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Q432 Chair: Mr Warner, thank you very much indeed for coming in today. We are very grateful to you. We are very cognisant of your “A Manifesto for Clean Athletics” and the remarks you made at the time of its launch. Could you open by briefly summarising what your view of the problem is, what your view is of the solution and what clean athletics as an idea is designed to do?

Ed Warner: Certainly. Last year’s corruption and doping scandals that have beset athletics are very well known and it is fair to say that confidence in the sport among the public must have been shaken by that. Wall to wall coverage outside of the competition time itself is unusual for a sport, particularly athletics, which fights for column inches with football all the time. Suddenly, it has every column inch it does not want because of all the news that came out, particularly from Russia, and the cover-ups that WADA has been investigating. We were and are concerned that the IAAF is so understandably beset by the work of cleaning up the past that not enough attention was being devoted—not just by the IAAF but generally by the sport, people in athletics—to looking at the future and ways in which confidence could be restored among the public. What we wanted to do was to promote debate about forward-thinking and forward-looking measures that would begin to restore credibility to the extent to which credibility had been damaged, which I am sure it must have been.
The manifesto itself is a call for debate. There are 14 suggestions in it, ranging from some that are already well-established arguments that people are making for change—longer bans for athletes who commit serious offences, for example—through to others that are really suggestions of things that might be debated and discussed, the idea being that nothing should be unthinkable and that in the midst of the current crisis, it is worth being prepared to examine all established thinking to find ways in which the sport can be improved and confidence can be restored. Most of them are outwith our own ability to deliver them.

The 14th is something we think we might be able to deliver, which is attempting to ensure that athletes who are guilty of serious doping offences in future never represent Great Britain in athletics. It is not necessarily easy to implement that, but we are working with our lawyers to do so. We have some announcements we will be able to make quite shortly, which show we are moving forward on that one. The other 13 are things that really all we can do is debate with people and try to engage them in conversations. That includes UKAD, who I know you have on after me, the IAAF themselves, UK Sport and WADA, and we are beginning to have those conversations.

I am pleased that we have prompted discussion. I was speaking to Lord Coe over the weekend. He tells me he has had something like a dozen sets of correspondence from different athletics federations around the world now, since our manifesto was published, with their own ideas and suggestions. That is what we want to see happen. We do not have a monopoly on good ideas. Some of them are workable, some of them may be less workable, but all of them I think are worthy of some discussion as we look to turn over every stone and find a way to restore credibility.

Q433 Chair: That is interesting and helpful. One of your recommendations is a call to the IAAF to investigate the implications of drawing a line under all existing or pre-existing sport records—for example, by adjusting event rules, and commencing a new set of records based on performances in the new clean athletics era. That has been interpreted as being all world records to be reset. Is that right?

Ed Warner: No. Well, you have just read it out and it is exactly what it says there. Let me explain the problem. If you look at a number of world records, they are very old and some of them do not have a lot of credibility. I will give you an example of that. The men’s shot-put record was set in 1990 by an American called Randy Barnes. Today’s throwers cannot get within about half a metre, 60 centimetres, of his distance. He was subsequently banned for life from the sport, but his record still stands because the ban came subsequent to his setting the record. I will give you another example. Marita Koch, who holds the women’s 400 metre world record from 1985: today’s athletes cannot get to within a second and a half of her, which in 400-metre terms is 15 metres. It is enormous. Stasi papers that subsequently were released show that she was probably using steroids. Today there is very little incentive for female 400-metre runners to break the world record because it is just 15 metres away from them.
What we would like to do is, again, have a debate about ways in which iniquitous records can be expunged and/or event regulations can be changed or tweaked such that you can start some of these again. To give you an example of how the debate is moving forward, only the day after we published our manifesto, European Athletics, of which we are a member, has announced that it is putting in place a taskforce to look at the whole issue of records. They have invited us on to that taskforce. For me, that is a good outcome because, okay, we do not have all the answers but we would like to be talking to people about ways in which they can be solved.

**Q434 Chair:** Your vision, then, is that a wide-ranging kind of “Big Bang” clean-up takes place. As soon as that is in place, there might be a new era of records that goes with that, so you have a kind of BC versus AD approach and there is a change. It is not invalidating what happened before—

**Ed Warner:** Completely not.

**Chair:** —it is just simply a different way of measuring achievement.

**Ed Warner:** Definitely not invalidating what has gone before. I have spoken to one of the European Athletics taskforce leaders and I will give you an example. One of the most difficult ones you might be able to deal with would be the 100 metres. It is pretty clear what it is—you do not want it to be the 101 metres or the 99 metres—but you could look at photo finish rules where there are particular regulations as to which part of the body crosses the line that sets the time. You might change the part of the body that needs to cross the line and, therefore, you have to freeze records under the old regulations and then you start again under the new ones.

It would be only worth doing this if a lot of these other measures were in place. There is no point starting a new set of records tomorrow without ensuring you have athlete biological passports that apply to all the leading nations and in time, hopefully, to all athletes at World Championships, and that you have a public register of tests so that you can be sure that athletes all over the world that are competing at the top level are being tested sufficiently in competition and out of competition. You have to do all these other things before you could then say we are in the new era. You asked earlier why we have done this. A lot of this is about the need for pace. The World Championships are coming to London next year.

**Chair:** For pace?

**Ed Warner:** Pace, yes.

**Chair:** You mean speed, getting on with it?

**Ed Warner:** Yes, exactly. The World Championships are coming to London next year in the Olympic Stadium. We would love those to be the first championships in a new era. That is very ambitious but there are things that could be done for London that would give the public more confidence. We want to see the IAAF engaging with us—we are organising these championships; I am the chair of them—to put in place some of these
measures so that you can turn up at the Olympic Stadium and really believe what you are watching.

Q435 Chair: Right, okay. I want to come on to that in a second, but the point is that you could not do this twice, could you?
Ed Warner: No.

Q436 Chair: You are going to have to be really certain that the clean athletics is clean and that, therefore, people competing in the new regime are able to discharge that obligation and expectation. How can you have that confidence when blood doping is such a sophisticated activity now?
Ed Warner: You never could, Mr Norman, and it would be very complacent to suggest that that could be the case. I think the minute you were to say, “We have done all we can and that is sufficient and it is clean”, your guard is down and you will be caught by the next cheat. This is something of an arms race and it is a perennial battle between the scientists and the authorities. The authorities can never assume that they have won that battle. They can only put themselves in a position in which they are winning it. Ultimately there would never be a clean era of athletics, or probably any other leading sport, and all we can do is do what we can to minimise the risks to athletic integrity.

Q437 Chair: That is interesting. You have talked about the championships next year. How can you be sure the IAAF is going to react? In your previous comments outside this Committee you have talked about being a cattle prod to the IAAF, which implies goosing them up a bit, and that they have been rather inactive. Is that true?
Ed Warner: They have been rather inactive, absolutely. They have been very, very active doing the things that they have to do on clean-up, but I do not think they have sufficient resources to invest in creating the new future. I will give you a very good example. The general secretary of the IAAF left in October. Only last week they appointed an interim chief executive—same role, different title—to replace him, and we are told that there will be a new permanent chief executive in place by the middle of this year. That will be a year into the new presidency and nine or 10 months since the previous general secretary left. To my mind, there is not enough speed in that process because you need that organisation run by a full-time set of executives, probably from outside the sport and, therefore, untainted by anything that has gone before, who can drive it forward as their full-time day jobs. At the moment, there is something of a vacuum in there and it needs to be filled. You used the phrase “cattle prod”. It is not a bad phrase. I think it needs some more impetus.

Q438 Chair: To be clear, you do not think there is anyone who really has a full-time focus at the top of the organisation at the moment in the IAAF?
Ed Warner: Not at the top. Lord Coe is a part-time president. There is only now an interim chief executive put in place, so I guess within the last week there is someone who has a full-time focus but that is only temporary. It
needs a great executive. We have already seen the deputy general secretary have to stand aside in the last few weeks. This is not good news.

Q439 Chair: Do you think Lord Coe needs to be a bit more hands-on in this crucial transition period?
Ed Warner: I think he is very hands-on at the moment. I would certainly not accuse him of failing to get his hands on it.

Chair: Or full-time. You have said he is not full-time. He is not full-time.
Ed Warner: But he has other obligations and he is the president, which is a part-time role. He only has two hands. He needs to get more good bodies around him. He has rented in some good temporary expertise in Paul Deighton and others from the LOCOG team, but I just think there is more capacity work to be done there that needs to be filled.

Q440 Chair: You have said—and I think this is a quotation—the lawyers look like they are running the show at the moment.
Ed Warner: I agree. I stand by that quote.

Q441 Chair: Your point being: how can there be meaningful reform if the lawyers are in charge? That is what seems to be your—
Ed Warner: That is half of it. Yes, that is a fair point. The other would be that there is so much clean-up work to be done in governance reviews, restructuring, and you need to have lawyers all over that. That is understandable, but if it is taking up the thinking time of the council of the IAAF, where is the time in their day to think about the future?

Q442 Chair: Is there a danger that they are obsessed with process rather than actually saying, “We need some substantive change here. We need to include these standards, these new procedures, push on the clean athletics agenda” that you have outlined?
Ed Warner: Yes, I think it is taking a very long time to put the foundations in place for the future.

Chair: That is helpful, thanks.

Q443 Ian C. Lucas: Isn’t one of the structural problems that you are very reliant within athletics on national organisations, like UK Athletics, and until there is an international enforcement body across athletics it is not possible to put in place the type of regime that you describe?
Ed Warner: You say “reliant on UK Athletics”. I think you mean—sorry to put words in your mouth—“UK Anti-Doping”.

Ian C. Lucas: Yes.
Ed Warner: One of the 14 manifesto calls is for truly independent anti-doping agencies around the world, possibly reporting directly into and controlled by
WADA, if WADA itself is fit for purpose. That is absolutely right. If you talk to any number of British athletes—a number of them gave input into our manifesto—they will say and have said for years their concern is that they are tested much more frequently here at the right times of the year because, if you are serious about cheating, you are cheating off-season when you are building your body for the next season knowing that you will be tested in competition so you do not want to be caught there. Therefore, you need local anti-doping agencies that are doing testing on the ground in the winter training season and it clearly is not happening sufficiently.

To go to another of our manifesto calls, we are asking for a public record of every test undertaken globally by any athlete. Not the outcome of the test, not their blood readings, but simply, “Mo Farah was tested last Wednesday. Jessica Ennis was tested six times in the last year. Here are the dates. Here are the times”. Not because I have any doubts about how often UKAD and the IAAF are testing our athletes but so that you can then look at other countries and say, “Hang on a minute, our athletes are competing against those athletes and they were not tested at all last winter. What is that all about? Can I trust it?” If we want to create trust, I think we need more transparency and the public needs to be sure so that, when the leading athletes stand on a podium, you can pop on to a website and see they were tested 12 times last year. You would get some confidence from that.

**Q444 Ian C. Lucas:** Would that go far enough, though? I accept that that would be a valid approach, but it seems to me that the central point is that there does need to be a regime that is independent of national organisations.

**Ed Warner:** Mr Lucas, I agree and that is clearly a lot of the problem that we have seen in Russia. It is abundantly clear there was systemic cheating, which went a very long way up the political ladder in that nation, and RUSADA, the anti-doping agency, was domestically controlled. Had it been controlled by WADA from the outset, and had WADA had the resources to exert that control, we may not be where we are now. Where we are now is a very ugly place.

**Q445 Chair:** Thank you very much. First of all, it is extraordinary that WADA does not maintain a global public register of the kind you have described, given that it is the world anti-doping agency.

**Ed Warner:** It has its register but it is not public, yes.

**Q446 Chair:** No. What you are really talking about is the publication of that, not the improvement of it?

**Ed Warner:** Yes.

**Q447 Chair:** You are satisfied that that register is a high-quality piece of data?
**Ed Warner**: You probably should ask Ms Sapstead that because she would have better insight into it, but we are assured it exists. The issue is how often athletes are tested in certain parts of the world.

**Q448 Chair**: Do you regard WADA, as an organisation, is itself competent to play that global co-ordinating role?  
**Ed Warner**: Again, she might have a better view. It is probably under-resourced, just as I would say UK Anti-Doping itself is under-resourced. One of the things that sport has to do, across all sports, is find a way to secure more of its revenues for the fight against doping, so again another manifesto point. We are calling for the IAAF to set aside a fixed percentage of all its sponsorship income to spend on anti-doping measures. If football did the same, then WADA’s problems financially would be completely transformed. A wealthy sport of that sort with a very small proportion of its global television income, for example, to go into anti-doping agencies worldwide would make a lot of sense. Football probably would not notice the difference but WADA certainly would.

**Q449 Chair**: Sponsors who are thinking about ending their relationship with the IAAF might instead put the money into anti-doping rather than withdrawing it altogether?  
**Ed Warner**: There are all sorts of things like that that could be looked at.

**Chair**: Thank you.

**Q450 Paul Farrelly**: I wonder what discussions you have had with Lord Coe about all your proposals in your manifesto and what his reaction has been.  
**Ed Warner**: Yes, I have done. In fact, I had a meeting with him on the morning of the manifesto’s launch and I have spoken to him a number of times about a number of things since, including this. If he was sitting here, what he would say to you is: they welcome it, they do not agree with everything in it, they do not have a monopoly of good ideas themselves, and they want to be talking to us about it. I am engaged with a number of his colleagues now and he has his council looking not just at our manifesto but all the other ones I referred to that have come to him privately.

Ultimately, the IAAF exists to serve athletes and the public and it is a membership body in which we are just one of 216 members. I think Lord Coe is cognisant of the fact that he exists to serve us and our athletes, so I have no doubt we will have that dialogue. What comes out of that process remains to be seen because, in its old guise, the IAAF has been quite a cumbrous organisation that is slow to respond to suggestions of change. I am hoping in the new world—particularly with the crisis that has engulfed the organisation—that it will be much more open to fresh ideas and fresh thinking.
Q451  Paul Farrelly: On the headline-grabbing proposal to reset all the records, from your conversations did you get the impression that he had an open mind or did he think it impractical?

Ed Warner: Well, it is interesting. Does he think it is impractical? Not impossible but difficult. No, his personal response, which I have stated publicly and I do not think he would mind me repeating it, was—I paraphrase slightly—"I have always been of the view that records that are clearly iniquitous should be struck out", to which my response was, "Can you get on and do that, please?" Some of those records have stood for a very long time and they have appeared iniquitous for a very long time. Another example: Florence Griffith Joyner holds the 100 and 200-metre records from 1988, 1990, and most people looking at those these days say they do not believe them. Well, Seb, if you think you can do it piecemeal, then please get on and do it piecemeal. But we are having the dialogue and I think that is a good thing.

Paul Farrelly: You have just pre-empted my question.

Ed Warner: My apologies.

Q452  Paul Farrelly: No, it is great crystal ball gazing. You said in the media that Lord Coe said he would be in favour of picking off all these records that are clearly wrong. That sounds as if you take one or two examples and you might make a persuasive case, but still those athletes would say, "Prove it", to the extent they were still alive.

Ed Warner: Yes.

Paul Farrelly: How would you decide?

Ed Warner: That is why our approach, which is could you look ultimately at a resetting, might be better than how do you decide. European Athletics is taking it very seriously. I am encouraged by the initiative they are taking. Let’s see where that goes. The issue for me is the watching public at a major event, and the athletes lining up on the start line or in the field, have to believe that the records that stand out there that they are chasing, as well as chasing victory, are credible and ultimately beatable, maybe not for 10 years, maybe not for 20 years, but they were set fairly. If in certain events that just clearly is not the case, then it is hugely unhealthy for the sport. It has been the sin that has not spoken its name for so long.

You could go to a championships now and some of the big throws, the discus, the hammer, they mark out the V with all the different distances and they have blocks with the championship record, the world record, the European record, whatever it might be. Often you see the world record is this tiny little flag way out, almost as if the sport is too embarrassed to admit that was the world record. If you take a young child to the sport and they are asking what that is all about, explaining it to them just makes you feel very grubby. We cannot keep hiding from the challenge of some of these records, which nobody believes in.
Q453 Paul Farrelly: Returning to Lord Coe. One of the things that astounded many people when the WADA commission second report was recently published, is that it catalogued such a series of failings from a broken organisation and yet at the end there was an endorsement that Lord Coe—who had been a vice president for many years, but clearly had not asked any searching questions—was the man to lead international athletics out of the mire. It pains me to ask this question because he is a national sporting legend, but it has happened on Lord Coe’s watch at the top of athletics. He has eaten so many of his own words in such a short space of time recently that he would find it difficult to start a race with indigestion. Don’t you think that a clean sport from your manifesto means it needs a clean break to be credible?

Ed Warner: I think Lord Coe can provide that clean break. We nominated him for the post and we lobbied very hard for him in his election campaign, and I do not regret either of those things. You have to understand that this is an organisation that has a very odd democratic process and to make change you have to win an election in which one country, one vote, everything from the Norfolk Islands through to the United States has an equal vote—

Paul Farrelly: But that is history. I am just looking into the future.

Ed Warner: Sure, exactly. Looking at the process and looking at what you had to do to become elected, it was my view all along that you can never be an outsider to get yourself into a position to lead the organisation. For Seb to lose by one vote would mean that there was no opportunity to have the change that the sport needs. We have assisted in getting our man, Britain’s nominee, into that place and I believe he has the wit, the intelligence, the ambition and the integrity to deliver that change. My job now, as just one of his 216 members, is to hold him to account on a continuous basis. Mr Norman used the phrase “cattle prod” earlier. I will keep applying that prod as and when I believe it to be necessary because we believe this man can deliver and will deliver but at all times, as with all politicians—and it is a political role—we need to hold him to account.

Q454 Paul Farrelly: Clearly, there have been an enormous number of revelations since that vote. Let’s take another sport. The FA here was backing Michel Platini. It is certainly not backing him anymore.

Ed Warner: If you are asking the question am I backing Seb Coe, the answer is yes.

Q455 Paul Farrelly: Final question; you could not be more clear there. You said earlier on that the IAAF needed a new set of executives untainted by what had gone on before.

Ed Warner: Exactly.

Paul Farrelly: Doesn’t that same measure apply to the presidency?

Ed Warner: I think in these things there is always a mixture required of knowledge, history, genuine deep understanding and fresh insight. For me, it is exactly the same as running a FTSE100 company where the chairman/chief executive double act is critical. It has to be a balance. You cannot have power
residing in only one of those two individuals or you cannot have that seesaw completely unbalanced. I think the combination of, let’s say, the equivalent of a FTSE100 chief executive hired in to run the IAAF combined with Lord Coe, with all of his expertise, history, understanding and ambition, would be hugely powerful. I would love to see that recruitment made sooner rather than later because I think that is the way forward.

Q456 Paul Farrelly: You are seriously suggesting, from your business background, that either the chairman or the deputy chairman of a FTSE100 company who got it so spectacularly wrong as the IAAF did would still be in post today and would not be forced to resign?

Ed Warner: Let’s distinguish between the two. The chairman clearly would and if you have a number of deputy chairmen, as you did here, that may not be the case and I do not believe that is the case here.

Q457 John Nicolson: Good morning. Thank you for your evidence so far; it has been really interesting. We have been talking quite a lot about Lord Coe, and you said he had been approached by various national athletic bodies in the light of your clean sport manifesto. I wonder whether Russia was one of the bodies that had approached him.

Ed Warner: Approached him? I don’t know. I should think he is talking with Russia a lot. Interestingly, I was relatively early—I am not taking too much credit for it—last spring in calling for Russia to be suspended if it was proven to be systemically cheating, which has proven to be the case, and a great disappointment is that they were not suspended before the World Championships last summer. We have yet to discover whether that was a political decision. Certainly, last summer, when the rumours were abounding, the Russian Federation was very keen to come and talk to UK Athletics about how to manage an anti-doping programme.

Q458 John Nicolson: Did they?

Ed Warner: They have not done because almost immediately afterwards the whole thing blew up. At the right moment, we would happily talk to them about how we educate our athletes because, as you will know, the distinction between the role of the governing body and the role of UK Anti-Doping is they are the policeman, shorthand, and ours is to educate our athletes in how to be clean. Any help we can give the Russians to do that we will.

Q459 John Nicolson: That presupposes, of course, that the Russians really want to do it, because you are describing our system where you are trying to educate athletes. Their system appears to be that they do try to educate their athletes but they try to educate them on how to take doping.

Ed Warner: Yes, it is horrible. To pre-empt a question you might ask me, do I think they should be back in time for Rio? No, I do not—not at all.

John Nicolson: That was the question I was going to ask you.
**Ed Warner**: Sorry, it is my crystal ball.

**Q460 John Nicolson**: We are all agreed, aren’t we, that the Russian state is in cahoots as far as this?

**Ed Warner**: Yes.

**John Nicolson**: Russian athletics is not independent of the state?

**Ed Warner**: No. My argument includes that, but there is an extra element. Anything they might do structurally to change leadership—you could tear up all the structures in Russia, put new systems in place—would not change the fact that the benefits of long-term use of performance-enhancing drugs exist for a very long time, for years. It is one of the arguments for very long bans. If Russia puts new systems and structures in place and they are allowed back in but their athletes are still benefiting from years of abuse of performance-enhancing drugs, then that will be unfair on athletes lining up against them this summer.

**Q461 John Nicolson**: Yes. A state that murders British citizens in our capital is hardly going to be squeamish when it comes to encouraging athletes to take drugs, and we know that now.

**Ed Warner**: I am not sure I had drawn that direct link, but I will let you draw it.

**Q462 John Nicolson**: Okay. The Stepanovs were the whistle blowers who appeared on German television and in the British press. They revealed the full extent of drug taking. They had to go into hiding because they were scared for their lives. When Lord Coe appeared before us, I was astonished to discover that he had neither met them nor picked up the phone to talk to them. Were you as surprised as I was?

**Ed Warner**: Goodness, I have not thought about that.

**Q463 John Nicolson**: Wouldn’t you have called them if you had been in his position? I know I would.

**Ed Warner**: Yes, I guess I probably would but, to be honest, I had not thought of it in those terms.

**Q464 John Nicolson**: Sheer curiosity, if I was the boss of the IAAF, would make me think, “I wonder what story these guys have to tell”. It is astonishing not to want to speak to them, given the role that they played in this saga.

**Ed Warner**: Just to be very precise in an answer on that, you would want to be sure the IAAF had spoken to them, whether it is Lord Coe or anybody else, provided they had been properly debriefed and thanked for whistle blowing, whoever it comes from. The question then is: were they? And I just do not know.
Q465 John Nicolson: Sure but, even on a human level, I would want to know that they were okay and I would want to ask whether there was anything I could do to help them.

Ed Warner: I would agree on a human level, of course, yes.

Q466 John Nicolson: Lord Coe also told us that he had never been offered a bribe and that he did not know anyone who had been encouraged to cheat. Again, I was astonished by that evidence he gave to us because, given the chronic nature of cheating in athletics, it suggests that he exists in such a rarefied atmosphere above the sport that he is not really having the conversations and making the contacts that you would expect somebody in his position would have and would do.

Ed Warner: I have never been offered a bribe and I have never directly had someone tell me that they had been induced to cheat, but one hears those stories all the time. They are trackside stories typically and usually it is coaches and other athletes that you hear these things from. Clearly, they hear the truth.

Ahead of the Moscow World Championships in 2013, a lot of our athletes were saying, some of them publicly—I remember Dai Greene, the hurdler, being very outspoken on the subject—that you would see people winning medals in Moscow that you had never heard of before and that you would never hear from since, and so it has proven. For years it has been my presumption that there is significant doping going on in the world of athletics. What I had not anticipated or understood was the state organised and IAAF condoned cover-up of that cheating, which is what the WADA report has flushed out, and the Stepanovs and the German television documentaries and so on.

When I first got the job nine and a bit years ago now, one of my new colleagues lined up to tell me, like it was in terms of the world of doping, of athletics going way back, names you sat and watched on the television that you think, “Oh, really?” I wondered at the time why he was doing this—was it a salacious thing, was it to prove he knew more about athletics than I did? But over time I have come of the view that he was very wisely just making sure my eyes were open from day one and that I was not a credulous new chairman who had come in from outside the sport. I am grateful for the steer he gave me because, as I said very much earlier on, you just cannot be complacent in this world.

Q467 John Nicolson: You are giving me the kind of answers that I expected Lord Coe would give us. In fact, his response to that question I have just asked you was to say—and I paraphrase—something along the lines of, “I don’t move in those circles”. It sounds like he should be moving in those circles, shouldn’t he, because he should be finding out what is going on? You had a mate who sat you down and, as you just put it, told you how things were. It sounds like Lord Coe should make more down there and dirty friends who can offer him a few choice facts.
**Ed Warner**: We have to be careful on the use of the word “dirty” in the context of what we are talking about here, but yes, I know what you mean.

**John Nicolson**: I will rephrase: ruffy-tuffy perhaps. He needs a tough mate, doesn’t he, who can help him climb down from the rarefied atmosphere and find out what is going on in sport?

**Ed Warner**: What you need is eyes and ears. It is probably no different from—and I am probably going to completely reveal my shallow knowledge of the workings of Parliament—you need your Whip’s Office to maintain discipline in the sport. You need people who know what is what. A lot of it comes out trackside, because that is where people are doing their work, that is where they are doing their training and that is when they are, particularly in competition time, seeing their rivals training ahead of the event and it is when coaches get to talk to each other.

**Q468 John Nicolson**: With so much going on in the sport, do you think Lord Coe should take this on—assuming that he stays in post—as a full-time job?

**Ed Warner**: No, I do not think so.

**Q469 John Nicolson**: What is he doing the rest of the time that he cannot apply himself to this?

**Ed Warner**: You would have to ask him that.

**John Nicolson**: We might.

**Ed Warner**: We have all seen his register of interests and he has them. No, I go back to the point I made earlier—and I passionately believe in it—that you look at the presidential role as being a quasi chairman. Again going back to my business background, I never really think of a chairman as either being executive or non-executive. You have to be on call all the time. Sometimes it takes up a lot of your time, sometimes not so much. You need a cracking good executive team working for you that you—

**Q470 John Nicolson**: Which he does not have at the moment?

**Ed Warner**: No, he does not have that at the moment and he knows that. I used the word “pace” earlier, speed, impetus. The sooner that is in place, a lot of them from outside the sport, the better.

**Q471 John Nicolson**: How long do you give him to clean it up before he has to resign?

**Ed Warner**: I do not see that happening. He has a four-year term. I am sure he will see it out and I look forward to nominating him for re-election. Sorry—I will not be around then, my term will be up, but I am looking forward to my successor nominating him for re-election.
Q472 John Nicolson: What is the benchmark that you will judge him by? Obviously, he has to have that. You have to give him a set of targets because you said you were going to hold him to account. What will you judge success by or failure by in two years’ time, halfway through his term?

Ed Warner: It will be a mixture of things. The first port of call for me, which is very parochially British, is we do have the London World Championships next year. It is an opportunity to do things differently, better, more imaginatively, so if I see his team really engage with us to come up with a new era, new age championships, that will be a big tick. He is clearly wrestling now with sponsorship challenges for the sport and I think that, if you see new sponsors coming in on that two-year view, that will tell you a lot about how the sport is being perceived at the time. A number of the measures that we and others are proposing for a tougher and more credible anti-doping regime, to see those in place. On a two-year view, that would be a great outcome if all three of those were achieved.

Q473 John Nicolson: Failure would be not to deliver those things?

Ed Warner: Yes.

John Nicolson: Thank you.

Q474 Chair: That is very interesting and helpful. Thank you, Mr Warner. Can I pick up one thing you said there? You said that you did not recognise a non-executive/executive distinction because, roughly speaking, when there is a crisis all hands are on deck. You have to put maximum round the clock hours in. Is that right?

Ed Warner: Yes.

Q475 Chair: Then, presumably, you are concerned that Lord Coe is not putting in maximum round the clock hours now although he is in a crisis?

Ed Warner: No, I would not say that. I think you asked the question, or someone did earlier, whether he was doing enough. I think he is working really hard on it right now. He has some other interests. It will be a matter of record. I think the British Olympic Association has a board meeting tomorrow that he will be chairing. The vast majority of his time, as I see it, is devoted to athletics right now. I think he is a better man for having a range of experiences and responsibilities. I go back to that; that is what a chairman is all about for me. He should not let himself be seen and he should not act as—and we should not let him as the sport become—a full-time executive chairman and not hire that chief executive. That is a key slot and that chief executive then has to make sure he has the right finance director, the right marketing director, the right anti-doping head, and so it goes on.

Chair: That is helpful. Thank you.

Q476 Andrew Bingham: One of the recommendations says that companies who are engaged in sports sponsorship should not support any athlete found guilty of doping offences. One of your kit sponsors is Nike. Have
you had any talks? Are you going to have any talks with them about their sponsorship of athletes who are guilty of such offences?

**Ed Warner:** Yes. Forgive me, this sounds slightly pedantic, but our contractual relationship is with Nike UK, who are very supportive of the manifesto. We have discussed it with them. Our work with Nike is as much as we can to lobby them that across the Nike world this is something they recognise and accept from within. They are very good partners of ours. We are keen to agitate for that manifesto pledge to be adopted by sponsors. Nike UK are very supportive of it. We certainly do not see anyone in the UK who is a doping cheat being supported by Nike. If we can make the case that Nike saw the value of that worldwide that would be a big win.

**Q477 Andrew Bingham:** Say that again about UK athletes. You said that you do not see Nike sponsoring anybody in this country who is guilty of doping. Is that what you just said?

**Ed Warner:** From my memory, yes. If I am wrong, I cannot think of that exception right now. Not that I know of.

**Q478 Andrew Bingham:** There is an inference that you think that while that athlete might be adopting that—

**Ed Warner:** No, sorry, I am trying to think who that would be. No, there are one or two athletes who have served bans who are competing. I do not believe they are Nike sponsored. I am certainly not aware that they are. But in the States we know that is not the case, that there are athletes who have served bans who are sponsored by them.

**Q479 Andrew Bingham:** Taking that forward, if companies want to sponsor athletes, how are they going to be able to decide which athletes they sponsor and do not sponsor?

**Ed Warner:** The company itself makes that choice based on a range of factors: the public perception of that athlete, their record, the media friendliness, the event they compete in, a whole host of things, and that is for them to do that. All we would say is that we would call on sponsors to draw that line and that, once you cheat, you forfeit your ability in the sponsorship marketplace to secure that sort of support. I think it would be to the benefit of clean athletes because money is then freed up that might be available for them.

**Q480 Andrew Bingham:** The manifesto argues for tougher penalties, which I think we would all support, the minimum of an eight-year ban and lifetime bans. I think the eight-year ban has already been available anyway, hasn’t it, for repeat offenders?

**Ed Warner:** For repeat offenders, not for first-time serious offenders.

**Q481 Andrew Bingham:** You are proposing an eight-year ban for first-time offenders?
**Ed Warner**: The point we are making there is that, whatever the number is, it is to be out of two Olympics or two Paralympics, so that could be a five-year ban.

**Andrew Bingham**: I get the significance of the eight years.

**Ed Warner**: Yes, make it a five-year ban. It is just to try to stretch it across the two.

**Q482 Andrew Bingham**: No, I get the significance of the eight years, but what you are saying is that, instead of being available for repeat offenders, it will be there for a first offence?

**Ed Warner**: First serious offence, yes. The offence that went from two years recently to four we would say you could cover two Olympics. That is significant. Most athletes are lucky to compete in one Olympics; two, great; three is really stretching it, and then you are Steve Redgrave in rowing. If you could take an athlete out for two Olympics, that would be a significant increase in the penalty.

**Q483 Andrew Bingham**: You could argue it is almost a career ban if you judge it on Olympics?

**Ed Warner**: Not far off, yes.

**Q484 Andrew Bingham**: In terms of the lifetime bans, are these sustainable? The Dwain Chambers one was lifted. As I said, is it impossible to enforce a lifetime? I think lifetime bans are the way but—

**Ed Warner**: I will tell you what we are trying to achieve. This goes to the final manifesto pledge, which is a ban from the British team for life. The World Indoor Championships are in America in March. Every time you compete for Britain you have to sign a team member’s agreement with us, which means you behave in a certain way, do not behave in other ways, and so on. What we are going to try to achieve this time is that athletes picked for the team in March in the team member’s agreement sign up to say, “If in future I am ever convicted of a serious doping offence, I am saying here and now I know I will be forfeiting my right ever to be picked for Britain again”. I think any sensible clean athlete will have no problem when they have the team member’s agreement under their nose signing that to say, “I am on the team for the world indoors”. If they are subsequently banned, then there is no way back for them.

That is much easier to achieve than retrospectively saying, “Someone was banned in the past, can they now come back on the team?” Looking forward, if we can draw a line and say, “In future to come on to the team you have to say, ‘If I am ever banned in future I will never be picked again’”, that is achievable. That is much more likely to stand up in a court of law and that—

**Andrew Bingham**: Because it has not stood up in court before.
Ed Warner: Because people have not signed in advance when they are not a cheat to say, “If 10 years down the road I am convicted of doping, I know I will never be picked again”. That has never been tested, that approach, so that is the one we will try.

Q485 Andrew Bingham: You are definitely going to do that?
Ed Warner: We are talking to Farrer, our lawyers, at the moment about crafting that. Our intention is that the team in March, in Oregon at the world indoors, will have each signed an agreement that says, “If I am ever convicted of a doping offence, I know you cannot pick me again. I am not eligible for selection”.

Q486 Andrew Bingham: So they are on TGB for next year. They have signed that. Are you envisaging that being in perpetuity then? If they are ever on TGB for future games, do they have to resign or they sign every time?
Ed Warner: Sorry, let’s be very clear. We are not Team GB as in the British Olympics Association.

Andrew Bingham: No.
Ed Warner: For British athletics, so World Championships, European championships, European cross-country, yes, absolutely. That is going to be our ambition. In so many of these things, the fight is worth having because the cause is so important. If X years down the line, someone manages through a court of law to overturn that, I think that the moral high ground will have been occupied by UK Athletics through that process and the public will recognise the merit in what we were trying to achieve, which is to keep cheats out of British vests.

Q487 Andrew Bingham: Yes, I understand that, but I think you have to achieve it because ambitions are one thing but realisation is another. As I said to Lord Coe—
Ed Warner: The team member’s agreement for the world indoors will include that clause and people invited on to the team will be invited to sign that agreement. I do not see any of them disagreeing with signing it there and then because they are clean, they will want to show they are clean, and they will want to show that intent.

Andrew Bingham: We will see what the lawyers make of it.
Ed Warner: Yes, we will.

Q488 Andrew Bingham: Have you thought of if somebody refuses to sign it? Are you just going to say, “You are not on the team”?
Ed Warner: Yes. If you want to be selected, one of the things you have to do is sign the team member’s agreement.

Andrew Bingham: Regardless of who it is?
Ed Warner: The reason the agreement exists is, for example, around kit. We are sponsored, as you said, by Nike. You have to wear your British kit from the minute you get on the plane to the minute you get back off the plane after the championships. If you are an Adidas-sponsored athlete you cannot walk around wearing your Adidas kit. It is all part of the agreement and that will be one clause in the agreement, and people always sign the agreement because they want to compete for Great Britain and they know that is the way the world works.

Q489 Andrew Bingham: Forgive me, I do not know: those agreements, are they public documents or are they confidential documents? I am curious if somebody refuses to sign it whether you will go public on it.
Ed Warner: Of course we would, absolutely, 100%, definitely.

Q490 Chair: To be clear, you would expect that regime to be extended in due course ideally to Olympic athletes as well, would you?
Ed Warner: I will happily talk to Bill Sweeney of the British Olympic Association about it, but we will get on with doing what we have to do. As I say right upfront in the manifesto, we cannot wait around for others to do what they have to do. Athletics is in such a crisis it has to look after itself and get on with these things, so we will get on with it.

Q491 Chair: You say “you” say. This manifesto is not just your work, is it, Mr Warner? It is a collective reflected—
Ed Warner: No, it is cabinet responsibility from our board. We have spoken, as we say, upfront to a lot of people who have made contributions to it.

Q492 Chair: You have talked about sponsorship. You have said in the manifesto that UK Sport should mandate all lottery-funded athletes in Great Britain to have their tests available on a public register maintained by UKAD, and non-lottery funded athletes should be invited to join the register. Can you talk about why? The idea would be if you are receiving public money you should have your tests made available publicly?
Ed Warner: Yes. UK Sport will tell you that the athlete agreement, if you want to be in receipt of funding, runs to a number of pages and contains a number of obligations on you. We are saying you could add an obligation that you are prepared to have your tests up on that list, and that is only if we could not get WADA to publish a global list. That would probably take some time. We think the publication of a British list is something that is easily achievable and I have begun talking to UKAD about that. There are pros and cons but it is a debate we want to have with them.

Q493 Chair: The global list that you have talked about is when someone was tested and that they were tested?
Ed Warner: Exactly, the same thing here.
Chair: You are not talking about blood doping scores?

Ed Warner: No, I am talking about the same list.

Chair: You are just talking about when they were tested and that they were tested?

Ed Warner: Exactly, “Mo Farah was tested last Wednesday at 3 o’clock. Jessica Ennis was tested 12 times last year”. That should all be on a public register and if it is not going to be done globally let’s do it in Great Britain.

Q494 Chair: In your view, it is not appropriate that the blood scores themselves should be published?

Ed Warner: No, and we said that last summer because viewing them in isolation can be misleading, as I think most people now agree. It is the very fact that athletes are tested we believe is important and having a biological passport, which is only possible if you have had sufficient tests. That again is an indication that the authorities are on the case, that they have the data and they are analysing it in the right way.

Q495 Chair: Should the public register you have described be retrospective so that, as far as possible, it would be clear in the past when people were tested?

Ed Warner: I had not thought of that and it is a good idea.

Chair: Thank you very much.

Q496 Damian Collins: Mr Warner, I want to ask about the London 2017 bid for the World Athletics Championships. Could you tell me, who were the core members of the team that led the bid?

Ed Warner: It was led very much from within UK Athletics, so my chief executive, Niels de Vos and a woman called Cherry Alexander, who is our head of international relations. We had substantial support from UK Sport, Simon Morton, the GLA, Callum Salter. On the pitch, when we were in Monaco making the bid, at the top table we had a couple of athletes. We had Margaret Ford, Baroness Ford, who was chair of the legacy company at the time, Hugh Robertson, the Sports Minister at the time, Lord Coe himself, the Mayor, Boris Johnson. I was up there; my chief executive was up there. That was the top table pitch team.

Q497 Damian Collins: You said in the interview you gave recently to Radio 5’s “Sportsweek” programme—I will quote for people who are not familiar with what you said—“The night before the bid a very senior person in the IAAF hierarchy told me and my bid team that they understood certain members of the IAAF council were being called upstairs one by one to a hotel suite to be given a brown envelope” supposedly full of money. Who was it who told you that?

Ed Warner: I am not prepared to say—sorry, not because I am losing my voice. I have had a number of discussions with the IAAF since that
programme and they have told me that the 2017 and 2019 bids by Qatar, Doha, have now been referred to their ethics commission. I am delighted at that, so my next conversation is going to be with that ethics commission to lay out all that I heard at the time. I think it would be inappropriate for me to pre-empt that formal process now to talk through who said what to whom, but I will be laying that out for the ethics commission.

**Q498 Damian Collins:** I am not asking you to identify who was alleged to be receiving envelopes, who was being called to the room. I am just asking you to say who told you that.

**Ed Warner:** No, I am not prepared to say.

**Damian Collins:** I think you should. With respect, this is a parliamentary inquiry looking at corruption in sport and, particularly, athletics. This is material information that you hold. I am not asking you to incriminate someone who might be part of an investigation. I am just asking you to tell us who told you that fact.

**Ed Warner:** But it might do, incriminate them as part of an investigation, because one could then ask what they did with that information, where they took it, whether it was properly investigated, all of which I want to discuss with Michael Beloff and his ethics team.

**Q499 Damian Collins:** Was it Lord Coe who told you?

**Ed Warner:** I am not prepared to say.

**Q500 Damian Collins:** But you will not rule him out? It could have been Lord Coe?

**Ed Warner:** It could have been any number of people. I am not prepared to say.

**Chair:** I think we have had enough on this. Let’s move the questioning on, if you don’t mind, Damian.

**Q501 Damian Collins:** There was another question as well about the $7.2 million.

**Ed Warner:** Yes.

**Damian Collins:** The bid team were told in terms—and correct me if I am wrong on this—that the Qatar bid for Doha was prepared to cover the $7.2 million in prize money the IAAF might otherwise have needed to stump up.

**Ed Warner:** Yes.

**Q502 Damian Collins:** This was not part of the bid criteria or the technical—

**Ed Warner:** No, it was an additional offer.
**Damian Collins:** An additional offer?

**Ed Warner:** Yes.

**Q503 Damian Collins:** You were basically told in terms, “If you want to win, you have to equal that amount of money”?

**Ed Warner:** Yes.

**Q504 Damian Collins:** Who was it who advised you on that point?

**Ed Warner:** Sorry, who told me that was the case?

**Damian Collins:** Who told you that, yes.

**Ed Warner:** We were told that by two council members—not Lord Coe—and two high-ranking officials within the IAAF, and had known for some time that they had made this offer. It was a public offer. They publicised it as part of their bid. We had not, so there was this gap of $7.2 million. We knew that within our budget, if we needed to, we could afford to make that offer and we made a late decision—and by “we” I mean all of our funding partners, not just UK Athletics. It was not in our gift to do it solus.

The point I was making on the radio, which I am happy to make again now, is we made that offer in the belief that it was a level playing field and a fair race. If subsequently it is demonstrated that we were only going to lose because it was a corrupt bid process, then we made the offer under false pretences and that is the critical thing for me. I believed when we made the offer that it was fair.

Rumours abound in all these bid situations. I put them to the back of my mind at the time. It seemed incredible to think that brown envelopes were being handed out in a hotel suite; you would have thought you would be much more subtle than that if you were corrupting. It is only subsequently, in the last few weeks and months, when we have heard that a Kenyan council member, around the time of the 2019 bid, received two cars, allegedly from Doha; that Lamine Diack’s son was allegedly asking for $5 million from Doha for the 2017 bid. No one said that he got it. These things have only come out recently and I have gone back and thought, “Well, hang on a minute, this rumour was going around, which I put to the back of my mind, but now I am hearing these things. Was it a fair race? Did we have to make that prize money offer?” because it is a substantial sum of public money.

**Q505 Damian Collins:** Did you go to Lord Coe and say, “We have been told this is what we have to do. I think it is totally unfair. Can’t you make representations on our behalf to the president to say this is not on?”

**Ed Warner:** No, not in those terms. Seb was a party to our discussion as to the merits of putting a prize money offer on the table, but I did not have that debate with him in the context of brown envelope rumours. It was more about, “What are your council thinking?” Because he is in the council meeting. He is in the room. He is one of the 26 people voting. What is the lie of the...
land? What is the mood music here? I road tested the need for us to make the offer with him, of course I did, because he was part of our bid team.

Q506 Damian Collins: He said "Pay it"?
Ed Warner: His advice was that would be a major swing factor in our favour because it was a tight race. As it turned out, it was 16-10 in our favour when the voting came around and people were amazed we were that far apart. The presumption would be it would be tighter than that and the IAAF would have been worse off to the tune of $7.2 million if they had gone with London than if they had gone with Doha, so we levelled that up. It was good advice because we won and I have heard subsequently that, for a number of council members, that was an important swing factor.

Q507 Damian Collins: With hindsight, don’t you think—perhaps you did and are not prepared to say—you should have discussed all of this with Lord Coe and said, "These are potentially very serious matters. We have this issue of the $7.2 million. We do not know whether we need to pay it or not. There is the question of the brown envelopes. I am very concerned about the picture this paints and I want your advice. You are one of our senior people here. What should we do?"
Ed Warner: As I think I said earlier, who I spoke to about it and who I heard it from within the IAAF hierarchy, I am going to leave for my ethics commission discussion.

Damian Collins: I will not ask the question again. You have answered it. Let me put this to you. If there were members of the IAAF council who were aware at the time of these allegations and did not act on them, do you think they are fit to hold any office within the IAAF today?
Ed Warner: I have had a working assumption since I heard the rumours, because I heard them from senior people from the IAAF, that these people were sufficiently senior and were telling me the rumours that they would be referring them upwards and dealing with them. I have worked on the assumption that they were dealt with and maybe it will now transpire they were dealt with. We will find out. What the Ethics Commission needs to find out is: who said what to whom and what did they do about it? We may discover that the rumours were properly investigated and proven to be nonsense and put to bed. Possibly that will be the work of a very swift discussion.

Q508 Damian Collins: In your view, if that very, very senior person, who you assumed would have taken that up, did not or did not act on the information that they had in their position, do you think that person is fit to hold any office within the IAAF today?
Ed Warner: Mr Collins, I would be hugely disappointed if someone had not taken action on the back of the rumours that were reported to me.
Q509 Damian Collins: Clearly, they would have no credibility as someone who is prepared to tackle corruption if they have not.

Ed Warner: I would be hugely disappointed in them.

Damian Collins: But you still think they should hold office?

Ed Warner: Let me talk to the Ethics Commission. That is the—

Damian Collins: I am asking your view.

Ed Warner: Let’s see who knew what and what they did.

Q510 Damian Collins: You are the person who has, rather late in the day, put these allegations in the public domain; I am just asking your view on what they mean.

Ed Warner: I would rather see how the thing plays out, and I want to engage with them vigorously to do that.

Q511 Damian Collins: Why did you not make these allegations public sooner? Five years ago, Lord Triesman sat in front of this Committee and set out allegations of attempts to solicit bribes from the England World Cup bid team, set them out for the public record. All of the people he named at that time have subsequently been drawn into the corruption investigations of FIFA. Don’t you think you have an obligation to set these issues out to the public much sooner?

Ed Warner: Possibly with hindsight, yes; I am not going to shy from that. I had taken the view—it was twofold—first, the people that were telling me were sufficiently senior that they would be dealing with it, and why were they telling me if they were not dealing with it? They were all in a position to deal with it. Secondly, it felt completely fanciful that you would be called upstairs one by one to be given a brown envelope. So it is only the issues that have emerged in recent weeks and months about 2019 and 2017 have said to me, “Well, maybe I was wrong. Maybe it was not fanciful”. With hindsight maybe that was an error on my part.

Q512 Damian Collins: But in a small way, Mr Warner, you are part of the problem in the IAAF because if there are very senior people like you who are aware of wrongdoing, who are not checking or following up on whether there is any investigation to that wrongdoing, you are effectively part of a conspiracy of silence in corruption in world sport.

Ed Warner: That is clearly your view.

Chair: You do not have to answer.

Ed Warner: That is Mr Collins’s view.

Q513 Chair: We do need to get to the point as to whether you followed up with any other people in the IAAF to make sure that your concerns were
being addressed. You said you assumed they were being addressed but did you take any steps to confirm those suspicions on your part?

**Ed Warner:** No, I had dialogue with people about it in Monaco at the time. I did not subsequently.

**Chair:** That is helpful. Thank you.

**Q514 Nigel Huddleston:** Just briefly: on the issue of world records being reset, it is true to say that some of the current world record holders would be quite concerned about that proposal, wouldn’t they?

**Ed Warner:** Yes, they would, absolutely. It is clearly not our intention in any way, shape or form to traduce or punish those people. What we are saying is—and I will repeat what I said much earlier on—it is a call to investigate. The sport should face the reality of records that seem incredible and find a way to deal with that. A number of those world record holders have had spirited contributions to the debate, all of which I welcome because by shining a light on the issue we might be able to find solutions.

**Q515 Nigel Huddleston:** You mentioned earlier having conversations with European Athletics and others, but is it not true that the manifesto coming from the UK, or even if it is adopted by Europe, is pretty toothless unless it is a global reset. It is all very well for—

**Ed Warner:** You are absolutely right, and the view of European Athletics is they want to show the way to the IAAF and use that mechanism to effect change at IAAF level.

**Q516 Nigel Huddleston:** Because you mentioned earlier if not done globally then let us do it in Great Britain, but that would in some ways be unfair to British athletes if we are the ones leading the way and then—

**Ed Warner:** At no point have I said we should reset British records. Others have suggested that externally, but our view is it is a global solution or not at all.

**Q517 Nigel Huddleston:** How can you force that; what is your role in making sure that happens on a global level?

**Ed Warner:** You cannot force that. We are one of 216 nations; all we can do is lobby, all we can do is publish manifestos like this and then talk to people. If European Athletics have a taskforce and we can be a part of that, great. Let us get momentum behind looking at the question.

**Q518 Nigel Huddleston:** If the Russians or the Americans do not want to play ball then nothing will happen?

**Ed Warner:** That is not the way the IAAF works. The key here is what its council decides and what they then put in front of a congress. The next congress is not until summer 2017 in London, so the key decision-makers here are the 27 members—I think they are now—on the IAAF Council.
Q519 Nigel Huddleston: Are you confident that your proposals are being taken seriously? Do you have confidence they will be adopted?

Ed Warner: I cannot say the later because there are 14 suggestions there. I have confidence—

Q520 Nigel Huddleston: Where are you getting push back then? Which ones do they not like?

Ed Warner: It is too early. We only published it a week or so ago. I have had one meeting with the UK Anti-Doping, I have another next week. I am seeing the president of European Athletics on Friday. We work our way through these conversations.

Q521 Nigel Huddleston: Are you confident?

Ed Warner: I am confident that people are listening. I am not confident all 14 will be adopted but that is not the point. The point is that there might be another 14 or 28, or multiply them, coming from other parts of the world that are better and more practical and will achieve more than these. That is great. Let us get them out there.

Q522 Chair: To be clear, you must be pleased that obviously the European Athletics Federation is complying.

Ed Warner: Yes.

Q523 Chair: Then the other thing is that, from your point of view, part of this is to try to shame the IAAF into assuming or adopting some of these suggestions and other—

Ed Warner: I would not use the word “shame”.

Chair: Nudge.

Ed Warner: Nudge. Cattle prod was your phrase—we will use that.

Chair: I think it was yours originally, but I will be very pleased if it is mine.

Ed Warner: Whatever it is, we are getting there.

Q524 Christian Matheson: Mr Warner, I had to step out briefly for a constituency vote; I apologise for my absence there. You talk about “trackside rumours”. You seem a little more attuned to what is going on in the sport than perhaps—I got the impression—Lord Coe was. We know about Russia. We know about Kenya. Is there somewhere else coming down the line that we need to be worried about in terms of, perhaps, more organised doping?

Ed Warner: Whether it is a matter of record or not—I am going to get the wrong side, I have to be careful—I am told that the problem of weak anti-
doping systems and high levels of cheating probably cover five or six countries, and Russia was one.

**Christian Matheson:** But Russia is not a weak anti-doping country, is it?

**Ed Warner:** It is systemic, so there is a small group of countries where a lot of the problem resides. The reason I am choosing my words carefully is your question was “organised”. I am not aware of the next Russia in terms of whether it is state organised or federation organised systemic cheating of the sport. What we are aware of is countries in which there seems to be a lot of doping and a weak policing regime, which is a different thing. So I do not see where the next Russia is coming from. That does not mean there is not a next Russia.

**Q525 Christian Matheson:** Are you satisfied that the balance in the IAAF is now on the right side of taking this on? I say that because of course when the problems were first announced by German and British media, to be fair, it was seen as an attack on the sport and there did not seem to be much gratitude to the media for helping to clean up the sport. We saw Lord Coe’s right-hand man talking about how we could work to massage the media. Are you seeing evidence that things are changing internationally?

**Ed Warner:** Yes, very much so.

**Q526 Christian Matheson:** Is the media more welcome now?

**Ed Warner:** It has also been welcome to me. They have done a great job; given me sleepless nights and hard times at times and that is what they are there for. That is why I am an avid consumer of print and broadcast media, and I think they hold the sport to account admirably however much of a pain in the posterior it can be personally at times. Is the IAAF more aware now of its debt to investigative journalism? I am sure it is.

**Chair:** We certainly hope so.

**Q527 Christian Matheson:** Two slightly separate issues, if I may. On the question of records being wiped: Bob Beamon’s record stood for many years. Edwin Moses; again, Ed Moses had a record that stood for many years. It is not just about time, is it? It is about additional evidence. What kind of additional evidence are you proposing is taken into account and how much weight of proof would you be looking for before you took this very serious step?

**Ed Warner:** That goes to—let’s call it—the Lord Coe solution to it, which is root out those that are clearly wrong. That is fraught with difficulty, which is why doing everything else that is required in here, and other things, and then looking at the possibility of tweaking the rules of events so that it is a new regime. I will give you a very obvious example. The javelin had to be altered a number of years ago because it was flying too far and endangering athletes on the track at the other end of the stadium, so they adjusted the javelin and had to set a whole new record book with the new javelin. So there are things you might be able to do of that sort, which then—I think, Mr Norman, you referred to it earlier—freezes existing records rather than scraps them. All of
that requires investigation. As I say, we don’t have a monopoly of good ideas and we just believe that people should have the debate in an open and honest fashion.

**Q528 Christian Matheson:** Finally, on a slightly separate subject, why was London our candidate to be the World Championship host?  
**Ed Warner:** Because it was the only place you could get 50,000-odd people into a stadium to watch athletics in the UK.

**Christian Matheson:** For example, Loughborough was not considered?  
**Ed Warner:** Loughborough has a few hundred seats, and we had a stadium, don’t forget, from the Olympics.

**Q529 Christian Matheson:** The reason I ask is that—and I realise this is not entirely within your area of responsibility—a place in the United States was chosen to host a world championship and was chosen apparently because of its heritage for sport, and Loughborough has a great heritage for sport. I just thought there was a reason there.  
**Ed Warner:** You know the elite training centre for British Athletics is in Loughborough—

**Christian Matheson:** It has a great history and heritage for sport.

**Ed Warner:** We love it, and we have a great relationship with them, but finding the money to build a—it probably needed to be—40,000-seat stadium in Loughborough as opposed to reusing the stadium that was built for the Olympics—

**Q530 Christian Matheson:** You would not have expected the fact that something has a long history and heritage of track and field is necessarily a good enough reason to host a world championship?  
**Ed Warner:** Unfortunately, it is a commercial proposition and you have to get the revenue through from ticket sales. If you look at the way the organising agreement is structured, you do not have many opportunities to make the money necessary to defray the costs of the championships. The obligations the IAAF puts on you are steep. Ticket revenue is by far and away your biggest source of income so you have to have a stadium with capacity.

For example, we thought in the past, “Could you drop a track into the Millennium Stadium in Cardiff?” Unfortunately it does not have the configuration that would allow that to happen. We know the Manchester Stadium that hosted the Commonwealth Games was converted to football with a smaller athletics track nearby. That would not be anywhere near big enough for the World Championship. So in the UK it would only have been the Don Valley Stadium, pre the reconfiguration, or London that had that necessary capacity to meet the IAAF’s requirements.
Q531 Chair: Just to wind up, Mr Warner. You have called for the supply or the procurement of performance-enhancing drugs to be criminalised and those involved to be banned for life for that. Is it just the supply and procurement of drugs rather than the process of doping itself or taking drugs?

Ed Warner: Yes, Germany and Japan, among others I believe, recently have now criminalised the use of performance-enhancing drugs. That is not something we are advocating. We think the sporting punishment is—provided it can be of sufficient length—the right one. Getting to those who make it their business to profit from the provision of performance-enhancing drugs, to find the gullible, maybe vulnerable, young athletes and turn their heads, we think would achieve a huge amount. That may well be something that is in your gift as MPs. I do not know in whose gift it might be but, again, it is one of the things we think should be looked at very seriously.

Q532 Chair: Do you have a specific argument against people who are doping being regarded as having committed a criminal offence, because obviously if you are a young athlete and someone is saying, “Here, try some of this stuff” it would help someone in that position to be able to say, “Hold on a second, you are essentially asking me to commit a criminal offence”.

Ed Warner: Yes, it would. Let us start somewhere. I prefer to start with supply and make that work.

Q533 Chair: So you are not ruling the other out, you are just focusing on supply and procurement?

Ed Warner: Germany has ruled it in. They have just recently passed that legislation.

Q534 Chair: You have not made any separate representations to the Government on this issue or national sporting bodies other than—

Ed Warner: Not as yet, no.

Chair: Thank you very much for that. It has been a very good session. We will move straight on to the next session, if we may.

Witness: Nicole Sapstead, Chief Executive, UK Anti-Doping, gave evidence.

Q535 Chair: Thank you very much indeed for coming in again. It is very kind of you. It is not our normal practice to invite anyone to come twice but we thought there had been so much more news about the topic since your original appearance that it might be helpful to do that. Are there any things in what you have just heard today, or in recent activity, regarding this area and these offences that you might want to update the Committee on or comment on?

Nicole Sapstead: First, with respect to the UK manifesto, it is something Ed and I have had an initial discussion about and I am intending to meet with him and the chief executive, Niels de Vos, next week, to discuss further. There is a lot to debate about all of the points raised. One of the ones I am
least enthused about is the proposal to publish athletes’ test data, and I say that for a number of reasons. One is that—and I think one of you made the point—it is all very well publishing data pertaining to British athletes but it has to be global to be meaningful. There are a number of countries, particularly European countries, that are bound by certain privacy laws. It is a complex area.

**Q536 Chair:** You understand this is not the content of any testing, this is just the fact of it and the timing of it?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Yes. I would also say that those who wished to try to understand how anti-doping organisations operate may be savvy enough to look at the dates that we conduct a test on an athlete, overlay it on to their competition and training details—a lot of it is available on open source—and to try to second-guess how organisations like UK Anti-Doping undertake our test plans.

I would also say that, inevitably in publishing a test data, wrong inferences or adverse inferences may be drawn from the fact that one athlete from a particular discipline was tested more or less than another athlete. Inevitably organisations like UK Anti-Doping will have to justify our actions if the public, as they are seeing it, do not think we are doing enough testing on certain athletes. There is more to consider other than just the transparency issue.

**Q537 Chair:** Your concern would be, first, unscrupulous athletes or people around them might use this as a way of gaming the testing regime, and, secondly, that somehow it might be a source of competitive advantage to other countries that we are being tested and being publicly out there with our athletes and they are not, or they are not able to do that?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Less so about that. More about putting some athletes under intense scrutiny and potentially forming the wrong conclusions about why they may or may not have been tested as much as their counterparts. We have to remember that all Anti-Doping organisations do not have the same resources that UK Anti-Doping do, so the fact that we do over 7,000 tests a year across a number of sports is clearly not going to be the same per country.

**Q538 Chair:** To be clear: when you say that Ed Warner discussed it with you, he front ran with you, did he, some of the key conclusions, wanted you to come in and buy in on them? What was the kind of relationship existing there?

**Nicole Sapstead:** No, as far as the manifesto was concerned, we had no idea, whatsoever, that they were preparing a manifesto until literally the day before, or 24, 48 hours before it was published.

**Q539 Chair:** Was it a lot punchier or a lot less punchy than you thought?

**Nicole Sapstead:** No, it certainly has prompted a debate. There are definitely some suggestions that perhaps demonstrate that they are a governing body and we are an anti-doping organisation and, therefore, there
is perhaps a lack of understanding of all the elements that have to come into play when you are considering some of the proposals.

Q540 Chair: You suggested that you and other anti-doping agencies, IAAF, were under-funded. The IAAF: we have had other evidence that their anti-doping activities are under-funded. First, would you share that view? Do you think the IAAF is under-funding its anti-doping activities?

Nicole Sapstead: Any anti-doping organisation needs more money to do what they are doing. Yes, absolutely. When you look at the sport of athletics, its size, absolutely, they need more money to do what they are doing.

Q541 Chair: The same in your own case? Are you adequately funded?

Nicole Sapstead: I would always welcome some more money. It is not so much about throwing tests. When I spoke here before I said a successful anti-doping programme is not just about testing. It is about all the other elements that form part of that, such as education. Investigations especially now. We have a well-resourced intelligence and investigations team at UK Anti-Doping, but I would like us to be able to do more investigations. We only have one investigator now. More money would mean—

Chair: You only have one investigator?

Nicole Sapstead: We have one investigator at UK Anti-Doping.

Chair: Do you mean one person?

Nicole Sapstead: One person who undertakes investigations at UK Anti-Doping, yes.

Q542 Chair: Your entire investigations capability consists of one person who goes around various track and field events or other competition testing?

Nicole Sapstead: Our reach is 47 sports, not just track and field. So yes, they are the one that are—

Q543 Chair: We are focusing on track and field and just in relation to that but indeed, over all these sports, you only have one testing person?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes, one investigator. That is all we have the capacity to have to employ.

Chair: So what does everyone else do?

Nicole Sapstead: Within the intelligence and investigations team?

Chair: Yes.

Nicole Sapstead: We have teams that monitor, for example, open source research that work up the intelligence, so the information that they are seeing, which then provide the investigator with the grounds on which to then make an approach to someone. They are doing all of the research behind to
build up the cases for us to enable us to pursue and sanction those who are in breach of the rules.

**Q544 Chair:** That seems extraordinary. When you have dealt with the IAAF, which you obviously do regularly, what were your reactions to the independent commission’s judgments about the Anti-Doping Department at the IAAF?

*Nicole Sapstead:* It is unfortunate that you had a team of individuals who were seeing things going on around them but they did not have the mechanisms by which they could report those. When you are looking at where the corruption existed at the very top where else could they go if it was not to their president or to the council members?

**Q545 Chair:** There was no whistleblowing mechanism there that would allow them to register their concerns?

*Nicole Sapstead:* It would appear not from the independent commission’s report.

**Q546 Chair:** No, so that is a concern you are raising, but you are not saying anything more than it was unfortunate that this organisation should have been involved in systematically corrupting not just the reporting of data but also—

*Nicole Sapstead:* Apart from the fact that the report obviously states that members of the Medical and Anti-Doping Department who were seeing things going on, and were raising them at various points within the IAAF, were being stonewalled, I do not think any of the members of that particular department were found wanting in terms of how they pursue their day-to-day roles or functions.

**Q547 Chair:** Did any of your staff have any knowledge of these activities?

*Nicole Sapstead:* Absolutely none whatsoever.

**Q548 Chair:** Did you have any interactions with Mr Cissé or Mr Dollé or some of the other people who have been implicated?

*Nicole Sapstead:* There would have been a degree of interaction at some point, particularly more in the past, between myself in years gone by and certainly the team moving forward with Mr Dollé, but it was purely in a straightforward exchange of information. It was never into the detail of who was being tested. It was more about when there was a particular IAAF-sanctioned event going on in the UK. It was about making a financial arrangement, a contractual arrangement about whether we would be doing the testing on their behalf or not.
Q549 John Nicolson: Hello, and thank you for coming in. Could we go back to that question of the resources that you have because Ed Warner says that you are under-resourced, and we just heard you there with the Chair give us that remarkable figure that you only have one person doing the testing. I do not think any of us—

Nicole Sapstead: Sorry, one person doing the investigation.

John Nicolson: Investigation, was it?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes.

John Nicolson: One person doing the investigation.

Nicole Sapstead: We have a huge team of doping control personnel.

Q550 John Nicolson: Can you explain what exactly it is that they do?

Nicole Sapstead: The investigator is the individual who is mandated by the organisation to go and interview sources, so individuals who wish to reveal information to us, who will go and interview athletes on the back of an anti-doping rule violation, to elicit as much information from them as regards where they got that substance from, who else—if they are from a team sport—might be taking it, to then enable us to pursue other possible avenues of sanctioning.

Q551 John Nicolson: What kind of professional background does that person have?

Nicole Sapstead: They have a law enforcement background.

John Nicolson: It is a law rather than a science background?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes.

Q552 John Nicolson: How much more money do you need?

Nicole Sapstead: I honestly cannot answer that question. I realise that if somebody were to say to me, "You have to quantify that" I would at least want the resources to have a few more investigators within the intelligence and investigations team.

John Nicolson: "A few more" being 10 times?

Nicole Sapstead: Two or three. The problem that we have within—

Q553 John Nicolson: You could do the job with three investigators?

Nicole Sapstead: No, but the problem that we have, and why I am finding it difficult to quantify or answer your question specifically, is because our mandate is to follow the intelligence. Our team do not know on any particular day where a piece of intelligence may lead us. It may be significant and it may point to corruption from top down within a particular sport or a team, if we are talking about a team sport.
**Q554 John Nicolson:** How can you possibly follow corruption top down in a team sport with one investigator?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Because we use the other individuals within the intelligence and investigations team to support them in that. They are looking at the individuals around or where we think there might be some corruption. They are doing in-depth analysis on each of the individuals that we think may be implicated in that corruption.

**Q555 John Nicolson:** What do you think specifically you would be able to do with a bigger budget?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Test more. I have explained—if it is not to yourselves then to the media—that, because we only have limited resources, if we see our intelligence is pointing to a particular doping issue within a sport we are to prove or disprove that intelligence. Particularly when it comes to testing, we have to take those tests from another sport to redirect them into the problem area that we think. That unfortunately means that there are sports, Paralympic and Olympic sports that, because of that, will receive nominal amounts, maybe token amounts, maybe no testing whatsoever at all in any financial year.

**Q556 John Nicolson:** There could be some sports at the moment where there is routine wrongdoing and you are not able to carry out the work that you would like to carry out in those sports?

**Nicole Sapstead:** If we see there is a wrongdoing we will divert our resources to where we think that wrongdoing is to the detriment of another sport and their testing programmes.

**Q557 John Nicolson:** The problem is—as we are discovering, sadly—there seems to be wrongdoing happening simultaneously in a large number of sports. It is just not credible that you could spread yourself at the moment in the way that you need to do with the resources you have. How does your organisation’s funding compare with other countries?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Similar. We have a large head count in comparison to other countries. We are comparable when you look at the States, Canada, maybe Australia in terms of our head count.

**Q558 John Nicolson:** So all across the world anti-doping bodies are under-funded?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Yes. Significantly under-funded.

**Q559 John Nicolson:** Do you see any moves across the world to react to the exposure that sports have had? The evidence that we have discovered of a huge amount of wrongdoing, do you see any great rush to fund anti-doping organisations?
Nicole Sapstead: It depends who you are talking about when it comes to who is funding. I know that there are some national anti-doping organisations that have turned to the national federations within their counties and said, “You have to start paying for this”. That is the reality. If we are limited in terms of our budget from Government then, to enable us to do more with more, that has to come from somewhere else. Maybe the time is now for sport to start to put their hand in their pocket and put some contribution towards anti-doping.

Q560 John Nicolson: There is some suggestion as well that, rather than withdraw their funding in protest at the revelations, some of the big corporate sponsors should specifically say that they are going to put their money into doping investigations and monitoring. Would you support that?

Nicole Sapstead: I would support a number of innovative ways of funding anti-doping organisations. Mr Warner mentioned that maybe there is an opportunity here to put a small percentage rise on ticket sales across sports, and that money goes to a wider integrity pot of money of which a portion of it can go to anti-doping.

Q561 John Nicolson: Let me ask you exactly the same question that I asked the previous witness about Lord Coe. When he appeared before us he told us that he had never been offered a bribe and he did not know anyone who had been encouraged to cheat. I think all of us were surprised at that. You know yourself that when we heard from Ed Warner, he said that he had had lots of conversations about cheating and doping with people who tried to fill him in and make sure that he was not approaching his job in an innocent or naive way. Are you surprised at the fact that Lord Coe seems to know so little about this from a first-hand experience?

Nicole Sapstead: In a situation where somebody is in front of a Select Committee you would like to think they are being nothing other than honest. I honestly don’t know. In my whole term of being in anti-doping I have never been offered any kind of money or incentive to make something go away.

John Nicolson: No, but you know doping is happening, obviously.

Nicole Sapstead: Absolutely.

Q562 John Nicolson: The peculiar thing about Lord Coe’s evidence was that he appears to exist in such a rarefied atmosphere that he had not had conversations, he said, about doping with people that he knew in the sport. It just seems peculiar.

Nicole Sapstead: All I will say is that, as a national anti-doping organisation, we are constantly liaising and exchanging information about sports or individuals where we think there may be a doping issue.

Q563 John Nicolson: How much contact have you had with Lord Coe himself?
Nicole Sapstead: I have had no contact with him whatsoever.

John Nicolson: Really? He has not asked to see you?

Nicole Sapstead: No.

John Nicolson: He has not phoned you?

Nicole Sapstead: No.

Q564 John Nicolson: That is extraordinary: the boss of the IAAF, in the midst of a doping scandal of huge international proportions, has not picked up the phone and asked to chat to you.

Nicole Sapstead: My position is that we will support Lord Coe and the IAAF—

John Nicolson: You cannot support him if he does not talk to you, can you?

Nicole Sapstead: No, but we can work through his other staff members. With him we continue to have a very successful and amiable relationship.

Q565 John Nicolson: Never mind amiable; I am sure everybody wants to be amiable, but it is just extraordinarily passive. We keep hearing this in evidence about Lord Coe, how passive he seems to be. He does not do the things that I know I would do. I would have phoned the Russian whistle-blowers, I would have phoned you up, and I would have said, “Come in and talk to me about drug taking. I seem to be something of an innocent abroad. I want to learn from you” and he has not done that?

Nicole Sapstead: No, but he could have gone elsewhere, rather than UK Anti-Doping, to get that insight into the world of why individuals take drugs and how they do them.

Q566 John Nicolson: I would have thought he would have started with his home country and talked to the relevant people, and he has been in office for some time now. Presumably you would like to meet him.

Nicole Sapstead: The offer of a discussion and a meeting is always there.

Q567 Damian Collins: There were reports a few days ago saying that you are in talks with Russian Athletics about UK Anti-Doping working with Russia on implementing a new anti-doping regime. Is that correct?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes, in that we are in discussions with the Russian anti-doping organisation and WADA about assisting them in relation to delivering a testing programme across all sports—so not just track and field—within Russia.

Q568 Damian Collins: What would UK Anti-Doping provide in terms of people? Would your investigators be involved in investigating in Russia as well?
Nicole Sapstead: No, it is fairly limited in that regard. It is in relation to delivering or producing a test distribution plan, so deciding with the budget that is available to us which athletes we are going to test in which sports, when and where. We will use commercial companies and their doping control officers to deliver or to undertake those tests for us. We will continue to root through the remaining members of staff or team at the Russian Anti-Doping Agency in our endeavours.

Q569 Damian Collins: Do you think you have the necessary resources to carry out this extra responsibility?

Nicole Sapstead: We will bring in some extra resource to conduct this, so at no point will our engagement in Russia be at the detriment of what we are trying to achieve in the UK.

Q570 Damian Collins: Would the Russians be paying for this service?

Nicole Sapstead: Absolutely. This is absolutely not at the UK public purse’s expense.

Q571 Damian Collins: Are you confident you will be able to police this arrangement successfully?

Nicole Sapstead: No, it is limited. If I start by saying it is better than nothing, so since the Russian Anti-Doping Agency was suspended and since the WADA accredited laboratory in Moscow had their accreditation withdrawn, there has been limited testing in Russia. As an organisation whose mandate is to protect clean sport and clean athletes, we were approached by the World Anti-Doping Agency to consider this venture. I feel it is incumbent on us as a country to try to plug a gap when we have Rio six months away. There will be athletes going to Rio, notwithstanding that they may or may not be inclusive of track and field athletes who—

Damian Collins: Are Russian athletes going to Rio?

Nicole Sapstead: Sorry, Russian sports people going to Rio. Sorry, I used that in a very generic way. Notwithstanding that track and field may or may not go—sorry, I have lost my train of thought, but the point is that we have six months. We are not the solution to this problem, but what we are trying to do is at least conduct a degree of testing on these sports who will be going to Rio, and also track and field, in collaboration with the IAAF, so that, where at all possible, we can catch some cheating Russian sports people we will catch them before they get to Rio and before they are caught either in competition or post the event.

Q572 Damian Collins: What you said about it is not perfect but better than nothing is quite important, because I can see that if this deal is agreed that you could be used by the IAAF and by Russian Athletics to say, “We have brought the UK Anti-Doping Agency in to oversee and run our anti-doping regime” and that will be a long way from the truth, wouldn’t it? You are
providing a very limited amount of assistance and you cannot have any certainty that you can effectively completely police the whole thing.

**Nicole Sapstead:** No, that is spot on. That is exactly the conversation that not only was raised at our board—when I raised this with the board about did I have their support in entering into these discussions—but also this is a conversation we had with the World Anti-Doping Agency, which is: we want no part in determining the compliance or otherwise of the Russian Athletics Federation. The IAAF have set out a number of criteria that they are required to meet, of which testing is a small portion of what they need to meet. I would be bitterly disappointed if at some point somebody went, “There is testing going on. UK Anti-Doping was party to that, therefore, they must be compliant” because that is not what the criteria for reinstatement state, as set out by the IAAF.

**Q573 Damian Collins:** From what you know and what you have seen, which I appreciate on the Russian perspective will be limited, do you think it is possible to create a new anti-doping regime in Russia in time for their athletes to compete at Rio?

**Nicole Sapstead:** I do not think so. What we have seen is so entrenched that this is not an overnight solution. It will take a number of years to even get to the point where there is any credibility that can be attached to their programmes and, potentially, the performances that they are witnessing.

**Q574 Damian Collins:** Have you discussed with the IAAF UK Anti-Doping playing this role in Russia?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Not yet because, literally, until two days ago we had not even signed a contract. We are now at the stage where the contract is being signed, and now we will enter into a discussion with the IAAF in relation to how we might work together to deliver that testing programme.

**Q575 Damian Collins:** I want to briefly ask about football and Arsene Wenger’s comments about doping. Do you think there is a need for a bigger anti-doping regime in football?

**Nicole Sapstead:** In terms of England, the Football Association run quite an extensive anti-doping programme and, with that, some good values-based education and an extensive testing programme, which includes blood profiling. My comments in relation to football were in relation to the sport generally and not just at an English level. Obviously our mandate is to care about what goes on in the UK and sport in the UK, but we also care about what is going on elsewhere. If we can try to influence what is happening in terms of anti-doping programmes in other parts of the world then we will do everything we can to do that.

**Q576 Chair:** Ms Sapstead, your scepticism is very clear about whether Russia could be ready to comply and, therefore, for Russian athletes to be able to compete at Rio. The same thing was said—that you will have accepted—by Mr Warner when he came in front of us a few minutes ago. The question is: did you
also share his view that, even if the mechanisms then somehow could be made compliant, it would still be grossly unfair because those Russian athletes would have had the benefit of years of body building and training on the basis of blood doping and, therefore, they would have at an unfair advantage at that point as well.

Nicole Sapstead: Yes, I see that point. I understand that point—it is a point that we hear time and again. My answer to that is you just cannot think that that argument applies to Russia and athletics. There are other countries and other sports who are doping. Therefore, for me, this is about how we address this wider issue that is going on before we start looking at the detail of things like: what are the benefits that can be derived by an individual from taking something from three, four, five years ago?

Q577 Chair: In that spirit, you have talked about some of the other countries, at least by implication, who might have been involved. Thinking from a Rio perspective and not thinking about athletics, what are the other sports you think are most at risk from the doping patterns that you have seen?

Nicole Sapstead: I would say weightlifting has a bad press and unfortunately amateur boxing has had some history of doping. Please let me be clear that I am not speaking from a UK perspective, but from a global perspective. Rowing has had its issues in the past internationally—not in the UK but internationally—and clearly cycling. There are sports that, I think, if you put any enthusiastic sports fan in front of you, they would probably list the same sports that I have listed.

Chair: Yes, it is helpful to have you say that and it is salutary, from the point of view of thinking about Rio. That is very kind.

Q578 Ian C. Lucas: I would like to continue to talk a little about football. You said in your evidence that the Russian Anti-Doping Agency had been suspended, so it is much broader than simply athletics as far as WADA is concerned. The anti-doping system in Russia has been suspended. How does that affect football in Russia?

Nicole Sapstead: I honestly cannot answer that question because I am presuming that that falls under the remit of the Russian Anti-Doping Agency, so that would mean that currently there is limited testing going on on Russian athletes.

Q579 Ian C. Lucas: Russia play England and Wales in the European Championships later this year, and Dinamo Zagreb’s Arijan Ademi was banned for four years for failing a test following his side’s champion league’s win over Arsenal in September. At the moment what is the system for testing Russian footballers?

Nicole Sapstead: The system at the moment, in the lack of an anti-doping organisation, would be the international federation, FIFA, and obviously there is UEFA as well, both of which run testing programmes. If you are looking at a country that has no national anti-doping organisation, of which there are many, that is where the responsibility of the international federation for that
sport is—front and centre—in relation to delivering a robust testing programme.

**Q580 Ian C. Lucas:** Are you confident that there is a robust testing programme for footballers in Russia at the moment?  
**Nicole Sapstead:** Without knowing if FIFA are doing anything to plug the gap that currently exists, I cannot answer that question.

**Q581 Ian C. Lucas:** Obviously you are a UK organisation, and you mentioned the FA in terms of football testing within the UK. Obviously there are other national football associations within the UK—Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland—are they responsible for testing programmes themselves? Do they have the resources to do that?  
**Nicole Sapstead:** They are responsible in partnership with UK Anti-Doping in relation to delivering their testing programme. What I will say is any sport has the ability to utilise the services of a commercial company if they wanted to, if they did not want to use UK Anti-Doping. We do run a testing programme for both the Football Association of Wales and Scottish Football. They are not anywhere near the size of the programme that we do for the Football Association. I imagine part of that is to do with resources. A lot of it as well is the profile of the particular sport. I do not mean any disrespect in that regard, but a number of their players will be playing within the Premier League and will be picked up under the Football Association’s programme.

**Q582 Ian C. Lucas:** Are you satisfied with the regimes in countries outside England as far as testing is concerned?  
**Nicole Sapstead:** No. I think I have said to this Committee before that it is a concern, not only for UK Anti-Doping but other national anti-doping organisations that run robust, extensive testing programmes within their countries, when there are a number of countries that run limited or token anti-doping programmes.

**Q583 Ian C. Lucas:** I suggested to our witness earlier that we needed to have an international regime concerning drug testing and anti-doping. Do you agree with that?  
**Nicole Sapstead:** I think it is worth exploring.

**Q584 Ian C. Lucas:** If we look at the situation in Russia at the minute, frankly relying on FIFA and UEFA to plug that gap—you are an expert in this area and you did not sound very convinced by the regime that is currently in place. Isn’t it the case that we need to have some of the enormous resources in football, for example, invested in a proper international regime to confront the menace of doping?  
**Nicole Sapstead:** When you look at an international regime you have to determine what you mean by that and whether that is an international body that is solely responsible for delivering testing and education, that is one
thing. Clearly the role of the World Anti-Doping Agency right now is to ensure compliance, and part of that compliance is probing and determining the extent to which anti-doping programmes are run within countries and sports. Their very role is to engage with those sports and countries who are not doing everything that they could be doing.

As soon as you start looking at the possibility that one organisation might do all of this for all of us and all of the sports, first, you need the buy-in of all the international federations for that to be taken from them but there is also a question of: who would fund this? At the moment you have to remember that WADA is part funded by Government and part funded by the IOC. So, for me, you could argue it is not entirely independent, is it?

**Q585 Chair:** That is very interesting and helpful, thank you. To follow up on one point there, Ms Sapstead, you were saying that in the absence of a Russian Anti-Doping Agency, given the crisis it is in at the moment, there is a special onus on FIFA and UEFA to step in to try to ensure that anti-doping testing has been done properly with regard to football, is that right?

**Nicole Sapstead:** No, it is an obligation on any international federation to look to the group of athletes or group of sportspeople that are coming from Russia and to focus some of their attention on putting some testing—

**Q586 Chair:** Well, talking about Russian football, it is going to be those two as the reigning football authorities?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Yes.

**Q587 Chair:** The same would be true in other areas?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Absolutely.

**Q588 Chair:** In a way, paradoxically, the effect of taking the corrupted and failed Russian Anti-Doping Agency out of the picture is going to be to open the door to more doping between now and Rio?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Effectively, yes.

**Q589 Chair:** If they do end up being brought into the fold from an Olympic standpoint, the athletes that come through are at a severe risk of having been at least as vulnerable to doping as the ones we have been talking about hitherto?

**Nicole Sapstead:** Yes.

**Chair:** That is very disturbing. Thank you very much.

**Q590 Christian Matheson:** Hello again, Ms Sapstead.

**Nicole Sapstead:** Hello.
Christian Matheson: I am going to ask you the same question I asked Mr Warner and I think probably I asked you when you were last in front of us, but obviously things move on very quickly. We are not really at the bottom of this yet, are we?

Nicole Sapstead: No, regrettably.

Q591 Christian Matheson: There is more to come?
Nicole Sapstead: Again, I have said I think it would be naive to think that this stops at the door of athletics.

Q592 Christian Matheson: Do you have suspicions, either in terms of other sports or in other countries involved in athletics, where these are likely to be?
Nicole Sapstead: The second part of the independent commission’s report I think mentions six other countries where perhaps they were concerned that there may be some issues, but clearly their mandate was not to look at those particular countries. I think Turkey and Kenya were mentioned, Morocco—

Q593 Christian Matheson: When you get together with the other doping agencies—and I presume you do, maybe have a gossip—perhaps you do not want to share them with us but there must be quite a lot of widespread fears as to where the system isn’t working? I am not just talking about anti-doping procedures not being up to scratch, but about where there is a systematic effort to use performance enhancements like this.
Nicole Sapstead: Yes. Yes, and we do—

Q594 Christian Matheson: You have your suspicions?
Nicole Sapstead: Yes, absolutely, and so does every other credible national anti-doping organisation.

Q595 Christian Matheson: Are these likely to have been shared to the top of the IAAF?
Nicole Sapstead: Sorry; I was talking about sport generally.

Christian Matheson: In general, yes.

Nicole Sapstead: In general, and those suspicions will be known and will have been shared with the World Anti-Doping Agency, as well as among the group of national anti-doping organisations.

Q596 Christian Matheson: Mr Nicolson was talking earlier about the rarefied atmosphere and about senior sports administrators perhaps getting their hands dirty. Is there a mechanism for suggesting to a sport—and we are talking about athletics today—that they need to be shining a spotlight on a certain area or on a certain country perhaps?
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Nicole Sapstead: I cannot speak for the IAAF but I would be very surprised, knowing the individuals who are in the Medical and Anti-Doping Department, if they were not already fully sighted on the countries that need some testing. I say that because I know a good international federation will look at all of the countries where that sport is being played. They will also look at the anti-doping organisations that may or may not exist within those countries.

For example, within the UK, it is quite unusual for an international federation to come into the UK or to insist on doing huge amounts of testing on UK athletes because we run such a robust programme. That enables them to then divert their resources to the very countries where there is nobody running a credible anti-doping programme. So, yes, only because I have seen how we liaise with the IAAF about UK athletes, I would expect them to be doing the same with other credible NADOs and focusing their attention to those areas that need a spotlight.

Christian Matheson: That does rather put a responsibility on the IAAF to get this right.

Nicole Sapstead: It does.

Q597 Christian Matheson: I want to ask about the IAAF internally in a moment but, on a broader point, we are talking here about blood doping, which is the latest way of cheating. Obviously in the past people would take drugs or steroids also. Do you have an idea of where the next cheat is coming from?

Nicole Sapstead: Country-wise, sport-wise?

Christian Matheson: No, scientifically, biologically, medically. How far are you playing catch up and how far are you trying to anticipate that this might be a good way of cheating?

Nicole Sapstead: A little bit of both. A little bit of catch-up, a little bit about trying to second-guess what might be around the corner. For us, I would say what continues to be a big threat is steroids and the designer steroids, so the ones that are constantly being manipulated, chemically altered to evade a test but to still ensure that the athlete is benefiting from the use of that steroid. We are reliant on intelligence. We are reliant on informants to pass over a vial or a hypodermic needle or to point us to an underground laboratory where those substances are being engineered.

Q598 Christian Matheson: Okay. You are independent, aren’t you, of individual sports?

Nicole Sapstead: Absolutely.

Christian Matheson: That is important to you?

Nicole Sapstead: Very important.

Q599 Christian Matheson: Would the same be the case at an international level? Is WADA considered independent?
Nicole Sapstead: Yes, I think they are very independent.

Christian Matheson: They value that independence?

Nicole Sapstead: Absolutely, absolutely.

Q600 Christian Matheson: Nick Davies is Lord Coe’s right-hand man. He got himself in some hot water and had to step aside after an e-mail that he sent to Diack Junior, I think, which was leaked, in which he said, “We need to minimise the impact of naming the Russians. I need to sit down with the Anti-Doping Department to see what Russian skeletons we still have”. This was about managing the potential fallout from the forthcoming anti-doping regulations. That makes me think that in the IAAF the Anti-Doping Department isn’t sufficiently independent.

Nicole Sapstead: I think that was the conclusion of the actual Independent Commission report was that it suggested that there was a clear line, a wall, a Chinese wall—call it what you will—between the other operational activity of the IAAF and the Medical and Anti-Doping Department.

Q601 Christian Matheson: Are you able to trust the IAAF now and its Anti-Doping Department, or do you think there are still problems there?

Nicole Sapstead: No, I have no reason to believe, and nobody has shown me any evidence to suggest that there is any member within that Medical and Anti-Doping Department who cannot be trusted.

Q602 Christian Matheson: It is obviously being influenced from the outside or the other side of that Chinese wall by senior management of the IAAF, or it has been?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes, I take that point but I think I started some of my evidence by saying, “Where were those individuals able to go?” Within UK Anti-Doping, if anyone wants to whistleblow, first of all, we have a clear policy about it. I would encourage anybody who saw any wrongdoing to shout out about it. We have a board. We have the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. We have the World Anti-Doping Agency. We have the media; if any of those points are met with some resistance they have somebody else to go to. But when you have a problem from the very top and the circle around them, where else were they able to go with their concerns?

Q603 Christian Matheson: This is not about whistleblowing. This is about coming from the other direction. This is about the very top coming into the Anti-Doping Department to manipulate the release of that information to the news and to manage the news, so it is not about whistleblowing. It is about the Anti-Doping Department being influenced by the IAAF management, albeit the previous management, notwithstanding that Mr Davies is obviously still connected to the current president.

Nicole Sapstead: I think the fact that there was a clear lack of governance structure is clearly an issue. There are a number of protocols and processes...
that you can put in place, which would minimise the opportunity from top down influencing what was going on within the Medical and Anti-Doping Department. I think that has been fully acknowledged and Lord Coe has said that is one of the very things that he will be addressing.

Q604 Christian Matheson: If I am head of UK Athletics and I give you a call and say, “Nicole, I understand you have some pretty damning results coming out, I would like to talk to you about how we manage that”. What do you say to me?

Nicole Sapstead: I would say to you that I am the last person to find out about an adverse analytical finding at the organisation. I only find out about it once it is in a state where it has been reported by the laboratory. At that point it is in a system where not only do the laboratory know about it, members of the UK Anti-Doping know about it and the World Anti-Doping Agency know about it.

Q605 Christian Matheson: Is it your job to manage the news?

Nicole Sapstead: Is it my job to manage the news?

Christian Matheson: You could perhaps work with us to minimise damage to the sport?

Nicole Sapstead: No, absolutely not. I am not beholden to any one sport agenda.

Q606 Christian Matheson: Is it, therefore, not the role of the anti-doping people at IAAF to manage the news? Is it their job to maintain the integrity of the anti-doping procedures?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes, of course it is.

Q607 Christian Matheson: Can I ask you, finally, what evidence have you seen from the IAAF that things have moved on since 2013 in terms of the integrity and the resilience of that independence of that Anti-Doping Department in the IAAF?

Nicole Sapstead: When it comes to our interaction with the IAAF, it is in relation to either testing at competitions within the UK or testing of UK athletes either in the UK or overseas. Any athlete biological passport data is entered on to ADAMS, so we have oversight and WADA has oversight. I have no evidence, whatsoever, that would tell me that there has ever been anything other than an open, honest, transparent exchange of information and that our efforts have been genuine and for the right reasons.

Q608 Christian Matheson: As far as you know, that 2013 e-mail from Mr Davies asking for the opportunity to potentially manage the release of that information was a one off, as far as you can see?

Nicole Sapstead: Well, unless there are others that are found to be available then I would hope so.
**Q609 Christian Matheson:** From an independence point of view, just a final question: would you consider such a bid by the management to be inappropriate? If you were an IAAF doping manager, if you are doing your job within the IAAF, would you find it an inappropriate advance for somebody from senior management to talk to you about how they would manage?

Nicole Sapstead: For the detail, absolutely.

Christian Matheson: Thank you.

**Q610 Chair:** Thank you very much indeed for that. Just to pick up on something that you were saying there, Ms Sapstead. You painted a picture in which drugs were being—I think it is widely believed—specifically engineered and designed to get around regulations in order to assist blood doping and cheating. The question is: where do you come out on the issue of criminalisation of the supply of drugs for this purpose? Can you answer that for us?

Nicole Sapstead: I will try to simply. This was an area that UK Anti-Doping was asked to look at, at the time that we were formed in December 2009. It is an area that the Minister, Tracey Crouch, asked us to look at again probably about two or three months ago. Our position in 2009—and it remains the position of UK Anti-Doping—is that it is not an area that we would necessarily support, in so much as we did engage with the Crown Prosecution Service back in 2009 for a discussion about what this might look like. I am sure you can imagine that when you look at the resources and the priorities, particularly, of law enforcement right now, asking them to pursue an individual because they have taken steroids, for example, is not high up on their agenda.

We have a hard enough job partnering with law enforcement now to try to get into where we think there might be underground laboratories, to try to take them down and for law enforcement to seize their assets. It is hard enough trying to get them to engage in that regard let alone to pursue a criminal action against an athlete or their entourage.

**Q611 Chair:** To be clear, you are struggling to get the police to raid criminal premises where you think there are drugs being illegally manufactured?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes. We have had some successful operations with the police—

Chair: That is quite interesting.

Nicole Sapstead: —but clearly they are stretched. They have limited resources themselves. They have competing priorities. We have to be able to demonstrate some clear evidence that we have reason to believe that there is criminal activity going on. We have had one recent, successful raid where some cash was seized. It makes it very attractive for law enforcement to engage if we can show a benefit to them from helping us to deliver our mandate.
Q612 Chair: Right, so there is a practical reason why you might worry about the actual enforcement of a new criminal offence but you do not seem to have given any consideration to the questions of whether or not it is a fraud on other athletes, which people widely claim it is, or whether indeed it might assist in the deterrents, which is obviously something you should be concerned with?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes, we have considered whether it would act as a deterrent and I do not deny that it wouldn’t.

Chair: You mean you do not deny that it would?

Nicole Sapstead: Sorry, I do not deny it would act as a deterrent—apologies. In relation to fraud, I personally think that is a difficult one. It is one thing being able to say, ”Right, we have a clear anti-doping rule violation here where an athlete’s sample has tested positive for X, Y, Z. It is therefore fraud”, but—

Q613 Chair: Yes, but some of the athletes you have described, who have subsequently been banned, if it can shown that they have won prize money or records were set and so on, then certainly others have testified before this Committee that is fraudulent behaviour and it has undoubtedly cost those who are not the winners as a result?

Nicole Sapstead: I do not disagree with that. I do not disagree that it is fraud and it is cheating in a different sense, but what I am trying to say is that is where you can tangibly say there is an outcome that we can say they were cheating and, therefore, it was fraud. The issue with regards to fraud is there is fraudulent behaviour going on all of the time. If you say that there are individuals who are cheating people out of prize money or a medal or a cup—call it what you will—how do you prove that fraud if you have no tangible outcome to it. I think it is just a complex area that needs to be properly debated.

Q614 Chair: When the Minister came to you and said, ”Will you look into it again?”—has that review been completed now by you?

Nicole Sapstead: Yes, we did provide a short briefing paper to the Minister.

Q615 Chair: So what you have just given us is a description of the content?

Nicole Sapstead: No, it is a snippet. I cannot recall off the top of my head exactly—

Q616 Chair: No, but it is the headline point, which is: your view has not changed.

Nicole Sapstead: Yes, our view has not changed.

Q617 Chair: Therefore, by extension, you would disagree with the manifesto that calls for this in that regard?

Nicole Sapstead: I would, yes.
Q618 Chair: You do not think there is any case for criminalisation for taking performance enhancing drugs?

Nicole Sapstead: No. At this point in time, the World Anti-Doping Code is clear about the sanctions that would come into play if you were proven to have taken a prohibited substance. It is an additional sanction on top of—

Chair: You are sticking with the code.

Nicole Sapstead: I am sticking with the code right now.

Chair: You do not think the deterrent effect from a young athlete saying, “I don’t want to be pushed into a criminal offence by this” is worth having?

Nicole Sapstead: There was one study where a group of athletes or sportspeople were asked, “This is a magic pill and, if you take this magic pill, it will assure you that you can win your competition event. You will be top of the game, would you take it?” Startling, over 50% said of course they would take it. You then overlay that with, “If we then told you that in five years’ time, as a consequence of taking that magic pill, you would die would you still take it?” You would expect the response rate to drop significantly but, no, it didn’t. So I could equally argue that a criminal charge, death—if you are prepared to dope I wonder if either of those two are something that you would consider.

Q619 Chair: That is interesting; maybe so. A final question: when Lord Coe came to testify before the Committee, he said that the IAAF would not, as matters presently stood, permit the release of the study by the WADA experts and the University of Tübingen. His argument was that, although the report had not been done by IAAF, it needed IAAF sanction and that they needed to study it further before it was released. The very obvious response to that is: this is a scientific study and it will receive all of the assessment it possibly can do once it has been formally been released for peer review and scientific examination. How do you come out on this? Do you think that study ought to be published, given its potentially highly significant impact?

Nicole Sapstead: I think probably now. If not, when? The time is right now to show some clear transparency so why would you not publish that report.

Chair: That is helpful. Thank you very much indeed. We are very grateful to you.