



Culture, Media and Sport Committee

Oral evidence: [Blood Doping in Athletics](#), HC 430 Wednesday 2 December 2015

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 2 December 2015.

[Watch the meeting](#)

Members present: Jesse Norman (Chair); Nigel Adams; Andrew Bingham; Damian Collins; Julie Elliott; Paul Farrelly; Nigel Huddleston; Ian C. Lucas; Chris Matheson; John Nicolson

Questions 178-431

Witnesses: **Lord Coe CH KBE**, President, International Association of Athletics Federations, and **Thomas Capdevielle**, Anti-Doping Senior Manager/Acting Operations Director, International Association of Athletics Federations, gave evidence.

Q178 Chair: The hearing is now in session. Thank you very much indeed, Lord Coe and Monsieur Capdevielle, for coming in today. We are very grateful to you.

Lord Coe, as a parliamentarian, you will be familiar with the proceedings here from this side of things as much as from yours, and we are very grateful you can join us. There has been a huge amount of public interest in the issues that we will be addressing today and, as a result, an awful lot of material to get through, so I will be enormously grateful—both to you and to colleagues—if we can keep the questions crisp and the answers as concise but as full as the questions demand.

Lord Coe, if I can start by asking you a framing question, which is: can you tell us what your personal view of blood doping is and why you think it is wrong, because you obviously do think it is wrong?

Lord Coe: That is a very simple concept for me. I joined an athletics club at the age of 11 and in my 59th year I became president of our sport. I competed at pretty much every level for the best part of 25, 30 years. It is a non-negotiable concept that athletes must compete with integrity, that coaches must believe that they can coach with integrity, and this goes way beyond the issue simply of clean athletes. This is about trust. It is about trust that the athletes have systems that they can believe in. It is that spectators, when they are watching something taking place in a stadium, trust what they are watching; it is the trust of the sponsors, the broadcasters that invest and, crucially, parents because parents have a huge influence on the sport that their children choose. I have to say that if it is a sport that shows any

ambivalence at all towards doping then they will find other sports and other activities, so for me it is the cornerstone of everything that I believe.

Q179 Chair: Do you share the experts' view that blood doping can pose serious risks to the athletes who do it?

Lord Coe: Yes, I do. There is a high degree of agreement across the scientific space. We have some key disagreements as a federation, but blood doping is a very serious issue. Doping processes that are secure are an extremely serious issue. It is incumbent upon any sporting federation, in whatever sport, to secure those. So, yes, these are serious issues.

Q180 Chair: Therefore, IAAF has a duty of care to the athletes themselves, who are blood doping, to try to stop them from doing that because of the health risks that it can pose to them?

Lord Coe: The IAAF has a duty of care to clean athletes to create structures and a landscape that allow them to do what they want to do freely. Part of the challenge, of course, is creating systems that weed out the cheats, and get them out as quickly as you possibly can, and then to create the education programmes and a values-based sport, but it is absolutely essential. The biggest challenge in our sport is trying to encourage more young people into track and field; the average age of people watching track and field is 55. That is not sustainable, so this is all part of the same landscape.

Q181 Chair: Does blood doping defraud the athletes who lose out as a result? Obviously there are appearance fees, prize money, winning endorsements, things like that. Do those athletes get defrauded if they lose as a result of a doping athlete?

Lord Coe: If there are failures in the anti-doping systems and protocols anywhere, then the biggest losers are, of course, the clean athletes. It is not just simply about the clean athletes in the country who may be suspended as a result of that. It has implications for clean athletes across the world because, inevitably, those athletes who are doing it without integrity are competing against clean athletes. They are finishing higher in races. They are probably taking prize money and, worse than that, they may well be taking medals off them.

Q182 Chair: Do you think that as a result of that that blood doping should be a criminal offence? Obviously it is in some other countries across Europe.

Lord Coe: This is a good debate. I authored a report to Government back in 1988 that created an independent, wholly random out-of-competition system that became the blueprint for anti-doping programmes around the world. We looked at the criminalisation of individual athletes and we felt that the first thing to do is to create a criminal offence around trafficking. We got it written into, I think, the 1988 Criminal Justice Bill.

I have a concern about criminalising the athletes because I think it is always very complicated to place a civil system against a criminal system. Which one takes primacy? My nervousness is that, while you are trying to figure that out, you slow up the process, so clearly it is a debate that we are having at this moment.

Q183 Chair: People have been defrauded, had money taken away from them because some blood-doping athlete is coming, taking winnings and endorsements that they could have had. Isn't that—

Lord Coe: Yes, I don't think there is any argument. You are right. I don't think there is any great argument around whether or not the athletes are being defrauded. Clearly they have been. They have had ambitions ruined. There are all sorts of things that take place. I think the discussion is what is the best way to deal with that. Currently I think that it is better for it to be a sporting sanction because ultimately the sporting sanction can be a lot tougher than the criminal sanction.

Q184 Chair: The IAAF has said that it thinks that 14% of athletes are doping. Am I right about that?

Lord Coe: That is a number that came out of a prevalence report that we published a few years ago. Thomas can give you a greater insight into that. That prevalence report showed roughly that but, again, that was slightly skewed because the mean was raised quite dramatically around four or five countries. Thomas, you may want to add to that.

Thomas Capdevielle: Yes. One illustration of the use of the blood data prior to the introduction of the Athlete Biological Passport was our submission that we made best use of this blood data: we were the first and still to date are the only international federation and sports organisation to have conducted a prevalence study to better measure the situation of doping, and in this case blood doping in sport.

Q185 Chair: What is the answer, 14% higher, lower? What is the IAAF's current view of the amount of blood doping that goes on?

Thomas Capdevielle: That was the situation at the time. We have now conducted a follow up to the study, which was based on blood data prior to the introduction of the Athlete Biological Passport, as I just said, and now we are doing a follow up of the study to see whether the situation has changed since the introduction of the Athlete Biological Passport.

Q186 Chair: Your view is it is not 1% or 2%; it is a lot higher than the level of detection that is going on at the moment?

Thomas Capdevielle: In anti-doping there are two dangers. One is to underestimate doping and I think the IAAF has done everything about this. Some organisations are in denial; some organisations are shying away. We have done exactly the contrary and to date we are the only one to have conducted such a study. The other danger is to exaggerate the issue. What

we did through the study is what we call a risk assessment analysis, like an insurance company. We try to have objective tools to measure the reality of doping and adjust your anti-doping programme accordingly. The purpose of the study was to identify a few countries.

Q187 Chair: Okay. Lord Coe, do you think that 14% is right or do you think it is higher or lower than that at the moment?

Lord Coe: I don't know. That is the honest answer. As Thomas said, we want to look beyond that prevalence report but, as I said, that prevalence report that showed 14% showed that a disproportionate amount of our reputational damage is being caused by a relatively small number of countries.

Q188 Chair: You have taken a very strong line on people who have had concerns about whistle-blowing and some of the activities that have been reported and the WADA have investigated. You said, for example, "There is nothing in our history of competence and integrity in drug testing that warrants this kind of attack". I think this was in the context of some reports in the press. "We should not be cowering. We should come out fighting. The idea that my sport sat there either covering up wrongdoing or just being incompetent could not be wider of the mark." Given what we know now, and the WADA report—and there is a second WADA report to come—and the information about Mr Diack and so on, that was a mistake, wasn't it? You were wrong about that.

Lord Coe: No. I think it is important, if you don't mind, for me to point out that there are three very different issues we are dealing with here. We are dealing with the issue about the management of a blood database, and Thomas can talk to you about that. There is then the issue that has arisen from the independent WADA commission showing widespread corruption in the Russian anti-doping processes, and there is a third issue that has allegedly implicated a handful of people in my organisation, the IAAF, who may have been complicit or conniving in that. These are three very different issues, and the observation that I was making at the time was very clearly about the reckless use of data on a database to imperil and put at risk the reputation of clean athletes, and Paula Radcliffe's treatment is a clear example of that.

Q189 Chair: The point is, isn't it, that allegations were made as a result of whistle-blowing? They were reported in the press. WADA was involved. The WADA report has been absolutely devastating in its indictment of athletes, and indeed an entire country's federation and system, as a result of that. Yet you described those reports as "a declaration of war".

Lord Coe: No, I described the use of selective data against clean athletes in exactly those terms and I don't step back from that. I am sorry that this has mutated into a shorthand for an attack on the media or media groups. It was never that, and I am very happy to have this platform to put that straight. I have been saying that—I said it on the "Today" programme just literally a couple of days later—I will die in a ditch for the right of media groups to challenge me, to impugn my motives, to question my judgments, to take to

task the sport that I am currently the head of, but the issue that I took exception to was the very selective use of data that could not possibly be used in and of itself to prove positive tests. The very nature of the collection of the data there—and there are two very clear histories here—is what was being collected before the biological passport was in place in 2009 and the protocols that were not in place before 2009, dating back to some of the discussions and allegations around 2001.

I know this is quite complicated but it is a very important distinction here, so the issue for me was about the way that clean athletes' reputations were being traduced and WADA themselves described that as irresponsible use of data.

Q190 Chair: You did not think you had an obligation to reach out to the journalists who were concerned about blood doping who had, as it turned out, well founded concerns, to protect the integrity of the sport rather than—

Lord Coe: No, no, no. Look, two things here. You talked about whistle-blowers. I placed on record my thanks to whistle-blowers. Some of those whistle-blowers came from within my organisation. This is not just playing lip service to it. The changes I am making to the constitution—so the ethics code—will give greater access for whistle-blowers to extend their concerns. One of the very key criteria that we have now laid down for the eventual reintroduction of clean Russian athletes and the Russian Federation back into our sport is a structure that allows whistle-blowers to relay their concerns.

I know that whistle-blowing comes with human cost. I know that, so this is very important to me. When ARD reported their concerns, allegations and findings in November 2014, I said at the time, "Please hand over to us what you have because this will help us understand a great deal more about the issue". I said, "If you don't trust our organisation then hand it to WADA. If you don't trust WADA, hand it to an independent organisation".

We have reached out to journalists. We speak a lot to journalists. We speak a lot to all sorts of people and I will also be speaking to those whistle-blowers once these reports and inquiries have been concluded, because it is very important that I learn from them as we are making the changes. There are failures. We will fix them but we will also listen and I will listen to whistle-blowers.

Q191 Chair: If your response has not been a defensive one in the way we have described it, why did you describe Michael Ashenden and Robin Parisotto as "so-called experts"? Why cast doubt publicly on their credentials when I think I am right in saying that they both helped to pioneer the biological passport that you have described? Indeed, the IAAF had asked one of them to be a member of the same panel of experts.

Lord Coe: Yes. Again, let me be clear about this. There were large areas of agreement: do we think blood doping is something worthy of investigation? Absolutely. That is why we have been the lead sport in pioneering protocols and doing the pioneering work on the blood passport. The best way to cover

up blood doping is not to test, it is not to collect. We have been collecting since 2001. We have been able to return 10 years later to weed athletes out. We don't shy from this and it comes with reputational damage.

The issue that I want to make clear here was the selective use of data—not my words; the words that WADA used and David Howman used in front of your Committee last time— to imperil the reputation of clean athletes, and to extrapolate from one or two readings a pathology of positive and sanction, you cannot do. You can't do it legally, it is not good medically and it is not within the WADA code. Again I make the point that there are two very distinct periods here. The collection of blood samples post 2009 and the creation of the profiles in the blood passport are done under a very different set of protocols that were available. In fact my sport set up many of those protocols before WADA created the system of protocols in 2007.

Q192 Damian Collins: Before I start, may I say that, despite what we discuss in the session today, I think there are not many other presidents of international sporting federations who would submit themselves to questioning from a House of Commons Select Committee and I think you deserve to be commended for that.

Lord Coe: I am comforted by that thought.

Damian Collins: I want to pick up first on the question from the Chairman earlier on. Do you regret using the term "declaration of war" to refer to *The Sunday Times* investigation?

Lord Coe: It probably expressed my frustration and anger at the time. Don't be under any illusion, I was being contacted by clean athletes, coaches, federations around the world who were incensed at the way clean athletes were having their reputations unnecessarily imperilled. This was never about the right of any media group.

Between 2005 and 2012, I was leading a team that delivered probably the highest profile project for many years. There were occasions when I probably said it through gritted teeth but actually we welcome press intrusion. It made us a better organisation. It made us a better bid. It made us more responsive. This was never about an attack on the media. I don't believe that. I choose to live in this country because of the forensic nature of free press. My frustrations were specifically aimed at the way clean athletes were being unnecessarily imperilled, and I have to say Paula Radcliffe is a very good example of that.

Q193 Damian Collins: The question was whether, with hindsight, you regretted using that term?

Lord Coe: It was probably language that was at the time expressing my anger but I stick by the sentiments. I probably might have chosen different language.

Q194 Damian Collins: The report the IAAF published on Friday looked at the *The Sunday Times* allegations in detail and some of the evidence this Committee has received as well. The IAAF states in that report, "If the IAAF had wanted to cover up blood doping it could simply have not collected any blood samples". Why then did the IAAF not conduct any out-of-competition blood tests on Russian athletes in 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010?

Lord Coe: I am going to ask Thomas to answer that question, because that is about process and protocol and I know he will explain the separation of the anti-doping unit and the non-executive nature of my role.

Thomas Capdevielle: Sir, when it was submitted in the rebuttal, which we assume that you read, every submission we made was supported by data that was shared with the independent committee formed by WADA. We opened our files very transparently. They came to our offices. We shared everything with them and all our testing data that you refer to was shared with them, so we respect the process here and let's see what conclusion they came up with in their investigation.

Q195 Damian Collins: You don't have a comment on the fact that there was no testing done in those years?

Thomas Capdevielle: There was testing collected out of competition in Russia. I told you that we shared the data with the WADA investigation commission, and it would be up to them to decide whether this was sufficient.

Lord Coe: This is quite an important point here. It is a shared database, so it is not something that we sit there looking at going, "Well, this looks worrying" or "alarming" or "okay". All that data is shared with the World Anti-Doping Agency. It is a shared database, so if there are concerns at any stage in the process then they are absolutely shared with the World Anti-Doping Agency, and that is the way it should be.

Q196 Damian Collins: No doubt we will find out what the independent commission says in the next report on that. On the prevalence study that the Chairman mentioned earlier—and I have read the prevalence study—Lord Coe, you said that the numbers are slightly skewed by a small number of countries. Seven countries are sampled and the sample percentages were: country A 48%, country B 3%, country C 23%, country D 6%, country E 18%, country F 6%, country H 39%. The numbers move around quite a bit, some extremely high, some much lower. It is an academic paper. It is conducted based on, I think, 10 years' worth of data gathered by the IAAF. People have stood by the 14% average that has been given, and it seems to be a pretty robust piece of work. Based on a sample of 5,000 athletes, if that means that about 700 or so could be in that 14%, 700 or so athletes could be guilty of blood-doping offences, and yet only 214 have been charged. Can you understand why people are concerned about this and are pushing the IAAF to do more, to move faster to identify people who are competing unfairly?

Lord Coe: To make any observation about that—and this is where I guess one of my issues with the original submissions was that nobody at that moment would know whether they were followed up on. When you are looking

at raw data like that, without any of the other what we call compounding issues—whether there were extenuating circumstances, whether it was training levels, various altitudes, there are lots and lots of things that impact on that—you have to be very clear what it is you are interpreting and how you extrapolate from those numbers. We were very happy to publish the prevalence report because we do want to contribute sensibly to this debate. It is important that people understand. I am not sure any other sport has done that. That is by the by but, Thomas, you may want to answer that.

Thomas Capdevielle: Yes, if I may answer that. The purpose of the study was to identify trends. It was never the case to give a judgment on individual cases, for the very reason that we explained to you through the rebuttal that this data cannot be used to determine whether or not athletes dope. It was just identifying trends to better adjust our testing programme and see exactly what we did. When we started the Athlete Biological Passport in 2009 we used the empirical data that we had, that we turned into a publication, basically to go after the usual suspects. No country identified here was subject to more testing than other countries. The main purpose of the study was to identify the fact that country was the first factor of exposure to doping.

Q197 Damian Collins: Country is clearly a factor but problems are widespread. It is not like it is just concentrated in one country, but the issue is the number. Is this a failure of governance in the IAAF if you can have a system where potentially from 5,000 athletes 700 may have produced sample results, which concern a problem that they are not being followed up on? Who is checking on that? Who knows? I am not expecting individual athletes to be named but just the numbers saying, “We have concerns, say, over 700. We have only charged 200. We don’t know how many others are being pursued”. If that is the case, isn’t that a failure of governance of the system?

Thomas Capdevielle: Sir, with due respect, the question of whether the IAAF did a proper follow-up is very clear for us. We duly followed up according to the protocols in place at the time. We did a follow-up of every block of data that was regarded as atypical according to the protocols in place at the time. We stick to this and I think we explained it in great detail in a rebuttal. We also showed it to the independent commission. We had some scientific bias here, limitations. You know that the purpose of conducting blood screening at the time was to identify potential cheaters, and the only purpose of doing blood screening at the time was an indicator to trigger for testing of urine. We follow up with urine testing and with EPO detection. We did more than 8,000 tests at the time. There were limitations in the EPO method at the time and we could not catch all the athletes who may have been identified as atypical because of the limitation of the then applicable EPO method. That is the reason why we put all our efforts into putting in place the Athlete Biological Passport with a handful of other organisations, including the UCI, including a few national anti-doping agencies, to be able to view this blood data not as an indicator but as direct evidence of doping. That is what we did and, to date, we have prosecuted more cases than any other organisation altogether. It is 71 cases as we speak.

Q198 Damian Collins: Yes, but I think the issue for people who are following this story will not be a question of how well you think you have done relative to other sporting organisations. If there is some scientific data that suggests that hundreds of athletes out there may be using blood doping to cheat and that is not being followed up on, is that because there are not the resources to do it, there are not the proper management systems in place? Why is that the case?

Lord Coe: They are being followed up on. I think this is what we are really saying to you; they are being followed up on. Is one too many? Yes, clearly. Do we have a disproportionate amount of damage being done by a relatively small number of countries? The prevalence report shows that, and of course that is our instinct now, but I think it would be wrong to say that we did not follow up on these. We have. I am dragging these numbers from the back of my head here but I think there have been about 80 prosecutions through the use of blood passports. Something like 60 to 70 of them have been from track and field and those prosecutions have been alerted through the use of our profiling and the use of blood passports.

Q199 Damian Collins: You have mentioned pre-2009 samples a lot today and it was mentioned a lot in your rebuttal document on Friday. I know this is touched on in the rebuttal document but I want to ask in a bit more detail. Doesn't the case of the German speed skater, Claudia Pechstein, demonstrate that it could be possible to bring a prosecution based on testing done before 2009?

Thomas Capdevielle: Absolutely not. As a matter of fact, this is the only precedent Mr Ashenden could cite; you are citing it today. If you ask the International Skating Union whether it is a good precedent—they are being sued now for a 15 million indemnity as a result of this case—I don't think they would agree with you that this is a precedent.

Q200 Damian Collins: The case was made against her. She has challenged it in the courts and she has lost. The case was clearly brought. The Court of Arbitration has ruled against her.

Lord Coe: It is very clear this is not the IAAF saying this. This is WADA. This is Dick Pound in his independent commission report. You cannot, from pre-2009 data, prosecute or use that alone as evidence of an anti-doping infringement. As Thomas has said, it can only be an indicator of further activity and further follow-up, and that has been clearly identified in CAS. It has been clearly identified as a protocol that WADA have accepted.

Q201 Damian Collins: I was looking through the arbitration summary from CAS and I think there are a couple of interesting things within that. First, the judgment says that it is not mandated to follow the WADA international standardised testing and WADA international standardised laboratories in order to prove the athlete's use of a prohibited method. Indeed, *in the Panel's opinion, any reasonably reliable practice* of sample collection, post-test administration,

transport of samples, analytical process and documentation would suffice. So based on that, if reasonable standardisation had been carried out on pre-2009 testing then that would be admissible?

Thomas Capdevielle: Let's be clear, prior to 2009, the Athlete Biological Passport was not even recognised as evidence, through the world anti-doping code, of support of anti-doping manipulation. I think the Pechstein case refers to data collected around 2009 when the protocol was nearly there, and if they could show that it was reliable data, close to the protocol, that is maybe what the reference is to, but CAS made it very clear in many references that you have the narrative of, including cases where Dr Ashenden appeared, that this data could not be used—

Q202 Damian Collins: In the report it also says that just because in this case ISU introduced the WADA rules in January 2009 it does not mean to say that any testing done before that is inadmissible. It says in the summary, "Longitudinal profiling of this kind constitutes one of the available means for finding doping offences. It even occurred before such a method was mentioned in the anti-doping rules", which I think is quite clear that, just because the rule came in in 2009, it does not mean that pre-2009 testing cannot be used as long as there has been effective standardisation of—

Thomas Capdevielle: Sir, what matters is the reliability of the data and we mentioned 2009 because it is then that the WADA anti-doping agency put in place an anonymised framework—which believe me is a very stringent one—to make sure that this data is reliable and is comparable.

Q203 Damian Collins: In the prevalence study report—so that is going back to sampling between 2001 to 2010—the question would be: in your case was there not effective standardisation and, therefore, would the test not be comparable? It says this, "Although strict standardisation was applied for the collection, transport and analysis of blood-doping samples, standardisation of methods can be checked from the data itself as well", which suggests that it was robust.

Thomas Capdevielle: Sir, the protocols change all the time. From 2001 to 2009, when the passport was introduced, we had maybe five or six different protocols and most of them were totally different from the protocol put in place by WADA, which is absolutely much more stringent. Therefore, the standards that were applicable were totally different. You cannot compare the protocols prior to 2009 with the protocol from 2009.

Q204 Chair: Sorry, there is a misunderstanding here. I don't know whether deliberately or not but I think you are obfuscating the issue, Mr Capdevielle. The issue is not what happens after 2009. We know after 2009 there is the blood passport and that standardises it in an acceptable way. The question is whatever the standards are that are in place before, were they adequate to allow a legal challenge and a sanction? You are saying they changed but that is not the answer. The question is: were they adequate to allow a legal challenge and sanctioning? Mr Collins is suggesting that they might have been.

Damian Collins: Not just me, the Court of Arbitration for Sport is.

Chair: Sure.

Thomas Capdevielle: No, they are not. You will find in our rebuttal all the references to the Court of Arbitration for Sport. My point is clear: the protocols in place prior to 2009 were put in place to ensure that—the purpose of the protocol was to collect blood screening data as indicators. That is clear even in the introduction of every protocol that we have put in place and we have shared with WADA. Again, it would be for the independent commission to carefully review all the protocols that the IAAF had in place at the time and to see whether a due follow-up was conducted.

Q205 Damian Collins: You are giving an interpretation and I think in your rebuttal document you gave an interpretation of the many areas of case law on this matter. I am not saying it is 100% clear cut that you can or you cannot. I think it is arguable, but certainly I think what the Court of Arbitration for Sport's case against Pechstein demonstrates is, first, that they are very clear that any reliable means can be used to bring a case against an athlete and that testing pre-2009 can be acceptable as well. The test would be: can you have fair standardisation of the testing? Your own prevalence study suggests that in the IAAF's case that should be the case too, so I think it is arguable that you could and I am surprised, given what is in the CAS court summary for the Pechstein case, that you take such a strong line against pre-2009 testing.

Thomas Capdevielle: Sir, we have tried to use the pre-2009 data in support of cases. I think you can see some case law, the Kokkinariou case, and we tried to use it as corroborating evidence to make the best use of this pre-2009 data, and we failed as other organisations failed. They all failed before CAS, because CAS considered at the time that the standardisation was not high enough to ensure reliability and comparability of the data.

Damian Collins: I have no further questions on this point, but I think there is a legitimate debate about this and I think you could be accused of following the code in a particular way that may have frustrated some people who wanted to see you make more progress in pursuing cheating athletes.

Q206 Chair: Let me just sharpen the question up a little bit, Mr Capdevielle. Let's just assume for the purposes of argument that the average number of 14% is about right. Therefore, there are about 700 athletes of which some number up to 200 have been successfully sanctioned. The question is: why hasn't the IAAF been much tougher about pushing the limits of its own powers in going after the other 500? What you simply say is that shifting standards, inadequate quality of testing, worries about legal claims the other way, have been things that have stopped you from doing that. Is that right?

Thomas Capdevielle: Sir, the Athlete Biological Passport is a very complex process.

Chair: Right, but we are talking about before this, though. We are talking about—

Thomas Capdevielle: Yes, the IAAF from the day it started doing blood testing up until 2009 has played a leading role with other organisations, with the UCI, for instance—

Chair: We know that.

Thomas Capdevielle: —in trying to determine the confirming factors and reach a level of standardisation that was sufficient to be satisfied that this data was reliable and comparable. This was achieved in 2009 and, believe me, the IAAF spent a lot of time and resources in order to achieve this.

Chair: I don't think that is an answer to the question but I think we need to move on.

Q207 Ian C. Lucas: Lord Coe, what years were you vice-president of the IAAF?

Lord Coe: I was elected to the vice-presidency in 2007, re-elected in 2011, became president in 2015, a few weeks ago.

Q208 Ian C. Lucas: You were also chair of the FIFA Ethics Committee?

Lord Coe: Yes, for the first year or so.

Q209 Ian C. Lucas: When was that?

Lord Coe: I can't remember. I think around 2006.

Q210 Ian C. Lucas: For the period before 2009, if there were allegations of blood doping, what steps did the IAAF take at that stage when cases came to its attention before the 2009 database was introduced?

Lord Coe: To help answer that question, the vice-presidency role is non-executive. It is non-operational. It is probably about 10 days a year, and add to that the days that I am representing the sport in conferences or on international occasions. We have a very clear separation between the anti-doping unit and the non-executive members of the board. That is absolutely essential.

Ian C. Lucas: Yes, I am going to ask you about that.

Lord Coe: That is actually essential in the conduct of our anti-doping protocols.

Q211 Ian C. Lucas: In 2007 when you undertook your role, you were aware of the allegations of blood doping in athletics?

Lord Coe: Of course I was aware that we had a problem but not the specific numbers or the details. That would have been for the anti-doping unit to know.

Q212 Ian C. Lucas: But you were part of the responsible body, the IAAF, you were the vice-president of the body. You explained you joined the athletics club at 11 and that this is a really important issue that has gone on for many years. I remember allegations around blood doping back in the Montreal Olympics; even back to your own running career you must have been aware of it. When you came in in 2007, what did you hear from within the IAAF about blood doping, about what was being done?

Lord Coe: Well, the fact that blood doping was something that we were taking a lead role in. I would not have known the specific protocols around it. I would not have known the athletes who were being targeted. I would not have known when the sanctions were about to come. That is a hermetically sealed unit, and so it should be. If you are saying to me, as somebody who came through athletics, have I been aware that doping in various guises throughout my career has been a challenge, I was the first athlete to speak at an IOC congress. I was given the opportunity for four minutes to synthesise the views of 38 competitors around the table. For three minutes of that I talked about the dangers of doping in sport. So, yes, of course, but if you are asking me specifically about names, numbers, prevalence, then the answer is that I would not have known that.

Q213 Ian C. Lucas: No. What I want to know is what did you do when you became vice-president of the IAAF in 2007 concerning blood doping? Did you take any action? Did you ask any questions yourself about what the position—

Lord Coe: The council—

Ian C. Lucas: No I am asking what you did.

Lord Coe: I know. I can tell you that I am a voting member of the council. I am not suggesting anything other than that. Every six months the anti-doping unit would come to the council, report on its work, report on progress, and report on the number of tests it was taking, the protocols around the world championships. That would be the extent of the information that we were given. Were we aware or was I aware, as anybody else was, that in some areas we had an escalating number from a particular country? We would be aware of that. I would not be aware of who they were and, yes, council members did raise concerns about the nature and the prevalence of some of these issues in particular countries. When that was raised, the anti-doping unit and the general secretary would say, "The systems we have in place are robust but we will look at these particular issues".

Q214 Ian C. Lucas: It is now eight years on, which is quite a long time. Has action been taken by the IAAF fast enough to deal with these issues?

Lord Coe: I can tell you exactly what I have done over the last 67 days and that is to set up an independent integrity unit to create a greater independence in our anti-doping processes, root and branch reform of the

organisation, our corporate governances and operational and financial. I can tell you exactly what I have done.

Q215 Ian C. Lucas: If you could answer the question. Was action taken fast enough following your going into the IAAF as an insider, as a vice-president in 2007 to deal with blood doping?

Lord Coe: The systems in place to deal with those issues you would have to address to Thomas.

Q216 Ian C. Lucas: No. Do you think that action was taken fast enough by the IAAF following 2007? We are now 2015.

Lord Coe: Am I satisfied on the follow-up tests and the action of the organisation to try to eradicate it, to chase down the cheats? Yes, I am. Are all our systems perfect? I doubt it very much. Were the walls too high? Around a large part of the anti-doping infrastructure and architecture, yes, they probably were.

Q217 Ian C. Lucas: You see, it is eight years since you have had a senior role in the IAAF and this issue has blown up—in the last 67 days that you mentioned—within that period. Why hasn't the IAAF dealt with this issue earlier and why haven't you been more prominent in pressing it, since you have such a prominent role within the organisation?

Lord Coe: Well, because we were not aware of the specific nature of those allegations. We were not aware—I was certainly not aware—of the specific allegations that had been made around the corruption of anti-doping processes in Russia. I would have been aware of the escalation of the problem and those concerns were relayed in council by me and by others, but I do remind you that there are three very—they are very serious. I am not walking away from this. These are very, very serious allegations. One is that—

Ian C. Lucas: They are part of the integrity of the sport, as you said at the outset.

Lord Coe: No, I am sorry, these are very specific and they are not the specific allegations that would have come across to the individual council members. I am going to ask Thomas to explain why that would not or could not have been the case.

Q218 Chair: Don't do that, because we are interested only in your position. You say you were vice-president but that is the second most senior person in the organisation.

Lord Coe: No, I was one of four vice-presidents and not a senior vice-president.

Chair: Right, but you were that second layer of the organisation.

Lord Coe: I remind you that I became a council member in 2003. Between 2003 and 2013 I was leading a team delivering the Olympic Games here. I

was given a very clear remit within the council, and that was to go away and deliver a successful track and field programme at the Olympic Games. This was a non-operational role. It is the traditional structure in sport. Is it adequate? No. Am I going to make those changes? Yes. Are there failures? Yes. Will we fix them? Absolutely, and everything that I have done since becoming president is to put systems in place that can make sure that there is external and internal scrutiny, and the independent integrity unit—which I got through the council literally on Thursday last week—will go a long way to introducing greater independence in the system, lowering the walls and creating a far greater level of external scrutiny.

Q219 Ian C. Lucas: In 2009 you took on the chair of the FIFA Ethics Committee.

Lord Coe: I can't remember the exact date.

Ian C. Lucas: It was around that time. It was after you took on this role.

Lord Coe: There was no ethics committee at that stage. I was asked to help to structure it.

Q220 Ian C. Lucas: So how were you the chair of it?

Lord Coe: Well, the ethics committee was created.

Q221 Ian C. Lucas: How long were you chair for?

Lord Coe: Until England threw their hat into the ring for the—

Ian C. Lucas: So how long is that, roughly, a couple of years?

Lord Coe: 18 months, 15 months, something like that. It was actually about setting up structures to allow the committee to operate.

Q222 Ian C. Lucas: You know about the rampant corruption alleged in connection with FIFA?

Lord Coe: The allegations, yes.

Ian C. Lucas: Yes, the allegations. You know about the doubts that there are about systems. Presumably that is why you were put in place?

Lord Coe: Yes, absolutely. All their ethics issues—this is going back a long way—were being addressed by a disciplinary committee. They recognised the need for an ethics committee. I was asked to chair it but it was ostensibly setting up structures creating a separate legal entity. Within that period I think there were probably only about two or three issues that got sent to the committee.

Q223 Ian C. Lucas: You are aware of the allegations, as you describe them, of corruption within FIFA. There are allegations of blood doping within

athletics. This is some years ago that this happened. This is before 2010. What I am getting at is that you are an insider in these two organisations that have been bedevilled by allegations of corruption for very many years, and you have been very closely and intimately involved in both organisations. Why in those circumstances should we think that you are the person to clean up the situation now?

Lord Coe: Because I have the experience to do that and I have the support—

Q224 Ian C. Lucas: You did not ask any tough questions in 2007, though, did you?

Lord Coe: No. I had the support of the sport to do that. Have there been failures? Yes. Will I fix them? Absolutely. Will I listen while we are doing that? Absolutely. So I am absolutely focused on doing that and if we don't do that I know there are no tomorrows for my sport. This is the crossroads.

Q225 Ian C. Lucas: Do you think one of the best things to do might be to completely separate? You have been talking about enforcement and general regulation, governance at the IAAF. Would it be better to split those up entirely and not have enforcement within the remit of the IAAF?

Lord Coe: I did want to explain the nature of the integrity unit and I am happy to do that now. We need to create more independence in the system. The integrity unit will help do that. Anti-doping/blood-doping protocols are not the only integrity issue that the sport confronts. There are issues around age manipulation, transfer of allegiance, being ever vigilant for the propensity for illegal betting; all those things will sit within the independent committee. It will be funded by the IAAF but it will be separate from it. It has to be. That is actually very important, and one of the most important things that we can do is remove the hearings that are now the subject of the domestic federations, remove that to an independent tribunal within that unit. That was green-lighted on Thursday next week.

I am very happy to come back to the Committee at any stage and talk about the processes and the systems that I am putting in place. That sits alongside a root and branch review of the organisation, a forensic financial and operational review, a rewrite of the constitution, clearer job roles. What do I want out of this sport? I want a responsible, accountable, responsive sport. I want a sport that people can again trust. I can put these systems in place because I will and I know how to do it. The issue over the longer haul, which I recognise and which is probably the most challenging, is that returning trust to the sport is going to be a longer journey. It will probably see out my mandate.

Q226 Chair: The difficulty I think, Lord Coe, if I may say so, and the question really lying behind what Mr Lucas is saying, is this. You had a non-executive but nonetheless responsible position within the IAAF from 2007. Lots and lots of dopers are getting away with it for various different reasons. We know that there was corruption within nations at that time, and yet you appear to be oblivious of it. Do I have that right?

Lord Coe: No, not oblivious but not across the individual allegations that have surfaced recently.

Q227 Chair: Right, but not pressing for change. You are not saying, "Let's get our guys in there. What on earth is going on? This is outrageous. What is happening in some of these countries?"

Lord Coe: No, because when those issues have been raised in council there has always been an assurance, through the anti-doping unit and through the general secretary, that the systems in place were robust, and—

Chair: Even if they weren't.

Lord Coe: No, no, and Thomas can be very helpful here because as and when those issues were raised in the council around the growing and escalating level of sanction in Russian athletes, this is when the unit then followed up and actually how they followed up is helpful—

Q228 Chair: Lord Coe, the very fact that we know about the unit at the time, that its head is under investigation now for potential corruption—

Lord Coe: Look, again, that is one of the pathologies I am dealing with at the moment.

Q229 Ian C. Lucas: Did you raise the issue of blood doping in the council?

Lord Coe: Yes, we have all raised the—we raised the—

Q230 Ian C. Lucas: You specifically raised it. The job of a non-executive director is to ask difficult questions, to challenge and that is your role.

Lord Coe: Those questions were asked in council.

Ian C. Lucas: Did you ask them?

Lord Coe: Yes, by me and by other members but not specific allegations because the specific allegations would not come to us, but the growing escalation, the preponderance, the prevalence we have discussed, of course, it would be discussed around council. When those concerns were relayed to the anti-doping unit through the general secretary or the president, we were told there would be follow-up action.

Q231 Ian C. Lucas: You were satisfied with that?

Lord Coe: The follow-up action is within the anti-doping unit and I was happy that—

Ian C. Lucas: Here we are eight years on.

Lord Coe: I am happy to concede here: was too much power vested in too few people within the organisation? Yes, clearly. Is that the case probably in the traditional structures across sport? Yes. Can those be changed? They have

to be because we have to lower the walls. We cannot have a situation where you are not able to properly interrogate and make sure that the right systems are in place. Will I put those systems in place? Yes. Can those changes be made quickly? Yes, they can. Can we return to trust? That is going to take far longer.

Chair: Thank you. We need to move on.

Q232 Chris Matheson: Lord Coe, good afternoon. I would like to return to some of the points you were making in answer to Mr Lucas a moment ago, when you were talking about some of the reforms that you would bring and obviously you have experience of athletics: you sat on one of FIFA's principal committees, you have good experience of how the International Olympic Committee and commission works.

Lord Coe: Also the local organising committee in London, yes.

Chris Matheson: Indeed. You have some good ideas about how some of these organisations can be reformed in terms of their governance.

Lord Coe: Well, not other organisations. I am focused only on the IAAF.

Chris Matheson: But you have had experience of how governance works in some of these sporting organisations. Can I ask you would you introduce, for example, term limits in the IAAF for board members and for president and vice-presidents?

Lord Coe: I have, yes.

Chris Matheson: That is going to go ahead?

Lord Coe: Yes.

Q233 Chris Matheson: What about external auditing of the accounts?

Lord Coe: Yes.

Q234 Chris Matheson: This is all part of your 67 days of office?

Lord Coe: We will have an independently-chaired audit committee to make sure that contracts, procurements, the way we consume resources is done appropriately.

Q235 Chris Matheson: What else are you looking at that might improve the governance of the organisation?

Lord Coe: A whole range of issues. I want to make sure, first, of the ethics code. I have amended that, so the very fact that the ethics committee is able to now discuss in more detail the investigations that are underway was because I lifted the confidentiality clauses so that they could do that. I will create a particular and special platform for whistle-blowers. We need to be able to do that. I want to make sure that every non-exec member of the council is governed by proper corporate governances, conflicts of interests are

identified and that we are transparent about that. That is all underway. It should be familiar stuff. It is not always that familiar in the traditional model of sport.

Q236 Chris Matheson: What is your term in it now?

Lord Coe: The terms are four years and at the very most a president could stand for three terms. I have indicated that I would intend to stand for only two.

Q237 Chris Matheson: Thank you. How much does the IAAF spend on detecting and enforcing its rules against cheats?

Lord Coe: If you look at the overall budget, including admin and Thomas's teams, it is, Thomas, about \$4 million?

Thomas Capdevielle: About \$4 million.

Chair: €4 million?

Lord Coe: Dollars.

Chair: Dollars.

Q238 Chris Matheson: I am told that is a quarter of what the International Cycling Federation spends; is that likely to be correct?

Lord Coe: I don't know that answer to that but it sounds slightly unlikely.

Q239 Chris Matheson: Right. Whether it is the case or not, do you have any plans to increase expenditure on combating cheating?

Lord Coe: Yes, I will do whatever it takes to properly make sure that we have systems in place. The independent integrity unit will come with added cost, so I will double it if I have to.

Q240 Chris Matheson: Do you have any thoughts at the moment about what actions you might include within that programme to combat cheating?

Lord Coe: Yes, as I said, we want to introduce greater levels of independence into the system. I want an independent tribunal to have the individual hearings rather than leaving that with the member federations. I want to speed up the process. I want to make sure that there are better checks and balances in the system and, again, that the walls are not too high for proper investigation and analysis.

Q241 Chair: More out-of-competition testing?

Lord Coe: If that is what it takes, yes.

Q242 Chair: More enforcement, more legal action, that kind of stuff?

Lord Coe: Well, we will do whatever we can to do that but I accept that there are resource implications here. If you asked me whether I am prepared to double that budget, the answer is yes.

Q243 Chris Matheson: You are not putting a figure on that yet.

Lord Coe: No, because I got the concept of the integrity unit and, within that, the way we will approach anti-doping in future. There are other issues that I need to work through, budget-wise, but I am very happy to sit here and say we will spend whatever it takes, and if that means doubling that budget, yes, we will have to find that money.

Q244 Chris Matheson: Lord Coe, can I move on slightly and ask you about Russia? Correct me if I get the details wrong, but the Russian Athletic Federation has been suspended recently from competition.

Lord Coe: Yes.

Q245 Chris Matheson: I can remember when I was younger, in the 1970s and 1980s, the years of the Cold War, and obviously when you were involved in competition. It was always—

Lord Coe: I was competing during the Cold War.

Chris Matheson: Indeed, and winning most of the time. There was a suspicion then—it was the old Soviet Bloc era—that eastern European athletes were involved in doping or drug misuse, performance-enhancing drugs or whatever. More recently, we have had the events that have led to the Russian Federation being suspended.

Lord Coe: Yes.

Chris Matheson: Was there ever a period when Russian athletics was clean, or is that something that has been ingrained within its national psyche?

Lord Coe: I genuinely do not know the answer to that. We recognise we have a global problem. If you were sitting there having this debate or discussion in the 1960s or 1970s, the Eastern Bloc would probably turn around and say, “Well, if we are, and it is state-sponsored, then we are only doing it in response to what is going on unabated on American university campuses”. This is a good and historical debate.

I am not sure, if I am being honest, it lends a lot of light to the current discussions. I was a competitor and I got into the British team in 1976 and competed internationally. I competed in pretty much most of the Iron Curtain countries. Were there suspicions? Yes, but there were suspicions about athletes around the world. Believe it or not, this is a much more enlightened environment because I would not be coming to a Select Committee in the 1960s or 1970s discussing the prevalence of anti-doping and the systems that we have put in place. The honest answer to your question is that I do not know the prevalence, but I think we have to assume that there were fewer

systems in place and there were no doping protocols. It is a relatively new set of systems. The blood passport is the latest iteration and a very effective one.

Q246 Chris Matheson: I believe that the spotlight has also fallen on Kenya and Kenyan athletics in the last few days. Do you have suspicions about other athletics federation areas perhaps that you might want to share with us, perhaps that you might not at the moment?

Lord Coe: I think Dick Pound, the chair of the independent commission, has made it clear in the report and in his own words at the press conference that this is not simply about Russian and it is not simply about athletics. People tend to forget that this is not simply about athletics. I will await with interest the second report because it may throw more light on other areas that we need to be concerned about.

Q247 Chris Matheson: Mentioning no names, perhaps, is there more to come?

Lord Coe: I do not know.

Q248 Chris Matheson: Did you suspect?

Lord Coe: I genuinely do not know the answer to that. I will await the second report. There is a lot of speculation around it but we have no prior knowledge of what is contained in that report. If that report shows that there is systematic failure, we will have to address it. I do make the point that the report was made public on 9 November. Five days later, in London, the Russian Federation was provisionally suspended. It is now under full suspension. I have appointed the independent chair of an inspection team, Rune Andersen, an anti-doping expert from Norway. I have appointed four other people who will start the process of verification, the change we want, and making sure that clean athletes in Russian can re-enter competition when we are satisfied that those criteria have been met. We moved extremely quickly from the publication of the first report to banning a federation. The criteria for us are very clear, and ultimately it will be the criteria that determine when Russia and clean athletes re-enter the fold. It is not for any other organisation. That power rests with the IAAF. The sole arbiter of when their return will be verifiable change across some very clear criteria.

Q249 Chair: We can be certain, can we not, Lord Coe, that the second report from WADA is going to be extremely critical of the IAAF because they have withheld an awful lot of the relevant information from the first report on that basis?

Lord Coe: I do not know that at all. We have co-operated with WADA. We have handed over and shared all the data, and I do make the point, of course, that we share a database with WADA. Post 2009, every bit of information on that database is shared with WADA, so we have co-operated fully with WADA.

Q250 Chair: There are no other databases you have that are not shared with WADA or with national anti-doping agencies?

Lord Coe: No. We have bilateral agreements with anti-doping agencies. We, of course, have one with the UK anti-doping agency. This is mutually shared data.

Q251 Chair: I understand. Are you comfortable with the changes you have introduced on testing, the enforcement arm, and a more independent integrity unit? Are you comfortable all those things will survive a second report by WADA into IAAF? You will not have to beef them up again to reflect concerns?

Lord Coe: No. In a way, they are what we have to do. They are absolutely what we have to do. We will await the second report and take any learnings we need to from that, but these are systems that need to be in place.

Q252 Nigel Adams: Lord Coe, just for clarity, how many member federations are there?

Lord Coe: 214. Two new federations joined us in 2015.

Q253 Nigel Adams: It has been suggested that during your successful election campaign to become president you offered each of the federations \$100,000 extra funding if you won. Is that true?

Lord Coe: No.

Q254 Nigel Adams: It is not true, which is rather encouraging, given the fact that 214 times \$100,000 might have been significantly more than the \$4 million budget. Do you have any idea why that might have come about?

Lord Coe: Let me be clear. I have for some time recognised—that was well before my campaign—that in a sport of 214 federations that range as wide as the United States and Norfolk Island, there were the haves and the have-nots. 50% of the federations within the IAAF are, frankly, not able to send athletes to major championships. They have little or no administrative structures, and they have no coaching structures to enhance the ambitions of those athletes.

The IAAF is in receipt of a large part of its income from the television and broadcast rights that they get from the International Olympic Committee and I wanted those federations, particularly the have-nots, to share in that dividend. I can probably say this now, as president of the IAAF. We send 2,500 athletes to the Games. Track and field is the number one sport in the Olympic Games. I wanted those federations to share in that Olympic dividend. I called it the Olympic athletic dividend, so I wanted that to be redistributed on very clear and set criteria across coaching, infrastructure and education programmes, but it is absolutely essential that we give those federations the wherewithal to deliver sport at a local level that will help us grow the sport globally.

Q255 Nigel Adams: What sort of numbers are you talking about? What figure had you allocated in your own mind, before you were elected, that you would be able to give to these federations that could not afford to send their athletes to China?

Lord Coe: It was not \$100,000. There is the potential for a drawdown of \$25,000 set against some very clear criteria, and it is a broad menu because there is no one size fits all when you are talking about 214 federations. Comfortingly, many of the better, well-heeled federations said they were happy to reinvest that Olympic dividend into the other federations and those that have some real challenges.

This is probably the most globally spread sport. On my journeys in the last year or so—and my instincts are very clear here—I have encountered federations that have had athletes on coaches for three days, crossing continents to get to championships. I have seen federation presidents sustaining out of their own pockets. I went to one Caribbean island where the high school teacher, who is the federation president, was paying out of her own high school salary for pots of paint to mark running tracks. This is not sustainable, and this is why it is absolutely essential that we are able, where we can, to improve the financial fortunes of these federations.

Q256 Nigel Adams: No, I absolutely get that, but do you have a figure in mind? Is there a budget that you had allocated before you were elected that you thought, “That is the sum of money that I would use to help very worthy causes”?

Lord Coe: Yes. This was not back-of-a-fag-packet campaigning. I did actually use a large City accounting practice to help me structure this, to challenge me on some of the assumptions and to go through where we could look. Our ability to do that will be predicated on cost savings within the organisation, the utilisation of the television revenues, making sure that we have a more vibrant stream of sponsorship coming through and making sure that those sponsors that are with us are working harder. That is all part of the process.

Q257 Nigel Adams: Yes. I guess I am not going to get the figure, but where I am getting at—

Lord Coe: You can work it out. The figure was clear. If every one of those 214 federations meets the criteria and wants to utilise that budget, it is 214 times the \$25,000 that I have earmarked.

Q258 Nigel Adams: Yes. Compared with the amount of money that you spend on doping and tracking down cheats, off the top of my head that tells me that it is north of the \$4 million allocated. Would it not make sense to also allocate some of that money for the relatively low budget that you referred to earlier?

Lord Coe: I think Thomas is better placed than I am to discuss how that budget gets used within his organisation. You asked me the question: was I prepared to spend more on our anti-doping protocols? The answer is yes, but I also have to recognise that our sport is not just a story of anti-doping. I do

need to create structures and coaching pathways for clean athletes to be able to do what they want to do. It is absolutely vital that we have more countries competing in world championships so we give better opportunities for athletes and coaches to be able to deliver those athletes with integrity. If I need to have systems in place that guarantee that, I am prepared to spend more on the anti-doping programmes.

Q259 Chair: You have highlighted, Lord Coe, have you not, the importance of television revenues as part of your answer to Mr Adams?

Lord Coe: Yes.

Chair: What guarantee do we have that, as regards Russian athletes, you are not going to decide that the television revenue that comes from allowing them to go to the Olympics trumps issues about whether or not those athletes are clean?

Lord Coe: I think I would just say what I said a few moments ago. The criteria that we have set are very clear. It is not about television revenues. The criteria we have set are about having safe, secure systems in place. Rune Andersen, the independent chair of my task force, with his team, will be the final arbiter of whether or not those criteria have been met. Frankly, they will get back into competition when we are satisfied that, first, the clean athletes are going back into safe and secure systems and, secondly, that we have a Russian federation that is fit for purpose.

Q260 Chair: Just to be clear then, it is within IAAF's control to refuse to allow those athletes to compete; it will do so if they do not pass the criteria; and the criteria are just not about clear evidence of non-doping among athletes but clear evidence that the institutions themselves of Russian athletics are not corrupt?

Lord Coe: Yes.

Chair: That is very helpful. Thank you.

Q261 Nigel Huddleston: Lord Coe, this Committee has received evidence in the past about the presence of doping among some very young athletes, particularly in certain countries. What is the IAAF doing to stop doping among these very young people coming through the ranks?

Lord Coe: Our anti-doping processes are focused on international athletes, athletes that get into, I think, junior ranks and then into senior ranks. The control below those in younger athletes and those athletes who are not in their international teams is the province of the individual federations.

Q262 Nigel Huddleston: Do you offer any guidelines to them on education about doping?

Lord Coe: Yes. We have education programmes. I am setting up a values commission. We talked about some of the cultural challenges, and I think this

is a good point and your question is a very valid one. It is really important that we have a shift of culture. I did join an athletics club at the age of 11, and I was only ever surrounded by coaches who were not just determined to impart the technical knowledge to me but they also created a framework through which we came to understand that you did it with integrity. Are there enough coaches out there now in some systems who believe that it is possible to take a young athlete through the ranks in the way that my coaches and my father did to an Olympic stadium anymore? I do not know. What I am determined to do is to make sure that coaches understand their responsibility is not just anaerobic thresholds or VO2 maxes or the right angle of entry into a high jump apron and the proper grouping of a pole vault. It is much more than that. We have to be alert to the malign influences that there are on young athletes, not just from coaches but from the entourage, from doctors, from team officials, from friends and family. We need to make sure that we are also creating a route map for them. They need to understand that it is possible to do that cleanly, and we need the vast majority of coaches to believe that good coaching and smart intellectual input and focus is going to do that. Do we have enough at this moment? I do not know, and that is what I want to challenge myself on.

Q263 Nigel Huddleston: My colleague, Mr Nicolson, has commented previously that the extent of doping among very young children and the institutionalised nature of it could almost be verging on child abuse. Would you agree with that?

Lord Coe: Yes. If athletes are being subjected to malign influences or systems that are actively encouraging them to do this in a dangerous and reckless and unclean way, then these are very serious issues. We do take this extremely seriously. I made the point at the beginning that this is about trust and confidence. Parents have a very large influence in the sport their children take up. In our private moments, what are we all, as parents, probably most concerned about? We know. It is the thought that our children are going to be in a drug environment. No parent is going to nudge their child to a sport that they think is full of junkies. That is my responsibility, and we will make those changes.

Q264 Nigel Huddleston: If I can turn your attention now to the WADA report. The Independent Commission of WADA, the World Anti-Doping Agency, stated in its report that within IAAF, "The acceptance of cheating at all levels is widespread and of long standing". That is the body that you were vice-president of and are currently the president of, and they are saying that acceptance of cheating was widespread.

Lord Coe: Across the sport wholesale?

Nigel Huddleston: They are stating that within the IAAF there was an acceptance of cheating. How do you respond to that?

Lord Coe: I do not accept that. I really do not accept that. Again, let me go back to the immediate challenges we have. We have the WADA Independent Commission report on corruption in Russia; I have the serious issues

surrounding the allegations made about some people that were in my organisation; but if you say to me that the IAAF across the board has an acceptance that doping is acceptable, I have to say no, I do not recognise that remotely.

Q265 Nigel Huddleston: You have talked a lot about various changes you are implementing, structural changes, governance and so on, but is it more than that? Is there a problem with the people there or the underlying culture?

Lord Coe: Culture is important. Culture is absolutely important. I am sorry to be repetitive here, but this is an emotional connection for me. I did join an athletics club at the age of 11. My first coach drove me and my team around South Yorkshire in a campervan. When he died, I spoke to his wife. She reminded me that the only day he was not coaching was on Christmas Day. I had no appreciation at that stage of my life or his what balances he was making to be able to devote that amount of time to me.

The question I have been asking myself in the last few weeks—and it is the most penetrating and probably the toughest—is how on earth have we got from a sport that was underpinned by that kind of philosophy to the horror show that has played out on the global stage in the last few weeks? I do not know the answer to that, but I will find out and that will be our route map. We have to put systems in place, and culture is absolutely at the heart of this. You can have every structure, every committee, every corporate governance, every horse-has-bolted-from-the-stable review, but if you do not have the right people in the organisation then I am afraid that no corporate governances will protect you.

Q266 Nigel Huddleston: You have taken on quite a headache there then. Do you regret taking on the role of president?

Lord Coe: No, not for one moment. This is a sport that has been very good to me. I do not kid myself that I am sitting here for any other reason. I started life as an athlete. Athletics will always define me. I am very privileged and very proud to be in a position to help shape the future of my sport. Are there things that we could have done better in the past? Absolutely. I am determined to fix it.

Q267 Nigel Huddleston: The WADA report also said that there are corruption and bribery practices in the highest levels of international athletics. Are you comfortable that the changes you are implementing and the processes you are putting in place will be adequate to dispel that corruption and bribery?

Lord Coe: Yes, I am. The allegations that are made particularly around members of the IAAF, and they are only a handful, are the subject of police investigation, so I do not know the details but we will obviously wait for that to follow its proper course. I believe the systems that I am putting in place will create far greater external scrutiny and will be far more robust than we have clearly had in place before.

Nigel Huddleston: Thank you very much.

Q268 Chair: I guess the question Mr Huddleston is really asking is: is the IAAF a corrupt organisation?

Lord Coe: No, it is not a corrupt organisation. Some very serious allegations have been made about former members of the IAAF, and I accept that, but I do not believe that the IAAF across all its organisation and across the vast majority of people that are involved in the sport is a corrupt sport, and we have—

Q269 Chair: Have you taken measures since you became president to try to identify other people who might have been involved in corruption but who have not been indicted or charged?

Lord Coe: No. Look, there are four separate inquiries going on here at the moment. We have the ethics committee, chaired by Michael Beloff QC; we have the Independent Commission for WADA that is in the process of reporting; we have WADA's own report; we have our own internal investigations; and of course I have a root and branch review, including Paul Deighton, who is independently reviewing, with Deloitte and Freshfields, the operational and auditing functions in my—

Q270 Chair: The point is your internal review is in part designed to identify corrupt practices in the IAAF?

Lord Coe: No. It is primarily there to identify the systems that we need to put in place to make sure that conflicts and corruption, perceived or real, are straightened out.

Q271 Chair: If and when you find some of that, will you be firing the relevant people, going after them for any money embezzlement and that kind of stuff?

Lord Coe: These are criminal investigations, so criminal sanctions will ultimately be the main arbiter.

Chair: Good. Thank you.

Q272 Andrew Bingham: Lord Coe, you spoke very eloquently about athletics. I think the phrase you used was that it is at a crossroads, and I think you are absolutely right. I look at other sports where things like this have happened and those sports have been sufficiently devalued now that they have become nothing more than a sideshow. WADA found that some of the delays in the enforcement by IAAF allowed 10 athletes who had been blood doping to take part in the London Olympics. Two of those were medals. Is that acceptable and do you think that is good enough when you are trying to clean up the sport that you love to make it credible once again?

Lord Coe: Thank you. I will have some observations, but I am going to ask Thomas to deal with the specific point that you have raised about those numbers.

Thomas Capdevielle: Yes. As you said, I will comment on these particular findings. As far as we are concerned, there were suspicious delays in four cases, not 10, and this is currently the objective of a written submission that will be sent to the independent commission and to WADA. That was one medal, not two, and all athletes were ultimately sanctioned and received an increased sanction, and all of their results were disqualified retroactively. I want to make clear here that under the current system, and the system as it was in place at the time, there cannot be any cover-up. There cannot be any cover-up of any case, doping case or Athlete Biological Passport case, because of the system that is in place, and it is transparent. The World Anti-Doping Agency has access to all the data we are commenting on today, including the cases in question.

Q273 Andrew Bingham: Do you want to add to that, Lord Coe?

Lord Coe: Yes. This is the point. If there have been delays in the system and they are delays that have been caused by the abuse of that system, then clearly that is a very serious issue and we will address that. As Thomas said, these are delays. It is not possible to cover those up.

Q274 Andrew Bingham: You said that these delays are not acceptable and you have to deal with them. Can we be assured that, with the next Olympics less than a year away, we will not be back around this table in two or three years' time, asking you the question why the blood doping—or whatever results were found—delay allowed athletes to once again compete in the Olympics?

Thomas Capdevielle: No. As we said, whatever the picture, the criminal investigation will find out. The consequences of the IAAF anti-doping programme are limited in scope and in time, and this is just what I describe. What my now president is saying is that the new structure in place will certainly allow us to avoid this delay. You mentioned the independent tribunal, for instance. We are going to do everything to try to deal with the cases more swiftly as regards delays that could be observed in other cases, but these are cases where there were suspicious delays and, again, no cover-up, and this is subject to investigations.

Q275 Andrew Bingham: Some sportsmen and women in this country have released their blood test results. Do you think that all blood-doping results should be published for all athletes, or not?

Lord Coe: No, because this information is confidential to the athletes. It can only be an indicator of further follow-up. I think, if I may say so, the way that some of those profiles have been used has damaged the reputation of clean athletes. The issue for us is very clear. We need to have systems in place that can follow up on suspicions, and we do, that can go back into the system, and we do, and we have just taken the medals away from some athletes who competed in the 2005 World Athletics Championships. This can only be an indicator of follow-up and review. I think that just putting that out into the public domain as raw data, without any context around it, is not good for clean athletes.

Q276 Andrew Bingham: Do you not think, given the place where the IAAF is now and where the whole sport is, that even for a certain period of time, to show some transparency and put some light on the situation, it could be something you should consider doing, if only to reestablish the credibility of the sport?

Lord Coe: We can have a longer, lengthy discussion about this. My instinct is that that is not a good thing to do. We are only talking about public exposure here. This information is available to WADA. It is available to the national anti-doping agencies. All British athletes are being monitored, if they are in the international system, by the IAAF, by WADA, by bilateral agreements we have with the UK Anti-Doping Agency, and that information of course is shared with the individual athlete themselves. This is not secret data. It is shared with all those organisations that should be monitoring those profiles, that should be, if we are not doing it quickly enough, knocking on our door, saying, "Why aren't you doing it quickly enough?" That is the nature of the relationship that we share with WADA and those other agencies.

I think it is dangerous for the clean athletes if that private, confidential data is put into the public domain without context, particularly in the way that it could and has been interpreted. That is the main concern I have with the way that some of this data has been used to conclude things that you really cannot conclude from it.

Q277 Andrew Bingham: We have already heard and it has already been discussed about how dangerous blood doping can be to athletes. Does the IAAF have a specific duty to alert event organisers when athletes' blood test levels are abnormal?

Lord Coe: Thomas would be able to answer that question, but yes, we are vigilant as well as we can be.

Q278 Andrew Bingham: That question was: do you have a duty to inform the organisers?

Thomas Capdevielle: No, we do not have a duty to inform the organisers. We are in charge of the anti-doping programme. In the context of the athlete passport, we collect blood data, and when there is sufficient evidence that the blood data is consistent with doping, going through a very lengthy process, then we pursue the athlete, but we do not have any obligation to inform an event organiser.

Q279 Andrew Bingham: Do you think you should?

Thomas Capdevielle: This is the current WADA system. I am not giving a judgment here. That is the system that was designed by many organisations, subject to consensus among the anti-doping community, through an extended period of consultation, and everybody has to respect this process.

Q280 Andrew Bingham: A question Mr Huddleston asked earlier about the culture. We can talk about processes and rules and laws. The culture is the thing that you have to address. Following the Olympics, your personal reputation would have probably made you king of the world because they went so well. I personally think your reputation is back on the line now you have taken this job, and I think it is going to be very difficult. A straight question: do you really think you can do this, you can break this culture if it does exist?

Lord Coe: Yes. I have to because, if I do not, there are no tomorrows for this sport.

Q281 Andrew Bingham: I would agree with you, and I look at cricket and all the things that have gone on about cricket match-fixing. If you see an unusual result, there is always the assumption that there is something wrong. I think there is a situation in athletics that if somebody puts in a magnificent performance, breaks a world record by a huge amount, there are questions asked, as opposed to applauding the performance.

Lord Coe: That is nothing new. I broke 11 world records.

Andrew Bingham: That is 11 more than me.

Lord Coe: I am guessing on each occasion those those same questions were asked. **Andrew Bingham:** Yes, I am sure, but now we have—

Lord Coe: No, you are right. You are absolutely right. This is absolutely essential. We have to get back to the belief that we have a culture, coaches, athletes, entourage, team doctors, physiotherapy, everybody in our sport believing that it is quite possible to do this cleanly, and I was only ever in a team with people who did it that way. I have to be honest here, this is not within my normal framework of reference. I do not understand this culture. It is not the culture I was brought up with. It is not a philosophy that any of my coaches had. My father would have killed somebody who had suggested that I took anything at all to performance-enhance. That was the non-negotiable nature of the environment I was brought up in, and that is an environment that the vast majority of athletes live in and are comfortable in.

In any walk of human life, whether it is sport, politics, the City, the arts, a few people will choose to step out from beyond those norms. Is it our responsibility to put those systems in place? Yes. It is our responsibility to kick them out of our sport? Yes. These are the changes I am making.

Q282 Andrew Bingham: I agree, but I think you have to be able to demonstrate to people that you are determined to do that and you have the ability to do that.

Lord Coe: I think that the changes we have made already—I was elected on 19 August. I took over the duties on 1 September. The day after I was elected, the reform process started, and that started in Beijing with my council colleagues.

Q283 Andrew Bingham: Perhaps your formative years running around my constituency will help me. Good luck with it.

Lord Coe: Everybody needs to help us here. We need help. Everybody needs to help us here.

Andrew Bingham: It is in the last chance saloon, in my view.

Q284 Chair: It is not just a few people, is it? It is not just a few bad apples, Lord Coe. It is potentially countries, structures of athletes and systematic doping across large numbers of athletes, so it is not a small—

Lord Coe: No. That may well be the case.

Q285 Chair: Let me be clear on a couple of other things, though. Do you in fact believe that you should be under an obligation to notify event organisers of high-doping athletes or high-scoring athletes? If you remember the response you made to my first question, it was that there are medical risks, very serious cardiovascular risks, potentially stroke, heart attack and so on, from high-doping athletes or from someone with very high scores. Does that not create an obligation on you to stop them from competing?

Lord Coe: There is an obligation for us to create systems that are robust and secure. You asked the question a few moments ago: should there be an obligation on the IAAF to report our suspicions through to event organisers? I think that is difficult, given the process that Thomas has taken us through. It is something I will ponder. It is something that I will ponder.

Q286 Chair: Could I ask another question, which is just to pick up on a point that Mr Bingham raised? You have said you are against the full publication of athletes' results because you regard it as potentially dangerous to clean athletes. Therefore, do you not think publication should be a condition of receiving public sponsorship? Of course, these athletes do compete with an enormous amount of public money sitting behind them and the public is entitled to know, is it not, that that money is being spent in a way that promotes high standards and clean competition?

Lord Coe: Yes, and that is the system that UK Sport, which funds our national governing bodies, and UK Anti-Doping Agency, that is—

Q287 Chair: Does that not create an obligation to publish results then, or at least make them available?

Lord Coe: No, because all these organisations have access to this data. The specific question you are asking me is should we publish raw data without any context and put it into the public domain, when really you cannot conclude a positive or even conclude that a sanction is on its way. As we have tried to point out today, this is a very complex process. All I am really saying is that by sticking information into the public domain, which is there for WADA, shared among the organisations that really do need to know what these profiles look like, would this be risky for the reputation of clean athletes? I still think it would.

Q288 Chair: In other industries—for example, in finance—the regulators do publish this kind of data, but they publish it after the events, after some time. The reason they do that is so that people can look at the question of whether the regulators were doing their job properly by comparing what the results were and then what the regulatory response was. Do you think there is a case for putting out this public information of the data perhaps five or 10 years after the event?

Lord Coe: Of course, I want to get there earlier and quicker than that. Within the integrity unit and around the anti-doping processes I want an independent supervisory board so that we can introduce external scrutiny into the way that the anti-doping unit is discharging its duties, the targets that it is setting for itself and the way that it is speeding up the process. An independent tribunal within that will take the hearings away from individual federations, as a group of independent people who understand the nature of the sport.

Q289 Chair: What about publishing this data on a 20-year rule, for example, analogous to the one in Government, so people can actually see what the data is after the event? Do you think that is a good idea?

Lord Coe: We did. We have relatively recently published a prevalence report, and we will—

Q290 Chair: No, but not individual data, so you could not actually look at the data. Even 20 years or 10 years after the event, putting this data—

Lord Coe: Again, it depends how you define the individual data. If it is individual data that is in a process that leads to a sanction, then the sanction is very public: the banning of an athlete for two or four years. That is a very clear and transparent process.

Chair: That sounds like a no.

Q291 Julie Elliott: Lord Coe, has the IAAF ever applied the no-start rule to British athletes when they have been found with very high off-scores?

Lord Coe: Not specifically to British athletes. The no-start rule was a discussion that was across some sports. We looked at it and thought that this would not be a successful way and would not add anything really to our anti-doping protocols. Thomas will answer the specific question as to why we had our concerns.

Thomas Capdevielle: There were lengthy discussions, not totally in the IAAF but across other organisations, as to the grounds for these rules. I think, again, we put it clearly in our submissions why the IAAF did not follow that route. It was not a medical rule and, retroactively, as was criticised by many other review bodies, this no-start rule, which was different from the athlete passport, which is not based on individual variations but putting a threshold applicable to everybody, was creating false positives, and was basically used, especially by riders, as a permit to dope and just to check to which level they could go. That was the case, and some riders admitted that they used the no-

start rule as a limit, a red line they could not cross, but everything below the red line, they were free to dope. That was based on their own admissions.

The IAAF was very clear from the beginning, and it showed it and demonstrated this. It put all its resources to go through a full anti-doping sanction. The no-start rule was just telling an athlete, "You cannot compete here, but you can come back in two weeks' time". This was not satisfactory for us. We wanted a full anti-doping regime, and we put significant resources, with WADA, the UCI and other organisations, to achieve this regime, which we then applied successfully now, as we demonstrated.

Q292 Julie Elliott: Thank you. The WADA report states that there is evidence of breaches by IAAF officials of IAAF rules and processes and of WADA's code on prohibited substances. Have you ordered an inquiry to find out which officials they are, and what will happen to them if they are found to be breaching those rules?

Lord Coe: That is, of course, the subject of a criminal investigation, so those individuals have been identified in that process. I am not in a position to add anything to that. Once the police investigations have been concluded, that will become a matter of public record.

Q293 Julie Elliott: Would the IAAF then take disciplinary action against those people?

Lord Coe: If the allegations are substantiated—and let us be clear about them, if they are, this is absolutely abhorrent—then I think that the criminal processes will take their natural course. I am not sure it is something that the IAAF at that stage would need to be involved in. I think it will be very clear-cut.

Q294 Julie Elliott: If they are your officials, then surely you have to be involved in it.

Lord Coe: It is the subject of a criminal investigation.

Q295 Julie Elliott: Yes, and I am not expecting you to comment on that because that is for the criminal process to follow its path.

Lord Coe: I am not allowed to. I cannot add. I am sorry, I have to be really clear here. I volunteered a conversation with the French prosecutor here. I am not in a position to add anything to that. This is a criminal investigation, and I am afraid it will take its natural course.

Q296 Julie Elliott: That sounds a bit like you are going through the motions.

Lord Coe: I do not think it sounds anything like that. This is a very serious set of allegations, and I have to say that the criminal investigation will take its own course.

Q297 Julie Elliott: How are you working with WADA? How will you ensure that the new code is effectively enforced next year?

Lord Coe: We have a code with WADA, which was agreed in 2009 around the blood passport, so we will continue to work with WADA on a data-sharing basis and, of course, work with them in all the ways that we have done. The independent integrity unit has already gained acceptance, the concept of that, by WADA. We will make sure that everything I do within that unit—particularly the issues around anti-doping, because WADA is not going to take a view on age manipulation or transfer of allegiance—will be WADA-compliant, and the Court of Arbitration for Sport will be the arbiter when issues need to be dealt with at that level.

Julie Elliott: Thank you.

Q298 John Nicolson: Good afternoon, gentlemen. Thank you very much indeed for coming. Lord Coe, I would like to look back and forward at the issue of whistle-blowing. You said in your earlier comments that you welcomed investigative journalism, which I know will please every journalist in the room, and you said that you lived in the UK because of its good journalism in fact. However, Mr Seppelt, the German ARD reporter, as you know, has been very critical of you and he says that you refused to meet him for his documentary. First of all, is that true? Secondly, if it is true, why?

Lord Coe: No. Actually, on the first occasion I met Mr Seppelt, it was, I think, a couple of days after the first broadcast, and within the first few days of that broadcast the IAAF ethics committee had confirmed that an investigation was underway. Within a few more days, WADA had discussed and agreed an investigation. They then set up the independent commission. We were having our own internal investigations, so I was very keen to allow those processes to—

Q299 John Nicolson: You did not meet him for his initial documentary?

Lord Coe: No, and nor did he ask me to.

Q300 John Nicolson: He rather implies that he did. Is that not true?

Lord Coe: No, I do not remember that at all, but what I do remember—

Q301 John Nicolson: He also says you slammed down the phone on him. Is that not true?

Lord Coe: No.

Q302 John Nicolson: Is none of that true?

Lord Coe: No. I do not slam down phones.

Q303 John Nicolson: Good to have that on the record, because he is quoted as saying that.

Lord Coe: No. I did ask Mr Seppelt for sight of the database that he was citing as evidence of wide-scale—look, I—

Q304 John Nicolson: Maybe your gentle phone putting down was his slamming.

Lord Coe: No, no, no. I have never had a telephone conversation with Mr Seppelt but, and I was very clear, I did actually say on record that I was grateful the ARD brought to the attention of our sport those particular challenges.

Q305 John Nicolson: He also says that you did not, as far as I know, watch the documentary at the time. Is that true?

Lord Coe: No. There were four documentaries. Three of them I watched. I think there were four or five actually. The one I did not see was the August one because I was travelling, but I did read the transcript.

Q306 John Nicolson: Mr Stepanov and his wife, of course, went public in the documentary, and their undercover filming was so dramatic and so shocking. Have you met him?

Lord Coe: No.

Q307 John Nicolson: Can I ask why you have not met him?

Lord Coe: There were four independent investigations taking place at that time and, as I said earlier, I do not remotely dismiss the whistle-blowing efforts that they have helped come in.

Q308 John Nicolson: If I were you, I would be dying to meet him.

Lord Coe: No, I will. I will discuss with them some of the issues as I am putting in place the restructuring. We need to learn from that.

Q309 John Nicolson: One of the first people you would want to meet, if I were you. He would be right at the top of my list, the man who has had to flee Russia because of his undercover filming. I cannot imagine anybody more fascinating to meet in the context of this subject.

Lord Coe: No, and I will discuss the implications of what he is saying and what they are saying, and clearly I take whistle-blowing very seriously. Part of the criteria for the reintroduction of the Russian federation is removing omertà around these issues.

Q310 John Nicolson: Can I ask who you think he has had to go into hiding from?

Lord Coe: Look, I have no idea.

Q311 John Nicolson: What is your hunch?

Lord Coe: I have no idea.

Q312 John Nicolson: I have an idea. If I was a Russian whistle-blower, I am pretty sure who I would be hiding from.

Lord Coe: I am sorry. I am not going to speculate. I do not know.

Q313 John Nicolson: Everyone is talking about cleaning up Russian athletics. Do you think Russian athletics is independent of Russian politics?

Lord Coe: The criteria that we are setting down are very clear. There is no ambiguity about it. The Russian federation was suspended. My council suspended the Russian federation unanimously on the basis that there were very clear doping code violations and that had a very clear implication for our ethics code as well. They will return as and when we think that those criteria are satisfied: are there safe and secure systems in place? Can clean athletes in Russia really go back into competition because those systems are in place?

Q314 John Nicolson: Except it is not really like dealing with a normal society, is it? If you find allegations of doping in the United Kingdom, we all know how the system would be dealt with: the governing athletics body would clean it up and we hope we would all move on. In a society where politics and sport are so intertwined, as in Russia, it is an entirely different ball game, is it not, if I am not mixing my sporting metaphors?

Lord Coe: That is why those criteria are absolutely oblivious, and should be, to political consideration. Whether that federation returns will be entirely predicated on whether they meet those criteria, and those criteria have been independently set and they have to enact change, they have to be verifiable, and they have to be across a series of measured outcomes, and that is absolutely non-negotiable, and that is the way they will come back.

Q315 John Nicolson: How do you feel about the fact that a whistle-blower has had to go into hiding?

Lord Coe: I am clearly sorry. This is not a good situation to be in. I want whistle-blowers—this not just lip service—and this is why I have changed the ethics code to give whistle-blowers, whether they are returning to my organisation or whether they are external, the opportunity to challenge and to make us accountable.

Q316 John Nicolson: I get that if the whistle-blowers stay here in the United Kingdom, but if they are in a country like Russia, how can you protect whistle-blowers?

Lord Coe: As I have said, as part of those criteria we will have structures that allow whistle-blowers. That is quite clear. If they do not accept that, they do not come back.

Q317 John Nicolson: Could you talk me through the kinds of structures that would protect a Russian whistle-blower?

Lord Coe: It will be removing the omertà around this. It will be allowing them to properly air their concerns and take their evidence to the independent commission. Again, I have freed up our own ethics committee to be able to take evidence from outside our sport. It could take evidence from you. It could take evidence from any of the media sitting in this room, and that was not the case before. It is very important that we broaden that, and that is part of the criteria.

Q318 John Nicolson: In this particular instance, the athlete concerned was so scared that he had to flee the country. It seems to me that we are in an entirely different situation. It is a question not just of allowing athletes the freedom to whistle-blow, but physically protecting them from danger and harm.

Lord Coe: Yes, and that has to be the challenge of those structures. If you are saying to me is this going to happen overnight—

John Nicolson: No, I was not saying that to you.

Lord Coe: —no, it is not, and it will not, but we have to start from somewhere, and we do need to have systems in place where athletes, coaches and anybody in the sport who really does have a serious problem about something have the ability to communicate that problem.

Q319 John Nicolson: What do the Russian sporting authorities say to you when you raise these concerns? We have watched your own rhetoric change very much on this issue, as you know. We have also seen the reaction of the Russian governing body change quite dramatically, from saying that they have robust systems in place and that there is no scandal of any kind, to acknowledging that there is a scandal and far stronger.

Lord Coe: It tends to happen when federations get suspended.

John Nicolson: What did they say to you about how it works in Russia? Did they say to you, "Oh, Lord Coe, there is absolutely nothing to worry about, just a few stray athletes here"?

Lord Coe: No. We have not had those discussions. That is the—

Q320 John Nicolson: You have not had discussions with the Russian athletics body?

Lord Coe: The Russian athletics body has now been suspended.

Q321 John Nicolson: You have not had any discussions?

Lord Coe: The Russian athletics body is waiting for the criteria. It is waiting for the structures to emerge within Russia so that our independent verification team task force, chaired by Rune Andersen, as I have said, is able to work to

make sure that we get the changes in place we need, and that may well take place through the national Olympic committee.

Q322 John Nicolson: You have not actually heard their defence?

Lord Coe: The night that they got suspended, my council colleague, Mikhail Butov, made the presentation to the council. The council decided that the evidence in the WADA report was enough for that suspension to be upheld.

Q323 John Nicolson: As my colleague here, Mr Huddleston, mentioned earlier on, we have had a previous witness for the Committee who has talked—it was not my phrase, actually, it was the witness’s phrase—about child abuse in athletics, and we all know what it was like before the wall came down, do we not? We heard afterwards Nadia Comăneci telling the stories about what she had been forced to do, and it was horrific. What one of the medical witnesses said to us was, “We understood what the dangers were of the steroids, for example, that athletes at that time were given in childhood, but we have no idea what the long-term effects are going to be on young athletes being given these new drugs. We just do not know”. Would you share that assessment?

Lord Coe: First of all, this is not an issue at the stage of the history you are talking about that was remotely limited to Russia. This was a very different era, and athletes were consuming things that they certainly should not have been consuming, and athletes have died early.

Q324 John Nicolson: There were visual effects, were there not?

Lord Coe: Of course there are, and—

John Nicolson: You can see famous Bulgarian shot-putters.

Lord Coe: If I may say so, there are some broader issues here, and that is that using performance-enhancing drugs is unnecessary, dangerous and of course, that rather old-fashioned concept, is cheating. Part of the health of the athletes is of course important, but am I sitting here really thinking about the health of cheating athletes? Not my primary concern. I want to make sure that clean athletes are given the absolute opportunity to compete in the cleanest way.

Q325 John Nicolson: I was not, of course, talking about adult athletes who make that choice. I was talking about underage athletes who are not in a position to give either informed or uninformed consent.

Lord Coe: No, absolutely. Absolutely, and that is why we need systems and structures in place and frameworks that protect athletes at all levels, but I suggest that is probably what we would want in any area of activity, whether it is education or childcare.

John Nicolson: Thank you.

Q326 Chair: Just to follow up on a couple of quick things there. It seemed to me what you were saying, Lord Coe, was that you were committed to the standard forms of dealing with whistle-blowers, that is to say things like hotlines and other kinds of confidential communication, but you thought it ought to go further, and I just want to push you a little bit on that, the kinds of things you might think about. Mr Nicolson was hinting at the idea of safe houses, somewhere they could go to be safe, to be kept away. Is that something you would support?

Lord Coe: I do not think I can or should be tightly prescriptive about this at the moment, but we will do whatever we can to give whistle-blowers the right opportunity and the right structures to relay their concerns.

Q327 Chair: Of course, one of the risks that the Stepanovs have is that they may be sued by other athletes. Will you support them in legal cases, if they have taken that legal risk?

Lord Coe: One of the things that I have already done within my own organisation is to remove some of those confidentiality clauses from the contracts of employees at the IAAF so they are not liable to legal challenge if they want to detail their concerns. These are all considerations. I am not sitting here telling you that I have a tightly prescriptive view of how this will be implemented. Believe me, we will put the right systems in place.

Q328 Chair: Why have you not taken someone like Vitaly Stepanov and praised him as a courageous whistle-blower? He is a rather heroic figure, is he not, in a way, because he has opened up an extraordinary cesspit of corruption?

Lord Coe: I have said that and if you would like me to say it again today I am very happy to. Whistle-blowing comes with human cost and there are people in my own organisation who have done that and there are people from outside the organisation who have done that at considerable personal risk.

Q329 Chair: I think it is important to have said that. I am grateful if you are repeating it today.

Lord Coe: I have said that before but let me put it on record. I do feel very strongly that clearly this has come with a human cost.

Q330 Paul Farrelly: I want to come on to Lamine Diack, but following the Chair's point first, I have read the 33-page rebuttal document you sent us and the summary of it that is on your website and find it entirely defensive. It does not in any way acknowledge the valuable role of ARD in Germany and *The Sunday Times* in shining a light on international athletics. It covers the timeframe of testing from 2001 to 2009 but does not say very much about 2009 to 2012 and nowhere does it put its hand up to other things that have been confirmed by WADA's independent commission, which were also the subject of the press reports, including this statement, "The delays by both the IAAF and ARAF—the Russians—"led to athletes competing in the London 2012 Olympics who should have been prevented from competing". I suggest culturally the IAAF

still has some valuable PR lessons to learn about how it presents itself and how it responds.

Having said that, one curiosity from me first of all. Dr Gabriel Dollé headed up the anti-doping unit, and €87,000 in cash was found in his home when the police raided it. Can you tell us how long he headed the anti-doping unit while the IAAF has been at the cutting edge of pursuing cheats?

Lord Coe: I can't answer that question. I don't know when Gabriel Dollé became head of the department.

Thomas Capdevielle: I wasn't in the IAAF but I think—

Paul Farrelly: Year and years?

Thomas Capdevielle: Yes.

Paul Farrelly: From 2001?

Thomas Capdevielle: Yes, probably.

Q331 Paul Farrelly: What was your reaction to the arrest last month of Lamine Diack and the allegations and charges made against him?

Lord Coe: Shock. Shock suffused with sorrow and anger.

Paul Farrelly: Surprise?

Lord Coe: Yes. I am chair of an organisation where we are consoling people who for 20 years in that organisation worked alongside people who are now the subject of some abhorrent criminal allegations. So, yes, shock, and that has gone through the whole organisation.

Q332 Paul Farrelly: You called Lamine Diack, I think, your spiritual president or the sport's spiritual leader. What did you mean by that?

Lord Coe: Lamine Diack had been president of the IAAF since 2000, 2001. He became a council member in 1976. He was our president and I said that for many in the sport he would always be seen as a spiritual force in athletics.

Q333 Paul Farrelly: In the light of the allegations, do you regret that?

Lord Coe: Clearly if I had been sitting with a charge sheet of allegations in front of me I probably would not have said that, but this was within a few moments of having won an election without any sight of those very specific allegations that were made.

Q334 Paul Farrelly: Did you hear at all any whispers within the IAAF family this year or previously about Lamine Diack possibly being involved in this sort of corrupt activity?

Lord Coe: No.

Q335 Paul Farrelly: You were aware of allegations against his son, Papa Massata Diack?

Lord Coe: They were allegations that were aired in the ARD documentary and after that he stepped down, along with the treasurer of the IAAF, Mr Balakhnichev, pending the outcome of the IAAF ethics committee's report.

Q336 Paul Farrelly: That was in December last year?

Lord Coe: I think the first ARD documentary was about November time.

Q337 Paul Farrelly: Did the fact that the IAAF employed the son of the president set any alarm bells ringing about nepotism at all?

Lord Coe: It was an arrangement between the president and the general secretary of the IAAF.

Q338 Paul Farrelly: Was it anything you ever remarked on?

Lord Coe: Would I have a system in place now that allowed that? No, I wouldn't.

Q339 Paul Farrelly: Is it anything you ever remarked on?

Lord Coe: It was an arrangement between the general secretary as a communications and commercial consultant.

Q340 Paul Farrelly: Was it anything you ever remarked on about the appropriateness?

Lord Coe: Not in the council, no.

Paul Farrelly: Outside the council?

Lord Coe: No.

Q341 Paul Farrelly: After the allegations were made and then the inquiry into Lamine Diack's son started, did you ever ask yourself, or more pertinently ask the president, whether he was involved in anything like this at all?

Lord Coe: No, because there were no allegations being made about the president.

Paul Farrelly: But he was the president's son.

Lord Coe: I did not ask the president directly.

Q342 Paul Farrelly: In previous investigations we have had the former DG of the BBC, Mr Entwistle, where we labelled him as having a lack of curiosity

in respect of Jimmy Savile, and in respect of the Murdoch phone hacking we used the term wilful blindness. How would you categorise and describe your lack of curiosity in asking the question: if the son is involved does it reach to the father?

Lord Coe: Confirmation that the IAAF ethics committee under the chairmanship of Michael Beloff has already started an investigation into some of these issues.

Q343 Paul Farrelly: It was not the first time Lamine Diack's family had been embroiled in bribery allegations. During his presidency, the IOC's people, I think, conducted an inquiry into allegations that he had been bribed back in 1993 by the defunct ISL company. So it was not the first time.

Lord Coe: The IOC's ethics committee concluded that he could remain a member of the IOC.

Q344 Paul Farrelly: It also found that he had put himself in a position where he had a conflict of interest.

Lord Coe: But their conclusion was that he was able to remain a member of the International Olympic Committee.

Q345 Paul Farrelly: Some people might find the lack of pursuit of this surprising given the family connection. One of the people involved in the various allegations was the IAAF treasurer, Valentin Balakhnichev. It is alleged that he refunded €300,000 of a bribe paid by Liliya Shobukhova, a Russian athlete, which was part of the allegations of bribery and extortion from the Russians, and that that money was refunded via a company called Black Tidings in Singapore, which was owned by a business partner of Papa Diack. In the light of this, what have you done since becoming president in terms of examining the federation's accounts over previous years?

Lord Coe: Paul Deighton, as I have said, is conducting an independent review into our operations and our finances. It is done with three forensic accountants from Deloitte and independently overseen by Freshfields. Of course all those issues are the subject of police investigation.

Q346 Paul Farrelly: Will that review extend to looking back at the accounts, receipts and payments, through all the time that comrade Balakhnichev was treasurer or indeed to the whole Diack era?

Lord Coe: That is the scope of the review underway.

Q347 Paul Farrelly: I will finish here. I have a picture here and I think this is on the day of your election. This is Mr Balakhnichev, 11 months after the allegation were made against him, giving the financial report to delegates at the Beijing meeting of your council after the recent Games. You were the president-elect then. Did you ask who the speakers were going to be? Who was giving the financial report? Did you know he was going to be doing it and did you say, "Surely not"?

Lord Coe: My predecessor sought guidance from the ethics committee and confirmed to the council that when Mr Balakhnichev asked to present the accounts there was no reason, given that the independent inquiry had not delivered its verdict, for him not to be there. Was that a good decision? No, it was not.

Q348 Paul Farrelly: Rather like having someone out on bail still performing their jobs, so it does not give the best impression of how seriously the IAAF is seeking to clean itself up. But you are changing that now?

Lord Coe: Absolutely.

Q349 John Nicolson: We were having a conversation earlier on about whether your own organisation is corrupt. A simple question: have you ever been offered a bribe?

Lord Coe: No.

Q350 John Nicolson: By nobody, ever, throughout your whole career?

Lord Coe: No.

Q351 John Nicolson: Do you know anybody who has been offered a bribe?

Lord Coe: No.

Q352 John Nicolson: Never heard any chat around the trackside or subsequently from anybody who has ever said, "I was offered some money"?

Lord Coe: No.

Q353 John Nicolson: It is extraordinary, isn't it, for a sport that is so full of corruption for you never to have come across it?

Lord Coe: I have rarely found in any environment that people who are doing corrupt acts tend to share that information with their co-workers.

Q354 John Nicolson: As a journalist myself I have often heard gossip, and often gossip is wrong but sometimes it is right and it is quite often worth following up.

Lord Coe: That is not an environment I have lived in.

John Nicolson: Okay.

Q355 Nigel Adams: Lord Coe, you have had a long relationship, ambassadorial sponsorship-wise, with Nike over the years. Clearly this has been in the news as well. Could you explain why you have recently ended your deal with Nike?

Lord Coe: Yes, I have. I have had a 38-year involvement. I was a sponsored athlete. I competed in two Games with them. I have had a long relationship. I helped create something called Design to Move, which is a foundation getting more young people involved. We launched the Design to Move in the House of Commons with 100 MPs; it is a programme that Government supports.

Nigel Adams: With Paula Radcliffe, as well. She was involved in that.

Lord Coe: Exactly, yes. This is a relationship I have had for a long time. I joined Nike as a sponsored athlete younger than my youngest son is now. So, yes, I have had a long relationship with them. I made the judgment, given the level of noise around the relationship, that this had become a monstrous distraction, that reality and perception had become horribly entangled, and I really did not want anything to distract from the changes I am making, that I hope I have identified this afternoon.

Q356 Nigel Adams: You have ended that relationship on the basis of the noise around it following your election. Would it not have been better to end that relationship at your election?

Lord Coe: Can I just go through a little bit of history here? First, that relationship has always been properly identified. The very fact you are asking me that question now is because you could have gone to the House of Lords website at any stage in the last 10, 13 years and seen that. I was chairman of the bid committee and then the organising committee for London when Adidas were our major sponsors and partners. I came before this Select Committee on any number of occasions. This issue was never raised. It was not raised in the media. I then went to the British Olympic Association where Adidas again were our partners, properly identified, clearly identified as an interest. Again no issues ever raised. Yes, if I thought on the basis that over the previous 10 or 12 years this had not caused any fragility and there was never any question about inappropriate behaviour—

Nigel Adams: I don't think anybody—

Lord Coe: But in hindsight would I have got rid of it earlier if I had thought that the noise would have escalated to the level it did? Yes, probably I would have done.

Q357 Nigel Adams: You could understand why people might think there is a conflict of interest, surely.

Lord Coe: I have to say I think that is challengeable point. It would have been a conflict of interest if it had not been properly identified. It would have been a conflict of interest if we did not have robust, secure structures around it. When I went into the president's role in August I voluntarily wrote to the ethics committee and said while I am reviewing all my own corporate governances and they are part of the changes that I am making—I was very clear about it; I was very clear even before the election that I would make all the right and relevant adjustments I needed to make and that I would reach those judgments by the end of the year—let's be clear that Nike will not seek

any business directly or indirectly with the IAAF while I am getting those corporate governances into the right position. You are right. The question is: if in hindsight, given that I really had not had any of these challenges in the previous 14 or 15 years and the level of noise reached the crescendo that it did, would I have left it earlier? Yes, I would have done.

Q358 Nigel Adams: I am sure colleagues have other questions that follow up on the Nike relationship. Separately, is the current role as president of IAAF unpaid?

Lord Coe: Yes.

Q359 Nigel Adams: It does seem quite extraordinary, given what Sepp Blatter was pulling out of FIFA via his role, especially doing 18-hour days as you and your team are. Should it be paid?

Lord Coe: I think that is for others to make a judgment. That is not something I am going to enter into today.

Q360 Chair: To follow up on one question raised by Mr Adams's point: something is a conflict of interest because interests potentially conflict. Whether it is disclosed or not is a different matter. That is what you do to try to get rid of a conflict of interest. The point is you had a conflict of interest, did you not, by being connected with Nike and also being president of an institution that is supposed to be completely neutral across all aspects of athletics? Is that not right? But it seems to me your argument is that you told it by making sure it was in the public record.

Lord Coe: Yes. I was very clear.

Q361 Chair: It was still a conflict but it was one that was public and understood.

Lord Coe: It was managed. All the right systems and structures were put around it.

Q362 Chair: I thought you might be saying it wasn't a conflict of interest.

Lord Coe: No. I am just saying—what is the process? It is identification, disclosure, reporting and managing those issues. I have always done that. That is the world that I have lived in since becoming even the vice-chair of the London 2012 bid.

Q363 Chair: Just to be clear, were there any points at which your interests as a sponsored athlete or a sponsored person by Nike and your interest as a president or vice-president of IAAF came into conflict with each other?

Lord Coe: No.

Q364 Chair: If they had, which would you have chosen?

Lord Coe: Of course I would have absolutely discharged my duties properly.

Q365 Chair: Do you mean to the IAAF?

Lord Coe: Of course, yes. As I did to LOCOG through the seven years; as I did to the British Olympic Association over the last four years.

Chair: That is very helpful. Thank you.

Q366 Damian Collins: You would agree it is clear that Nike had an interest in the world championships in 2021 going to Eugene in Oregon?

Lord Coe: No, I don't conclude that.

Q367 Damian Collins: It would not have bothered Nike whether it had been in Gothenburg or Eugene?

Lord Coe: You would have to ask them that, but there was no direct interest in the organisation of those world championships.

Q368 Damian Collins: I imagine you have seen the BBC report from last week, the e-mail that was sent by Craig Masback. That clearly shows that Nike had an interest in the championships going to Eugene. Would you not agree?

Lord Coe: No. The e-mail, which I saw but I didn't see at the time of publication, clearly indicates a wide-ranging conversation. I don't remember the conversation but I assume that it did take place. If I was asked the question about Eugene or the World Athletic Championships I would have said, as I have consistently said, that this was a strong bid and they needed to get back into the bidding process.

Q369 Damian Collins: Why were you discussing it with Nike executives?

Lord Coe: Because I was asked the question.

Q370 Damian Collins: Could you not say, "I don't think it is appropriate for me to answer that question"?

Lord Coe: This was not a question uniquely limited to Nike. It was a question that was being asked at the time across the sport. Again, it is worth remembering that Eugene had lost to another bidding city in the 2019 cycle by only three votes. They were very keen to get back into the competition. They wanted to be a host to the world championships. This was a question that was being asked not just by Nike or through Eugene. This was being asked across the whole sport. It was a very big decision.

Q371 Damian Collins: To anyone who follows these issues, the idea that Nike would be totally dispassionate about the idea of the world

championships going to Eugene would not be credible at all. I don't think there would be any dispute about that.

Lord Coe: You really would have to ask them that question.

Q372 Damian Collins: I think it would be difficult to find anyone who would really dispute that fact. This goes back to the issue about policing potential conflicts of interest because what you could have said in a meeting with a Nike executive—

Lord Coe: It wasn't a meeting, it was a telephone call.

Damian Collins: A telephone call, a conversation. You could have said, "I don't think it really is appropriate. We are going through a process now of determining this; we will be shortly. I don't think it is appropriate for me to discuss it with you given your clear interest in the Track Town bid". Is that not how you should have done it?

Lord Coe: No, no. The advice I gave was very clear and concise and is recorded in the e-mail. It is, "Get back into the competition".

Q373 Damian Collins: You then recounted to them a private conversation you had had with the then president of the IAAF about the bidding process and you passed that information on. Was that appropriate?

Lord Coe: The conclusion, yes, that they needed to get back into the competition. That is exactly the advice I would have given to any bidding city, and have in the past, that has narrowly lost a vote for staging the championships. "Get back into the competition".

Q374 Damian Collins: So you don't think in that situation where you are vice-president of the IAAF, you are also a paid Nike ambassador, talking to an executive of Nike about a bid in which they have an interest—I think most people would expect they have an interest—there is any potential conflict at all in behaving in the way you did in that role?

Lord Coe: I was asked the question. I gave a view that Eugene needed to get back into the competition and get into the next bid cycle.

Q375 Damian Collins: Is this how your conflict of interest was policed: if Nike executives asked you a question you answered it?

Lord Coe: But it was not uniquely a Nike question. It was a question that was being asked across the whole sport. This was of very big interest to everybody in the sport.

Damian Collins: I think this was of particular interest to Nike. You said in the past that a unique funding package came together around the Track Town bid and that the IAAF circumvented the normal process in order to go for this bid. Could you tell us a bit more about this unique funding package?

Lord Coe: Again, you have to put this into context.

Damian Collins: Those were your words?

Lord Coe: Yes, yes. No, the first round, the first bidding process, was for the 2019 cycle and there were three bidding cities and I was the chair of the evaluation committee. Again, I declared very clearly my outside interests and the ethics committee concluded that it was acceptable for me to chair that committee. The role of the chair of an evaluation commission is to provide comparable information across three cities and for the council, my council, to make that judgment. I did not give a steer nor did I lobby on behalf of any of those cities. In fact, the council narrowly decided by three votes not to go to Eugene. Any American bid is a complicated process because they don't have the types of statutory organisations or public bodies that come together in the way that they would have come together in London for an Olympic Games so it was quite a complex funding package. They also by that stage had got the approval of NBC as a broadcaster. Again, it is worth remembering that there were 25 people who voted on that strategic decision; 23 of them voted to offer Eugene the opportunity to stage the world championships.

Q376 Damian Collins: Was Nike part of that funding package?

Lord Coe: No.

Q377 Damian Collins: They were not putting any money in?

Lord Coe: No.

Q378 Chair: To be clear, how did you vote on that particular vote yourself?

Lord Coe: I am very clear. I am open about it. I supported the strategic decision to go to Eugene.

Chair: Right. Okay.

Q379 Damian Collins: It was reported in *The Times* newspaper, following a telephone conversation you had with Bjorn Eriksson who had been working on the Gothenburg bid, that you acknowledged that you thought it was wrong for Eugene to be awarded the championships without a competitive bidding process. Is that correct?

Lord Coe: No, I didn't. Bjorn Eriksson sought clarification around the process—the telephone call was not my only conversation with Bjorn Eriksson—around the time of Gothenburg's interest in that bid. The bid had not opened. There was no bid process that had already opened post 2019. That would only be taking place about now and the decision would take place in November of next year, 2016. In the conversation I had with Bjorn Eriksson he sought clarification around the process. I had conversations with Bjorn Eriksson because he had asked me specifically back at the end, only weeks, months, after the decision for the appointment of the 2019 city, about Gothenburg bidding. So he had asked me that question.

Q380 Damian Collins: Did you say anything to him, as he is suggesting in his remarks that you did, that there was something flawed about that process?

Lord Coe: No, I didn't say that. Bjorn Eriksson first asked me, back at the end of 2014, weeks after the decision not to go to Eugene, that Gothenburg would show an interest and was it my view that this would be a normal bidding cycle. I gave him the view that it would be because every evidence at that moment was that we were not going to offer Eugene the opportunity to take the bid out of that cycle and that was clarification that I sought. So when I saw Mr Eriksson at the European Indoor Championships a few months later I was able to confirm to him that that it was still my view, as whenever I was asked about Eugene I gave exactly the same view, that the best way to secure these championships was to get back into the bidding process.

Q381 Damian Collins: So after the IAAF decided not to run the normal process, just to award the games to Eugene—

Lord Coe: It's not—

Damian Collins: If I can finish the question?

Lord Coe: Of course.

Damian Collins: Did Mr Eriksson speak to you again and say, "What happened?"

Lord Coe: Yes. The process was very clear-cut. The president made a case to the council meeting in April of this year that the funding arrangements, which I was aware of because of my work as the chair of the evaluation commission, would not hold together for very much longer—these are political judgments—and that it was his advice to the council. It has always been our ambition to take the World Athletics Championships to the United States. It is the largest sports market. It is a country where our sport has struggled. We needed to be back there. So that was the judgment that was made.

Q382 Damian Collins: I am just trying to follow the events, because I think it is quite important. The question I asked was did Mr Eriksson speak to you after the decision was made to not follow the normal process and did he ask you, "You told me that you were going to and now that has not happened. Why is that"?

Lord Coe: Yes. I explained to him that in and around that council meeting, the president raised the issue about a strategic judgment to award or to give the Eugene the opportunity to stage those championships. This is not without precedent. Birmingham and Portland, for the indoor championships in the next few months, were given the opportunity on the same day to stage consecutive games. The World Athletics Championships, if you remember, were due to come to London in 2005. Wembley was not ready, so UK Athletics handed them back and they went, without a bidding process, to Helsinki that year—and actually outdoor athletics championships have been awarded to two cities

in the world on the same day. There was not a bidding process in place at that time.

Q383 Damian Collins: Okay, but the intention had been to have a bidding process for 2021 and that was stopped. I just want to go back to what Mr Eriksson said in *The Times* newspaper about his conversation with you, which is that you had expressed some regret that the process had been abandoned and that Eugene had been awarded the games without a bid. Is that an accurate reflection of what you said?

Lord Coe: No, it is not. Out of courtesy, I picked up the phone to Mr Eriksson last week, because he had clearly said he sought clarification so I spoke to him in order to give that clarification.

Q384 Damian Collins: He has referred to the decision as “bad ethics” and “a back-door deal”. Did he put those arguments to you when you spoke?

Lord Coe: No, he did not.

Q385 Damian Collins: Okay, so it is not true. If he is asserting that you said it was wrong for that process to award Eugene the games in the way it did, that was wrong? If he is saying that is what you said, that is not true, as far as you are concerned?

Lord Coe: No, it is not a recollection of the conversation I had with Mr Eriksson. It was a perfectly reasonable conversation. I know him well; he knows me well. I read that he wanted to seek clarification and out of courtesy I picked up the phone to him.

Q386 Damian Collins: I just want to ask a couple more questions. Yesterday, the IAAF ethics commission published the advice that they gave to you regarding your business interests. Do you think, given the advice that they gave, which was not to participate in any decisions by any organ of the IAAF or any action of the IAAF involving, let’s say, Nike, for example, but any of your business interests, and not to seek—

Lord Coe: Nike is not a sponsor of IAAF.

Damian Collins: No, I know, but in the letter I think it is in the context of the organisations with which you had an outside interest, of which Nike was one, and that you should not seek to influence in any way, direct or indirect, any such decisions or action. Do you think, based on that guideline, that you should have not voted in the meeting to give Eugene the World Athletics Championships?

Lord Coe: No. I was one of 25 voting members of the council. I sought clarification around my involvement with Nike when I took the chair of the evaluation commission. I was entirely comfortable that I was entitled to vote for that.

Q387 Damian Collins: But based on this new guidance that has been given, I think people would look at that and say, “Well, there was a company in which you had an interest and that had an interest in Eugene getting the bid in this unusual way”. Perhaps it would have been proper to absent yourself or maybe take advice from the ethics commission before that vote to say, “Is it proper that I should take part in this process?”

Lord Coe: It was not a vote between two cities.

Damian Collins: No, I know that.

Lord Coe: It was endorsement of a decision that the council had to make about whether to seize the opportunity to take the games at that stage to a country that we needed to be in. There was no bidding process at that moment. Did we decide, for strategic reasons—and I still think they were the right decisions—to advance that because of the circumstances around the funding arrangements, the guarantees and the support that we were getting from NBC, who had never agreed in the past to come to the table in that way, and to take athletics into the world’s largest sporting market? That was the decision that my council made.

Q388 Damian Collins: But to be clear, just a one-word answer on this, you did not seek advice before that meeting from the ethics commission or from the president about whether, given your relationship with Nike, it was appropriate for you to vote?

Lord Coe: No, because the ethics committee had clearly taken a view that my relationship with Nike, properly accounted for and properly disclosed, was in a right and proper structure.

Q389 Damian Collins: You spoke earlier about coaches and the role of coaching. There were allegations made earlier in the year about Alberto Salazar, who you know well, and you spoke about his character and your friendship with him after those allegations were made. Did you take any advice before making a comment after that “Panorama” programme was broadcast?

Lord Coe: No. My observations were very clear, and let us be clear about what I said. I said the relationship between a coach and an athlete—and believe me, I probably understand more about that than most—is a very close bond and it is predicated entirely on trust. I said at the time, “If there are issues, if there are questions to be asked, the athlete will need to ask them of the coach. If the coach satisfies the athlete with the answers that he gives, then that relationship should continue”. That is all I said. I was asked was I a friend of Alberto Salazar. The answer was, yes, I have known him since 1981.

Q390 Damian Collins: Before you made those comments, did you discuss the allegations against Alberto Salazar with anyone at Nike?

Lord Coe: No.

Q391 Damian Collins: Then just finally—thank you for your patience or tolerance—one of the allegations made against Kenyan athletics earlier in the week was that the president of Kenyan athletics has been accused of accepting a gift or apparent gift of two motor vehicles from the Qatar Association of Athletics Federation during a period when they were bidding for the world championship to go to Doha. Is that a matter that will be investigated fully by the IAAF?

Lord Coe: It is a matter that I understand is now being investigated—and it has been confirmed to me—by the IAAF’s ethics committee and of course is the subject of a criminal investigation in Kenya.

Q392 Damian Collins: Yes. Will the IAAF’s investigation into that be made public, as long as it does not conflict with the criminal investigation?

Lord Coe: The IAAF’s ethics committee is independent. They have confirmed that they are investigating that and I am sure that the committee will make their findings public at the right moment.

Q393 Damian Collins: They have the power to publish themselves then?

Lord Coe: No, not yet. I do not know how long they have been investigating, but they have confirmed publicly—

Q394 Damian Collins: I just want to check we are not going to have another kind of “Garcia Report” scenario. It feels slightly FIFA-esque, with investigations that are not published afterwards. There will be a proper investigation and the findings will be made public about that?

Lord Coe: Yes.

Q395 Chair: Thank you. I want to finish up by 5 pm if we possibly can, Lord Coe. I am very grateful for the time you have taken. Just a couple of quick supplementaries to that line of questioning. I take it there can be no doubt that Nike had an interest in the Eugene bid, because they were expressing interest in it too; they were expressing interest in the Gothenburg bid; they were talking to you about what was required for Eugene to win. Is that right?

Lord Coe: Again, this is a really important point. I was asked a very specific question in a wide-ranging discussion with Craig Masback and the question I was asked was my view about the bidding process. At that point, I had every reason to believe that this would go full term and that is exactly what I said to Gothenburg.

Q396 Chair: Sure, but they were not asking about Gothenburg. They had an interest in Eugene and it is not surprising that—

Lord Coe: No, but Nike were not uniquely asking that question. This was a question that was being asked widely across the whole of the sport.

Q397 Chair: Eugene is, what, 100 miles away from Nike's headquarters, so you could see why they might potentially have an interest in that, right?

Lord Coe: Adidas also has its United States headquarters in the same town.

Q398 Chair: But no one thinks of Adidas as being run by the United States business, do they? It is not a US business.

Lord Coe: I am not sure Adidas would agree with that suggestion.

Q399 Chair: Maybe not. Let us come on to another question on this. Given the public concern about this issue and the process of the awarding of not the bid but the unique right to host to Eugene and the strength of the integrity processes that you set up, would you be happy to refer that to your new integrity group or board at the IAAF so they could look into it?

Lord Coe: If there is any evidence at all that this went beyond a simple strategic decision, then of course I will review it.

Q400 Chair: You cannot be the person who assesses the evidence. You have a view on the evidence; you are a party to this dispute. The question is do you refer it to them to investigate and have a look and then—

Lord Coe: No. In the reviews that are taking place, if there is any evidence at all, whether in the criminal allegations, whether they are uncovered in whatever vehicle there is, if there is any suggestion that that decision was made for any other reason than good strategic, sound judgment then, yes, of course I would—

Chair: You would invite them to. That is very helpful.

Lord Coe: Of course I would, yes.

Q401 Chris Matheson: I will be brief. Lord Coe, this is all well and good, but the truth is I had never heard of Eugene, Oregon before this whole process started. That is not because I have a deficient geographical knowledge; it is because it is a small city of 160,000 people. Chester, which I represent, and Ellesmere Port, has a fairly similar population. What are the chances that we are going to get the World Athletics Championships?

Lord Coe: You can try.

Chris Matheson: We will try our best, but the fact is the only reason that Eugene, Oregon was in the game at all the first time around, let alone the second time around, is because of these large corporate sporting interests pushing it.

Lord Coe: No, no, no.

Chris Matheson: Hang on a minute. I am told it does not even have a proper international airport. That may or may not be the case. Surely the only reason it is there is because Nike, and apparently now Adidas, are saying they want it in Eugene, Oregon. It simply was not a credible city, was it?

Lord Coe: Before Nike became a big player in that area, Eugene had a rich history of track and field. It is known as Track Town USA. Steve Prefontaine broke world records there. Their coaches are people like Bill Bowerman, Tom Dillinger. It has a rich history. Yes, it is a small town. Yes, it does not have an international airport.

Q402 Chris Matheson: Sorry to interrupt, Lord Coe, but it is not a credible host for a world championships.

Lord Coe: Yes, it is.

Chris Matheson: I can remember when Manchester bid for the Olympics. I accept that the Olympics might be on a different scale, but nevertheless the World Athletics Championships is still a major undertaking. Manchester was told, after having failed twice, that only London could get away with a winning bid in the UK, because Manchester did not have the credibility. Yet for the World Athletics Championships, Eugene, with a population of 160,000, is somehow considered credible. It is not credible, is it?

Lord Coe: It is credible, and that is the conclusion that I drew when I did the evaluation report. With all due respect, you are rather comparing apples with pears here. I am not trying to remotely dismiss the complexity of the arrangements you need to have in place for a track and field event.

Chris Matheson: If anybody is going to dismiss it, it will be a dismissal from you, Lord Coe.

Lord Coe: But I am afraid that falls into the foothills of the complexity of delivering an Olympic Games. We give a city five years to deliver one world championship. The International Olympic Committee gave London seven years to deliver 26 simultaneous world championships. I am not remotely dismissing the project management around the delivery of a World Athletics Championships, but Eugene was a perfectly credible city to stage a World Athletics Championships and, frankly, with more athletics tradition than most other cities.

Chair: That is very helpful, thank you.

Q403 Paul Farrelly: I want to come back, because there is an important point that has not been covered with regard to your other commercial interests in respect of what the ethics commission has said. But first of all, just to pursue my colleague Damian's point, on Monday the ethics commission made a statement saying, among other things, there was a prima facie case that the president of Athletics Kenya had received two motor vehicles from Qatar Athletics at the time it was bidding for 2019. We have clearly had all this stuff that *The Sunday Times* has faithfully investigated over FIFA and Qatar. We have previously had allegations, denied, but only through the IAAF, not in person, that young Papa Diack was requesting \$5 million to support Qatar's previous bid for the World Athletics Championships. The question is not whether the ethics commission is just looking at Kenya and Qatar, but what you, as the president of

the IAAF, are going to do to make sure that Qatar's bid was clean and free from bribery, corruption, improper inducements, and does not become, for you—with further revelations—a World Cup embarrassment, as with FIFA.

Lord Coe: That is why the ethics committee has confirmed that it is going to investigate the issues surrounding the Kenyan Track and Field Federation.

Q404 Paul Farrelly: No, this is about the Qatar bid.

Lord Coe: No, but these are allegations that have been made about the conduct of officials in the Kenyan Track and Field Federation and they are now the subject of criminal investigation. I do not think I can add a great deal more to that.

Q405 Paul Farrelly: But if there is a prima facie case the Qatari Athletics Authority has been providing two vehicles to one member of your board and council, then that is Kenya, but there is clearly a case, given the other allegations previously, for the IAAF to investigate and ask other council members and people in authority, "Have any further inducements been offered or provided by the Qatari Athletics Authority or any Qatari company?" to make sure that that bid was clean.

Lord Coe: Yes. First, the official who is under suspicion, where the allegations were made, is not a council member any more. He was, but he is not now.

Q406 Paul Farrelly: Not any more?

Lord Coe: No, he did not stand. No, I do not think he did, Anyway, I can't remember, but he is not a member any more. The issue that has been raised around Kenya and the allegations, as I said—and I do keep repeating this—are the subject of criminal investigations.

Q407 Paul Farrelly: Let us forget Kenya. How do you know the Qatari bid was clean?

Lord Coe: I am sorry, the issue is around Kenya. The allegations have been made and it surrounds a Kenyan official. They are the subject of police investigation. The police will look at that.

Paul Farrelly: How do you know the Qatar bid was clean?

Lord Coe: The IAAF, the ethics commission is looking at those circumstances. They are looking at that.

Paul Farrelly: How do you know the whole Qatari bid was clean?

Lord Coe: I do not, but this is the—

Q408 Paul Farrelly: Will you investigate?

Lord Coe: The situation is very clear. The ethics committee will look at those investigations.

Q409 Paul Farrelly: That is a no, you will not investigate whether the whole of the Qatari bid was clean?

Lord Coe: Within our own corporate governance and within our structures, there will be a—

Q410 Paul Farrelly: So we will leave you to go away and ponder it then?

Lord Coe: We are reviewing everything, but I do make the point this is a criminal investigation.

Chair: Move on, sorry, Paul.

Q411 Paul Farrelly: We will leave you to go away and ponder it. It is a very simple question.

Let us just return to the ethics committee, which thought it was entirely appropriate for a treasurer subject to a serious allegation to present the financial reports of the recent games in Beijing. Yesterday, ahead of this meeting, the ethics committee published a letter from Michael Beloff saying that you had sought advice from him. When was this advice sought?

Lord Coe: First of all, we talked about the structures going forward, within days of having become president, and the advice was sought. I do not know, my team sought that advice relatively recently, I think.

Q412 Paul Farrelly: It was not simply for this Committee?

Lord Coe: No, it was not. It was part of the reform process that I have discussed and the need to make sure that my corporate governances and the things I am going to ask all my other council colleagues to adhere to were in the right and safe structure, as I have always done throughout the duration of my IAAF council membership and vice-presidency, have always sought since the inception of the ethics committee.

I do also make the point that when there was no onus on me to do that, I was also declaring those interests publicly, and even when I became chair of the London Olympic bid, without these corporate governances, I referred myself to the Cabinet Office. So I have been pretty assiduous in the way that these have been captured.

Q413 Paul Farrelly: I want to get us through this quickly.

Chair: Final question.

Paul Farrelly: The advice here says, "In order to comply with IAAF Code of Ethics concerned with conflicts of interests, during his presidency Lord Coe may retain his present disclosed positions in Nike, CSM, Chime and CLG on the following conditions: he won't participate in any decisions made by any organ of the IAAF or any action of the IAAF involving such organisations; he

will not seek to influence in any way, direct or indirect, any such decisions or action." Let us put Nike to one side.

With regard to your other commercial activities, for which you are handsomely paid and you stand to make some more money following the sale of your company to Chime, that advice to you captures only an instance where the IAAF may seek to employ your sports marketing agency itself, but it does not capture an instance where your commercial activities may have clients that are involved in athletics—such, as it has been reported, Azerbaijan with their recent European games—and therefore conflicts of interest that might arise in that way. So this advice is pretty useless in capturing the rest of your commercial activities, and any impression, whatever safeguards you may put in place, of a conflict of interest arising.

Lord Coe: I do not think the advice is useless, but that is something you might want to take up with Michael Beloff. There are the systems and the structures—

Paul Farrelly: It is a chocolate fireguard.

Lord Coe: No, the systems and structures that I have in place are very clear and they are robust. The issue you specifically raised around Nike was, before I had even got the corporate governances in place that I want, I was offering up the very clear indication that Nike would not challenge or bid for business directly or indirectly with the IOC or with any cities that it is working with. This is a world that I have lived in, that is well-structured and that is advice that is good. But I chose not to maintain my relationship with Nike because I did not want it to become a distraction. So there are all sorts of judgments that you make. That is the transparency of the advice that I have been given by the ethics committee.

Q414 Chair: We have given this a good going over and I do want to wind up. Thank you for that. One question following from that, which is that normally in positions of public authority people are encouraged to disclose shareholdings that might create a conflict of interest. Is that something that would be appropriate in your case, do you think?

Lord Coe: I think you will find on the House of Lords website pretty much everything that I do is disclosed.

Q415 Chair: Good. So you are comfortable that that covers it over and above anything Mr Beloff will be doing for—

Lord Coe: I have my House of Lords registry in there. I do not think that I could possibly have been more transparent in what I do. The very fact that you are able to ask these questions— this has not been huge investigative journalism, this has been working their way through a House of Lords website.

Q416 Chair: That is helpful, thank you. Tell me one final thing, which is in a press release of 16 August of this year, the IAAF said that it had never vetoed publication of the report by the University of Tübingen. Does that mean that you have now lifted the embargo on the report and therefore they can publish it in the scientific journal?

Lord Coe: No, we never stopped the University of Tübingen. WADA sought agreement with the IAAF in terms of developing its understanding about the prevalence of blood doping and access to athletes through a questionnaire in the 2011 world championships. The IAAF were unaware of a secondary relationship that WADA had entered into with the University of Tübingen. The University of Tübingen then sought to publish their report, the research report. They were turned down by a number of scientific journals. I think the latest leak is on your own website.

Q417 Chair: But just to be clear, there is no reason from an IAAF standpoint why this has been embargoed?

Lord Coe: No, no.

Q418 Chair: You are perfectly happy for them to try to publish it?

Lord Coe: The issue for us was a very simple one. It was about the effectiveness of the methodology, the conclusions that they were drawing from a questionnaire, but at no time had we ever sought to stop this report being published. It would have been very difficult to have stopped it. We were unaware until the University of Tübingen were floating it around scientific journals and being turned down.

Q419 Chair: So they can go ahead and submit it to other scientific journals for the purposes of scientific assessment and verification? Is that a yes or a no?

Lord Coe: I think the answer is a very simple it is already out there, it is on your website.

Q420 Chair: No, but there is a separate process. It will not be accepted for scientific assessment by the journals unless there is no ambiguity about the permission from IAAF or WADA to support it. I just want to be clear.

Lord Coe: I think you will find it was turned down by a number of scientific journals on the grounds that they were not sure about the nature of the report. No, I think that this was—

Q421 Chair: Lord Coe, the authors will take their choice and their chance with the different journals. What they need from you is official authorisation now that they can publish and seek to publish within these journals. I want you to say—if you are planning to say that—that you are perfectly comfortable with that.

Lord Coe: It is out there.

Chair: Is that a yes?

Lord Coe: No, it is out there.

Chair: Sorry, no, I need a yes. I am sorry, it is actually rather important.

Lord Coe: No, no, we question—

Chair: Okay. In that case it is a no and you are withholding.

Lord Coe: No, absolutely we are not suspending that. We never have done. We were unaware that this report was being touted around in the first place.

Q422 Chair: Right, but the point is not registering any objection to their trying to get published in a scientific journal.

Lord Coe: No, we are still checking, and as long as the methodology that they have used is appropriate and the conclusions they have drawn are on a scientific basis then, yes, but we are still—

Q423 Chair: It has six reputable scientific authors, it has been waiting for four years. You have had three or four years to check it. How can there possibly be any checking required?

Lord Coe: It is out there.

Chair: No, no, no. That is not—

Lord Coe: No, no, it is out there.

Q424 Chair: Unless it is given your permission to publish, they cannot.

Lord Coe: No, we need to be clear that any information that is given—

Q425 Chair: So you are withholding is what is actually happening, is it not?

Lord Coe: No, we are not withholding the information.

Q426 Chair: In which case, are you allowing it to be published?

Lord Coe: If we are satisfied that the right methodologies have been adopted and the conclusions that are drawn and we are not imperilling the reputation of clean athletes—

Q427 Chair: Can you give us a date by which there will be some clear—you have had it for three years. What is the date?

Lord Coe: No, I am just asking.

Thomas Capdevielle: Please, we recently had a direct contact with the research team, which was not the case before, as my president observed, and

there was an exchange already. We sought independent advice from social science specialists as to the methodology they had used. This is a process that is ongoing and to date, as we speak, we do not even have the underlying data of this study. It is difficult for us to give you a yes or a no.

Q428 Chair: Mr Capdevielle, this is not a study that involved IAAF at all, as we know from what Lord Coe has said.

Lord Coe: No, it does, because we gave access to the athletes at the World Athletics Championships in 2011, so it is data that has been secured through our sport. I think we have the right to be sure that that data has been appropriately gathered, that the conclusions are drawn along scientific lines and the methodology is pristine. I do not think that is an unreasonable thing to ask. We have not yet been given the underlying data.

Q429 Chair: What is the date by which you will be able to clear this report or not?

Thomas Capdevielle: This I do not know. I told you there was an exchange ongoing, there were questions asked, there are answers, but to date we do not have the underlying data supporting this study. If you are suggesting that the IAAF would not welcome any study on the prevalence of doping in sport, I repeat that to date we are the only international federation, the only sports organisation that has accepted conducting—and has conducted itself—four years ago a prevalence study and published this.

Lord Coe: We have published that study.

Q430 Chair: WADA reported to us that they would have published this, except that you had prevented it from being published.

Thomas Capdevielle: It was published eight times. It was already published eight times and it was only recently—

Q431 Chair: Published in a scientific journal is what they want to be able to do, for the reasons that Lord Coe said at the very beginning, which is the process of supporting scientific research into this area of athletics, but it has not been published in a scientific journal.

Thomas Capdevielle: It has not been published and it is only recently that we were in direct contact—it was not the case before—with this research team and we are engaging in a discussion with them.

Chair: I am afraid we have to leave it there. I must say it has been a very helpful session, but I find that last part extremely unsatisfactory. I hope you will come back to us very soon with a clear suggestion as to when you are going to be able to clear this document, because it is in the public interest that it should be properly scientifically assessed. It is more in the public interest that it should be scientifically assessed than that it should be released under parliamentary privilege, which is what we were forced to do at the last hearing.

That said, we have kept you for almost three hours. We are extremely grateful to you for the time you have taken, Lord Coe, and we are very grateful to you, Mr Capdevielle, and unless there is any final—no, I think we have had a good go around. I am not going to do that. Thank you very much indeed.

