the list of priority areas. Assistance with doping controls was essential to help States Parties to meet their obligations under the Convention and would help to ensure testing outside of large international sporting competitions, in particular during regional sporting events. The Delegation therefore suggested an amendment to the proposal of the working group to include an additional item: (4) testing programmes. The Delegation of Mauritius seconded this amendment.
99. After lengthy discussions, the Delegation of Mozambique took the floor to suggest that this matter be resolved by a vote. In accordance with Rule 13.2, any decisions not taken by consensus shall be taken by a majority of the States Parties present and voting. The Delegation of Jamaica seconded the suggestion to vote on this issue. The amendment of the informal working group to give priority to: (1) education projects focusing on youth and sports organizations; (2) policy advice; and (3) mentoring or capacity development programmes was taken first. In response to a point of order, the Secretariat explained that in accordance with Rule 13.8 of the Rules of Procedure when two or more amendments to a proposal are moved, the Conference shall first vote on the amendment deemed by the Chairperson or presiding officer to be furthest removed in substance from the original proposal. This explanation was followed by a request from the Delegation of Barbados for both proposals to be considered side by side.
100. Vice-Chairperson Mr Carlos Sousa assumed the position of Chairperson following the departure of Mr Fetisov and decided that the amendment proposed by the informal working group would be voted on first. The vote was conducted by a show of hands. Of the 27 States Parties voting, 25 voted in favour of amending the resolution as outlined above and two voted against. Given the outcome of this vote it was decided that a vote need not be taken on the other proposal on the table which included drug testing.
101. The Conference also adopted an amendment to paragraph 5, subparagraph 9 of the draft resolution, to state that where there is no National Commission, prioritization of projects should be through a designated government channel. This amendment provided consistency with paragraph 5, subparagraph 2. The Conference adopted resolution number 1CP/7 as amended.

RESOLUTION 1CP/7

The Conference of Parties,

1. *Having examined* document ICDS/1CP/Doc.6,
2. *Recognizing* that the elimination of doping in sport is dependent upon the development of a network of competent national authorities across the world with the requisite capacity to implement effective anti-doping programmes,
3. *Acknowledges* the establishment of a special account for the administration of the Fund for Elimination of Doping in Sport,
4. *Acknowledges* that World Anti-Doping Agency, the Council of Europe and other organizations have excellent projects in several areas covered by the Voluntary Fund and wishes to be complementary to those projects while avoiding duplication,
5. *Agrees* that the following principles and procedures shall govern the administration of the Fund for Elimination of Doping in Sport:
 - Assistance may be accorded only to States Parties to the Convention and allocated by the Conference of Parties to cover, on a minimal basis, both the functioning costs of the Convention and anti-doping education programmes developed by UNESCO.
 - Requests shall be submitted to the Director-General of UNESCO by States Parties, through the National Commission for UNESCO, or where there is no National Commission, through a designated government channel.
 - Projects initiated by the Secretariat shall require the prior approval of the Conference of Parties.
 - Each request by a State Party shall not be in excess of US \$10,000 for national projects.
 - Each sub-regional, inter-regional or regional project submitted by States Parties shall not be in excess of \$25,000.
 - Requests will be treated as advance payments which must be based on the receipt of a detailed work plan including the costs of the specific elements that make up the contribution.
 - Applications shall have four compulsory prerequisites. States Parties in submitting the applications must agree:
 - (i) to assume financial and administrative responsibility for implementing the project;
 - (ii) in the case of a financial contribution, to submit to the Director-General at the close of the project an itemized certified financial statement, together with supporting documentation (invoices etc.), showing that the funds provided have been used for the implementation of the project and return to UNESCO any unspent balance;

- (iii) to provide a reasonable financial contribution or non-financial contribution (such as human resources, equipment, office space etc.) in each national, sub-national, inter-regional or regional project submitted;
 - (iv) to provide, on a compulsory basis, a detailed evaluation report on the results of the activities financed and the outcomes achieved.
- No new financial contribution will be paid until the applicant has submitted all the financial and evaluation reports for projects previously approved and for which payments were made.
 - Each State Party may submit three requests during any biennium. These requests shall be numbered in order of priority as determined by the National Commission and may only be changed by an official letter from the National Commission, or where there is no National Commission, through a designated government channel.
 - The Director-General shall give priority to projects from least developed States Parties or low-income countries as defined by the United Nations Economic and Social Council's Committee for Development Policy, or projects which enhance the capacity of those States Parties.
 - A list of the projects will be prepared by the Secretariat for support under the special account. The Secretariat shall also have responsibility for allocation of financial contributions, receipt of itemized statement accounting for the activities executed, verifying that the funds have been used for the implementation of the project and reviewing the project evaluation reports,
6. *Approves* allocation of the Voluntary Fund subject to available resources, to States Parties to assist with: (1) educational projects focusing on youth and sports organizations; (2) policy advice; and (3) mentoring or capacity development programmes. These priorities will remain in place until the next ordinary session of the Conference of Parties. A guideline for the allocation of the Voluntary Fund to these priorities will be half to education and the remainder divided between policy advice and capacity-building;
 7. *Requests* the Secretariat to develop the above-mentioned principles and procedures governing the administration of the Fund for the Elimination of Doping in Sport as well as application forms and model documents;
 8. *Approves* funding, subject to available resources, for the Secretariat to develop anti-doping education programmes in accordance with resolution 5, subparagraph 1 above;
 9. *Requests* the Secretariat to report to States Parties in writing, on an annual basis, on applications for assistance received, projects supported including results achieved, and an itemized, certified statement showing expenditure between priority areas identified in resolution 6 above;
 10. *Requests* the Secretariat to prepare a report on the operation of the Voluntary Fund and options in relation to the above-mentioned principles, procedures and allocation of priorities for consideration at the next ordinary session of the Conference of Parties.

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business: Invitations to the Conference

102. Acting Chairperson, Mr Carlos Sousa called upon the Delegations of Argentina, Monaco, and Tunisia to introduce their draft resolution concerning attendance of future sessions of the Conference by a range of intergovernmental organizations. This item was first raised under item 2 of the Agenda. During the discussion of this item, interventions were made by the Delegations of Argentina, Finland, Jamaica, Monaco, New Zealand, Niger, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The representative of the Director-General also presented an amended text which accorded with usual formalities.

DELIBERATION

103. The Delegation of Argentina took the floor to reaffirm its desire for other intergovernmental organizations to be invited to future sessions of the Conference. It felt strongly that anti-doping efforts would be strengthened by the involvement of a wide range of participants in the implementation of the Convention. Other organizations should be recognized as important to the work of the Conference as they represent an expression of interest by regions that may have special needs or lack expertise in anti-doping. Therefore, it was requested that the Director-General take the necessary steps to achieve this objective. The Delegation of Monaco endorsed these comments and proposed amendments to the text as outlined by the representative of the Director-General to include regional and continental organizations. A reference to Article 29 of the Convention, which states that the Conference may decide to invite other relevant organizations as observers, was included in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The Delegation of Tunisia seconded these amendments and raised a procedural question concerning the process for the incorporation of this resolution into the Rules of Procedure, adopted under item 3 of the Agenda, which gave rise to considerable discussion.
104. The Delegation of Monaco was the first to take the floor. Its understanding was that discussions on the question of “participation” under item 3 of the agenda had been postponed subject to the resolution of this matter. On this basis, it would be possible to amend the Rules of Procedure to annex the draft resolution. However, the representative of the Director-General noted that such an approach was problematic because the Rules of Procedure had already been unanimously adopted. Moreover, the Rules of Procedure had been adopted in their entirety and that there was no suspension of discussions. Technically the Conference could amend the Rules of Procedure if two thirds of States Parties agreed, however, the legal merits of such an approach were debatable. The resolution, as it was currently drafted, merely asked the Secretariat to establish a list of organizations to be invited to the next session of the Conference. Such a function already existed under Article 29 of the Convention and Rule 2.3. Moreover, the resolution did not actually outline the organizations to be invited and therefore did not add anything to the existing provisions. Rather than attempting to amend the Rules of Procedure the Conference might be better served by adopting a resolution on this matter.
105. The Delegation of Tunisia noted that the proposed resolution was inspired by the discussions that took place at the time of the adoption of the Rules of Procedure. There was a clear request to include regional and continental organizations and an objective of increasing the levels of participation at future sessions of the Conference. If there were legal difficulties arising from annexing the resolution to the Rules of Procedure, another solution should be sought. The Delegation of Argentina, while accepting the

advice of the representative of the Legal Adviser, requested that a list of organizations be prepared and made official so that these observers could be present at the next Conference.

106. The Delegation of Jamaica recognised the spirit of the draft resolution, however, Rule 2.3 already allowed for the invitation of any relevant organizations as identified by the Conference and nothing would be gained by amending this provision. The Delegation of Jamaica also expressed its disappointment that the resolution did not contain an indicative list of organizations. The Conference should decide now which organizations it would like to invite. In the absence of this list, all States Parties were encouraged to submit to the Secretariat details of particular organizations at a later date.
107. The Delegation of New Zealand affirmed its support for greater participation in the Conference and its desire for a stand-alone resolution. Invitations to the Conference were not procedural or legal matters, but an opportunity for States Parties to give clear direction to the Secretariat of their wishes. As suggested by the Delegation of Finland, the adoption of the resolution would send a strong message to the Secretariat to invite a range of organizations to the next session of the Conference. The Delegations of Niger and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concurred, noting that once the resolution was adopted by the Conference the Secretariat would ensure its implementation. The desire for a universal instrument and for broad participation in future sessions of the Conference would thus be assured.
108. The Acting Chairperson, recognizing that there was a clear consensus on this issue, called for the adoption of the resolution. However, before a decision was taken, the Delegation of Tunisia proposed several refinements to the text which were roundly endorsed by the Conference. The Conference adopted resolution number 1CP/8 as amended.

RESOLUTION 1CP/8

The Conference of Parties,

1. *Welcoming warmly* the entry into force, on 1 February 2007, of the International Convention against Doping in Sport and the keen interest shown by many States in acceding to it rapidly, particularly those that have been associated with it and actively participated in its preparation,
2. *Mindful of* the exceptional role played by both intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations – regional and continental alike – in promoting the adoption of the Convention, which should also be very important for its implementation,
3. *Invites* the UNESCO Secretariat, pursuant to and in the spirit of Article 29 of the International Convention against Doping in Sport, to establish a non-exhaustive list, which can therefore be added to and updated regularly, of the intergovernmental bodies, international federations and the associations and other bodies concerned by and/or interested in the fight against doping in sport, that will be invited as observers to the sessions of the Conference of States Parties to the International Convention, in order to secure the widest possible promotion and the effective, efficient and concrete application of the instrument at the national, regional and international levels.

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business: Relationship with WADA

109. The Delegation of Jamaica proposed a draft resolution calling for issues concerning the relationship with WADA and its funding to be included as a standing item on the agenda of the Conference of Parties. During the discussion of this item interventions were made by the Delegations of Jamaica, Namibia, Spain and Sweden.

DELIBERATION

110. The Delegation of Jamaica noted that the Conference had undertaken all of its functions under the Convention with one exception. There had been no discussion of Article 30.1(b) of the Convention, which states that it is a function of the Conference of Parties to discuss the relationship with WADA and study the mechanisms of funding of the agency's annual core budget. It therefore proposed that issues concerning the relationship with WADA and its funding should be a standing item on the agenda of the Conference. In explaining the rationale for this proposed resolution, the Jamaican Delegation suggested that there could be aspects of WADA operations that warranted closer attention and that concerns over its funding remained. The equal funding of WADA was a key issue during the intergovernmental meeting of experts during the development of the Convention and a consensus position was only reached with the addition of this particular article. Moreover, States non-Parties should be invited to participate in these discussions because the Conference provided the only forum for all governments to discuss anti-doping issues.
111. The Delegation of Sweden did not support the adoption of a resolution on this item, noting that the 41 States Parties to the Convention did not have a mandate to consider what was essentially an internal matter for WADA. Over 140 governments currently make annual payments to WADA under an agreed funding matrix, which seeks to take into account the capacity of each government to pay and each nation's level of involvement in international sport. However, the Delegation of Sweden suggested that this issue could be revisited in the future, when the majority of governments in the world had become States Parties to the Convention. The Delegations of Spain and Namibia concurred with this position.
112. The Delegation of Jamaica took the floor again to clarify its position. It reiterated the fact that the Convention expressly provided a function for the Conference to consider WADA's funding and that all governments, including States non-Parties, should determine this matter. The Delegation also observed that some governments, particularly from South America and the Caribbean, continue to have concerns about the regional apportionment of WADA's annual core budget across governments. This was determined by the International Intergovernmental Consultative Group on Anti-Doping (IICGADS) at a meeting in South Africa in 2001, where many governments were not represented. While not wishing to discuss this matter now, the Delegation of Jamaica called for this issue to be brought before the next ordinary session of the Conference. However, the proposed resolution of Jamaica was not supported by the Conference.

[Room IV, 7 February 2007, 3.25 p.m.]

Agenda Item 9.1

Date and Venue of the Second Session of the Conference of Parties

113. Acting Chairperson, Mr Carlos Sousa, introduced agenda item 9 and drew attention to document ICDS/1CP/Doc.7 prepared by the Secretariat concerning the date and venue of the second session of the Conference. The Delegation of Jamaica also made a short intervention concerning this item.

DELIBERATION

114. The Delegation of Jamaica took the floor to highlight timing issues concerning the publication of the Prohibited List by WADA on 1 October every year and the provisions of the specific amendment procedure for the annexes to the Convention. It was noted that if the second ordinary session of the Conference was held in October 2009, closely following the notification of the Director-General under Article 34.1 of the Convention, States Parties may not have had sufficient time to fully consider amendments to the annexes. Therefore, any decisions taken by the Conference on the amendments to the annexes would be taken 'in principle'. States Parties would still have 45 days following the notification by the Director-General of the decisions taken by the Conference (Article 34.3) to express a contrary position. The Conference adopted resolution number 1CP/9.1.

RESOLUTION 1CP/9.1

The Conference of Parties,

1. *Having examined* document ICDS/1CP/Doc.7,
2. *Decides* to convene its ordinary sessions every second year at UNESCO Headquarters in the period closely following the ordinary session of the General Conference of UNESCO, account being taken of the time frame established under Article 34 of the Convention for the specific amendment procedure concerning its annexes.

[Room IV, 7 February 2007, 3.50 p.m.]

Agenda Item 9.2

Oral Report of the Rapporteur of the First Session of the Conference of Parties

115. The Acting Chairperson called upon the Rapporteur to present his oral report. Mr Kamal Guemmar provided an informative and comprehensive summary of the deliberations over the three days and the decisions taken. This oral report was adopted by acclamation and the Rapporteur was warmly thanked by the Acting Chairperson for his excellent work.

[Room IV, 7 February 2007, 3.50 p.m.]

Agenda Item 9.3

Closure of the First Session of the Conference of Parties by the Chairperson

116. The Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences warmly thanked Chairpersons Mr Viacheslav Fetisov and Mr Carlos Sousa for their leadership during the Conference and management of the debates, which allowed a wide range of complex issues to be resolved. He noted that formal rules of procedure had been approved by the Conference and key decisions had been made in respect of the Prohibited List, the Fund for the Elimination of Doping in Sport and the monitoring of the Convention. Mr Sané also thanked the Vice-Chairpersons, Rapporteur, the Secretariat and all of the participants for their worthwhile contributions.
117. The Acting Chairperson, having expressed his appreciation to the Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences, the Secretariat, the participants and interpreters for their efficient and dedicated work, declared the first session of the Conference closed.

[The Conference concluded at 4.00 p.m. on 7 February 2007]

Annex I: List of Participants

States Parties

| | |
|------------|--|
| Albania | Tatiana GJONAJ |
| Algeria | Sbih MISSOUM, Kamel BOUGHABA, Mokhtar ATTAR, Farida AKHDACHE Kamal GUEMMAR |
| Argentina | Claudio MORRESSI, Miguel Angel ESTRELLA, Daniel JACUBOVICH, Miguel Angel HILDMANN, Luis María SOBRON |
| Australia | James CAMERON, Sally MANSFIELD, Anne SIWICKI |
| Barbados | Anthony P WOOD, Adrian LORDE, Neil MURRELL |
| Bolivia | Ivo ETEROVIC, Angela AYLLON |
| Canada | Gilbert LAURIN, René BOUCHARD, Sue NEILL, Jean-Pierre LEFEBVRE, Mary WARREN, Dominique LEVASSEUR, André BUIST, Pierre LEMIEUX |
| China | JIANG Zhixue, HAN Bing, WANG Xinzhai, ZHANG Yaxin |
| Denmark | Torben HOFFELDT |
| Finland | Raija MATTILA, Juha VIERTOLA, Pia HILLO |
| Greece | Georgios ORFANOS, Georges ANASTASSOPOULOS, Iphigenie CONTOLEONTOS, Maria LEVANTI, Iro ORFANO, Calliopi NEDELKOU, Chaza SPILIOPOULOU |
| Iceland | Líney R HALLDÓRSDÓTTIR |
| Jamaica | Renee Anne SHIRLEY, Herbert ELLIOTT, David PRENDERGAST Angella DARBY |
| Japan | Toshiei MIZUOCHI, Hiroshi KURISAKI, Noboru NISHISAKA, Mikio HIBINO, Hidetaka NAKAMURA, Shin ASAKAWA, Junichi KUSANO, Seiichi KONDO, Yuzuru IMASATO, Tsunashige SHIOTORI, Nana OYAMADA-BISCEGLIA, Sanae SASAJIMA, Takako ENSO-BUTEL |
| Latvia | Edgars ŠNEPS, Diana PUTNINA, Liene KOZLOVSKA |
| Lithuania | Algirdas RASLANAS, Kornelija TIESNESYTE, Ieva LUKOSIUTE-STANIKUNIENE, Ina MARČIULIONYTĖ |
| Luxembourg | Hubert WURTH, Robert SCHULER, Elisabeth CARDOSO JORDÃO, Joël BEREND, Anik SAX |
| Malaysia | Azalina OTHMAN SAID, Ramlan ABDUL AZIZ, Tony MARIADASS, Nishel KUMAR |
| Mauritius | Indira Savitree THACOR-SIDAYA, Jay T REETOO, Anbanaden VEERASAMY |
| Monaco | Jacques BOISSON, Sylvie BERTRAND, Jacques MICHEL, Corinne BOURDAS-TAGAIL |
| Mozambique | Carlos SOUSA |

| | |
|--|--|
| Namibia | Vetumbuavi S VEII, Benjamin II NAOBEB |
| Netherlands | Rob DE VRIES, Hermann RAM, Peter DE KLERK, Gerk NUMAN |
| New Zealand | Andrew FIELDSEND, Linda TE PUNI |
| Niger | Inoussa OUSSEINI, Issa Boubaca TANKARI, Adani ILLO |
| Nigeria | Abba ABDULLAHI YOLA, Bello KAOJE |
| Norway | Per Kristian AASMUNDSTAD, Øyvind SJURSEN |
| Peru | Harry BELEVAN, Carlos HERRERA, Mario BUSTAMANTE |
| Romania | Graziela Elena VAJIALA, Mia LAMOR, Claudia ILIE, Carmen TROCAN, Dumitru PREDA |
| Russian Federation | Viacheslav FETISOV, Vladimir KALAMANOV, Dmitry TUGARIN, Mikhail KHOREV, Valéry ROUNOV, Sergey TITKOV, Victor FEDORINOV, Artem KOZVONIN, Vasily POPOV |
| South Africa | Gert OOSTHUIZEN, Gregory FREDERICKS, Bernardus VAN DER SPUY, Nomakephu Alice KOTELO, Sipiwo RINI, Pule BOSELONG, Jonas MOGANO |
| Spain | Jaime LISSAVETZKY DÍEZ, Manuel FONSECA, Javier ODRIOSOLA, Matilde GARCÍA DUARTE, Cecilia RODRIGUEZ BUENO, José María ALISES SANZ, Myriam PALLARÉS CORTÓN |
| Sweden | Tomas JOHANSSON, Kristina OLINDER, Anders FALK |
| Tunisia | Raouf NAJAR, Zied BOUZOUITA, Zakia BARTEGI, Latifa CHERIF |
| Ukraine | Viktor KORZH, Ivan KURLISHCHUK, Oleksandr VASHENKO, Myroslav DUTCHAK, Oleh YATSENKIVSKYI |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | Matthew READER, Joanne CLINTON, Andy PARKINSON |

Member States of UNESCO represented by observers

Andorra, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, Cyprus, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Macedonia Former Republic of Yugoslavia, France, Gabon, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mexico, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United States of America, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Advisory organizations

World Anti-Doping Organization (WADA)

Organizations represented as observers

Council of Europe (COE) and the Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport (CIGEPS)

UNESCO

Director-General of UNESCO

Assistant Director-General for Social and Human Sciences

Director of Social Sciences Research and Policy, Social and Human Sciences

UNESCO Secretariat

Programme Specialist: Anti-Doping, Section for Youth, Sport and Physical Education, Social and Human Sciences

Annex II: Rules of Procedure

I PARTICIPATION

Rule 1 – Chief participants

The representatives of all States Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport (hereinafter referred to as “the Convention”) may take part, with the right to vote, in the work of the Conference of Parties to the Convention (hereinafter referred to as the “Conference”).

Rule 2 – Representatives, advisory organization and observers

- 2.1. The representatives of Member States of UNESCO not parties to the Convention and permanent observer missions to UNESCO may participate in the work of the Conference as observers without the right to vote.
- 2.2. In accordance with Article 29 of the Convention, representatives of the World Anti-Doping Agency may take part in the work of the Conference in an advisory capacity without the right to vote.
- 2.3. In accordance with Article 29 of the Convention, representatives of the International Olympic Committee, International Paralympic Committee, Council of Europe and Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport (CIGEPS) as well as other relevant organizations invited by the Conference may participate in the work thereof as observers, without the right to vote.
- 2.4. Representatives of the United Nations and organizations of the United Nations system and other intergovernmental organizations which have concluded mutual representation agreements with UNESCO, as well as observers of intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations invited by the Director-General, may participate in the work of the Conference, without the right to vote.

II ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE

Rule 3 – Meetings of the Conference

Pursuant to Article 28.2 of the Convention, the Conference shall meet in ordinary session in principle once every two years. It may meet in extraordinary session if it so decides or at the request of at least one third of the States Parties, provided that the necessary resources are available.

Rule 4 – Election of officers

At the beginning of its session, the Conference shall elect a Chairperson, one or more Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur with due regard being given to ensuring an equitable geographical distribution.

Rule 5 – Duties of the Chairperson

- 5.1 In addition to exercising the powers which are conferred upon him/her elsewhere by the present Rules, the Chairperson shall open and close each session of the Conference. He/She shall direct the discussions, ensure observance of these Rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to the vote and announce decisions.

He/She shall rule on points of order and, subject to the present Rules, shall control the proceedings and the maintenance of order. He/She shall not vote, but he/she may instruct another member of his/her delegation to vote on his/her behalf.

- 5.2 If the Chairperson finds it necessary to be absent during a meeting, or any part thereof, he/she shall designate one of the Vice-Chairpersons to take his/her place. A Vice-Chairperson acting as Chairperson shall have the same powers and duties as the Chairperson.
- 5.3 At the opening of each session of the Conference the Chairperson elected at the previous session or, in his/her absence, the head of the delegation from which the Chairperson of the previous session was elected shall preside until the Conference has elected the Chairperson for the session.

III CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

Rule 6 – Public nature of meetings

Meetings shall be held in public unless decided otherwise by the Conference.

Rule 7 – Quorum

- 7.1 A quorum shall consist of a majority of the States Parties referred to in Rule 1 and represented at the Conference.
- 7.2 The Conference shall not decide on any matter unless a quorum is present.

Rule 8 – Order and time limit of speakers

- 8.1 The Chairperson shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their wish to speak.
- 8.2 For the convenience of the discussion, the Chairperson may limit the time to be allowed to each speaker.
- 8.3 The consent of the Chairperson must be obtained whenever an observer wishes to address the Conference.

Rule 9 – Points of order

- 9.1 During a discussion, a representative of a State Party referred to in Rule 1 may raise a point of order; the Chairperson or presiding officer shall immediately decide upon such a point of order.
- 9.2 An appeal may be made against the ruling of the Chairperson or presiding officer. Such an appeal shall be put to the vote immediately and the Chairperson's or presiding officer's ruling shall stand, unless overruled by a majority of the States Parties present and voting.

Rule 10 – Procedural motions

- 10.1 During a discussion, any representative of a State Party referred to in Rule 1 may move the suspension or adjournment of the meeting or the adjournment or closure of the debate.

- 10.2 Such a motion shall be put to the vote immediately. Subject to Rule 9.1, such motions shall have precedence in the following order over all other proposals or motions before the meeting:
- (a) suspension of the meeting;
 - (b) adjournment of the meeting;
 - (c) adjournment of the debate on the question under discussion;
 - (d) closure of the debate on the question under discussion.

Rule 11 – Working languages

- 11.1 The working languages of the Conference shall be Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.
- 11.2 Speeches made at the Conference in one of the working languages shall be interpreted into the other languages.

Rule 12 – Resolutions and amendments

- 12.1 Draft resolutions and amendments may be proposed by the States Parties referred to in Rule 1 and shall be transmitted in writing to the Secretariat of the Conference, which shall circulate copies to all participants.
- 12.2 As a general rule, no draft resolution or amendment shall be discussed or put to the vote unless it has been circulated sufficiently in advance to all participants in the working languages of the Conference.

Rule 13 – Voting

- 13.1 The representative of each State Party referred to in Rule 1 shall have one vote in the Conference.
- 13.2 Any decisions not taken by consensus shall be taken by a majority of the States Parties present and voting, subject to the provisions of Rules 7.2, 14.1 and 17.
- 13.3 For the purpose of the present Rules, the expression "States Parties present and voting" shall mean States Parties casting an affirmative or negative vote. States Parties abstaining from voting shall be regarded as having not voted.
- 13.4 Voting shall normally be by a show of hands.
- 13.5 When the result of a vote by show of hands is in doubt, the Chairperson or presiding officer may take a second vote by a roll-call. A vote by roll-call shall also be taken if it is requested by not less than two States Parties before the voting takes place, except as provided in Rule 14.2.
- 13.6 If two or more proposals relate to the same question, they shall, unless the Conference of Parties decides otherwise, be voted on in the order in which they were submitted. The Conference may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal.

- 13.7 A motion requiring that no decision be taken on a proposal shall have priority over that proposal.
- 13.8 When an amendment to a proposal is moved, the amendment shall be voted on first. When two or more amendments to a proposal are moved, the Conference shall first vote on the amendment deemed by the Chairperson or presiding officer to be furthest removed in substance from the original proposal, and then on the amendment next furthest removed therefrom and so on, until all the amendments have been put to the vote.
- 13.9 If one or more amendments are adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted upon as a whole.
- 13.10 A motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes from or revises part of that proposal.

Rule 14 – Decisions on amendments to the Annexes to the Convention

- 14.1. In accordance with Article 34.2 of the Convention, decisions on amendments to the Annexes to the Convention shall be deemed to be approved by the Conference unless two thirds of the States Parties express their objection.
- 14.2.1 Voting on amendments to the annexes to the Convention shall be conducted by a roll-call.

IV SECRETARIAT OF THE MEETING

Rule 15 – Secretariat

- 15.1 The Director-General of UNESCO or his/her representative shall participate in the work of the Conference, without the right to vote. He/She may, at any time, make either oral or written statements to the Conference on any question under discussion.
- 15.2 The Director-General of UNESCO shall appoint an official of the Secretariat of UNESCO to act as Secretary to the Conference, and other officials who shall together constitute the Secretariat of the Conference.
- 15.3 The Secretariat shall receive, translate and distribute all official documents of the Conference and shall arrange for the interpretation of the discussions, as provided for in Rule 11.2. It shall also perform all other duties necessary for the proper conduct of the work of the Conference.

V ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 16 – Adoption

The Conference shall adopt its Rules of Procedure by a decision taken in plenary meeting by a simple majority of the representatives of States Parties present and voting.

Rule 17 – Amendment

The Conference may amend these Rules of Procedure by a decision taken in plenary meeting by a two-thirds majority of the representatives of States Parties present and voting.

Annex III: List of Documents before the Conference

| Agenda Item | Title | Document Reference |
|-------------|--|----------------------|
| 1.2 | Election of a Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur | ICDS/1CP/Doc.1 |
| 2 | Provisional Agenda and Timetable | ICDS/1CP/Doc.2/Rev.1 |
| 3 | Provisional Rules of Procedure for the Conference of Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport | ICDS/1CP/Doc.3 |
| 5 | Approval of the 2007 Prohibited List International Standard | ICDS/1CP/Doc.4 |
| 6 | Monitoring Framework for the International Convention against Doping in Sport | ICDS/1CP/Doc.5 |
| 7 | Administration of the Fund for the Elimination of Doping in Sport | ICDS/1CP/Doc.6 |
| 8.1 | Date and Venue for the Second Session of the Conference of Parties | ICDS/1CP/Doc.7 |

Additional documents available during the Conference

- International Convention against Doping in Sport
- World Anti-Doping Code
- International Standards for Testing
- International Standards for Laboratories