

From: **Hein Verbruggen** <[hein1941@gmail.com](mailto:hein1941@gmail.com)>

Date: 13 November 2013 23:44

Subject: IC

To: "[brian.cookson@binternet.com](mailto:brian.cookson@binternet.com)" <[brian.cookson@binternet.com](mailto:brian.cookson@binternet.com)>

Cc: "Mr. Ray GODKIN" <[ray.godkin@cyclimg.org.au](mailto:ray.godkin@cyclimg.org.au)>, Pâquerette Girard Zappelli <[paquerette.girard\\_zappelli@olympic.org](mailto:paquerette.girard_zappelli@olympic.org)>

Dear Mr. President, dear Brian,

An important and recurrent theme of your campaign has been an investigation into past "wrongdoings" within the UCI. By linking this regularly with "possible corruption" it is clear that the investigation you want to take place is of great importance and will likely extend beyond the area of doping/anti-doping alone.

The undersigned, having been honored with the "Honorary"- title by the UCI-Congress, and having had important responsibilities within the UCI during the last 20 years, do obviously feel directly addressed. We do not hide to have rather uncomfortable feelings by being suspected of "wrongdoings" on the basis of allegations and accusations by journalists and book authors while till the date of today, not even the slightest proof of any "wrongdoing" has been delivered. Allow us to mention that also in the USADA Reasoned Decision, there are no concrete mentions of any "wrongdoings".

It is however your and the MB's right to organize investigations by an independent commission (IC) and we will of course welcome all initiatives that can help to establish the truth. We are obviously convinced that no "wrongdoings" were done in the period of our leadership; we feel strongly about the level of transparency and integrity during "our" period, both in the field of the overall management as well as in the area of anti-doping. This feeling we do not only have about ourselves, but certainly also about other colleagues with important responsibilities, both administrators (as the late messrs. Goehner and Donicke; mr.Schattenberg other MB-Members), as well as Staff Members and Messrs. Strebel, Verbiest and many others.

As a conclusion, we are in principle prepared to offer our full cooperation to an IC. But you will appreciate that we first want to make sure what exactly will be the mission and tasks of such an IC.

This letter is meant to give you and your MB an opportunity to be very precise on the composition of the IC, its mission and its tasks. Your answers will, obviously, be carefully studied and evaluated by us, determining to a large extent our eventual cooperation.

As to the composition of the IC, its Members should be totally independent. In this respect we express our worry about the fact that, according to your declarations, you seem to seek a close cooperation with WADA when it comes to nominating IC-Members. Given the very negative attitude of major WADA-administrators towards the UCI and cycling in the past and the fact that WADA has an interest in that its own role is not examined, we fail to see how the required independence of the IC can be

guaranteed if there is any involvement of WADA in the IC-Member nomination process. In fact the nominations should best be made by a person or body that is totally independent not only from WADA but also and in the first place from the UCI (as well as from any other person or body possibly to be subject of the investigation). Indeed this applies in particular to the UCI at this moment, as the issue of the IC was part of your political campaign against those who you intend to be subject of the investigation. We would like to read you on this.

It will be important to learn about the mission of the IC. When you speak about "wrongdoings", it is our interpretation that this goes beyond the area of anti-doping and that also the overall managing of our Federation would be under scrutiny. Needless to say that given our confidence in the positive outcome expressed already here above, we would encourage you to give a wider scope to the IC's mission.

This would allow to have another issue in all its details thoroughly analyzed, namely the funds that were received in the nineties from the Japanese Keirin Association for the global promotion of track cycling and Keirin in particular. Indeed, this is a theme that keeps on coming back, especially -and as usual we dare to say - in the British press. It should be investigated if the allegations of "wrongdoings" also in this case are justified. The undersigned were all holding responsible positions within the UCI at that time and we feel that we should use the IC to have the exact records established. Again, we are very confident in the outcome.

The next issue will be the period over which the IC will have to judge. You have clearly spoken about the "past", meaning the period before you were elected on September 27 (also the fact that you ordered the seizure of all computer information before the date of your election indicates your intention to ask the IC to investigate the period till September 27 last). Here also, we would indeed be very much in favor of an investigation till September 27, 2013. An additional advantage will be that this allows the IC to look also into allegations about irregularities during the last electoral campaign. We are sure that, given the fact that you were a candidate, you will see your interest that these allegations will prove wrong.

Another important issue for the IC would be to establish the scope of responsibilities for each statutory stakeholder. In the case of any "wrongdoing", it should be the IC's mission to establish the exact responsibility for the "wrongdoing". Let us give an example here. If one of the conclusions would be that the UCI's anti-doping efforts have been insufficient, would this be the responsibility of the UCI's AD-commission, of the UCI's MB or of the UCI-congress (and thus the NF's) if the latter would have accepted the applied AD-strategy and budgets without any serious proposal for amendments during many, many years?

When it comes to the area of AD, we would like to stress that the investigation should not be restricted to the Armstrong-case. It will be of paramount importance for the UCI's past and current image, that for once and for all it will be determined if indeed UCI's AD-strategy and its execution were second to none. There has been too much biased criticism, especially from WADA-side, on the UCI's AD-activities whereas insiders know very well that no other IF, nor NADO (including USADA!) had or has an equally strong AD-program, let alone a better one. This was confirmed last year by Mr. David Howman to one of the undersigned, but we strongly believe that the IC

should confirm this also by giving WADA, USADA and others the opportunity to come up with proofs for their criticism and this can only be done by means of a quantitative and qualitative comparison between the UCI and other AD-controlling bodies.

Other doping/AD-issues that should also be dealt with by the IC are:

- in the first place the role of Messrs. Armstrong and Bruyneel with respect to the stories about positive tests by Armstrong and the bribery that would have taken place. There exist indeed strong indications (affidavits under oath from riders) that both Armstrong and Bruyneel have told that Armstrong tested positive in 2001 and that bribes had been paid to make this positive test go away. It is however clear for everyone now that it was not a positive but a suspicious tests and that no bribe has been paid. We are of the opinion that these false statements by Armstrong and Bruyneel, serving apparently only to incite team mates to use doping, are at the basis of much of the accusations against the UCI. We express hope that the IC will shed light on the (cynical, if true) behavior of both men;
- the role of USADA. In particular, is it normal that a NADO investigates into a number of major doping cases within a sport without any serious contact at all, let alone collaborating with the relevant IF?
- the role of USA Cycling. Is it normal that a NF does not first of all inform its governing IF when they are aware of serious doping issues in their country? This has to be seen separate from the fact that USA Cycling has delegated anti-doping to USADA;
- the role of WADA in the case of the reanalysis in 2004-2005 of the 1998 and 1999 Tour de France samples where WADA clearly violated its own rules. WADA has always refused to provide the information on the subject or to conduct an internal investigation. The examination of WADA's role is the more important as the Paris Lab and WADA (taking the Lab's refusal as an excuse) refused to participate in a mediation process by CAS as initiated by the IOC (!) in 2006 in order to find out what happened exactly between the Lab and WADA when reanalyzing the samples;
- the role of WADA and USADA after they started to have serious doubts about the use of doping products by Armstrong and his team mates. We believe that it should be clarified why both AD-bodies did not increase their level of testing. WADA carried out 3 (!) tests in total during the period 2002-2010 on Lance Armstrong and USADA carried out 12 tests during 5 years (2001-2005) and ZERO tests during the two months before Armstrong's return in 2009. Obviously the IC should compare this with the number of tests carried out by the UCI during the same periods! This point is of great importance for the UCI's image since it looks straightforwardly bizarre that it is precisely the UCI (with a great numbers of tests) that is blamed for "complicity" when other ADO's didn't even bother to test adequately.

Since this IC-investigation played such an important role in your campaign, Mr. President, we are sure that all the elements and questions we have mentioned in this letter, have already been thoroughly thought through and considered by yourself and your MB. As such, we would feel obliged with speedy and detailed answers.

We propose to keep this letter confidential for the time being with only a copy for the IOC-President. We are not interested in raising and causing public discussions. We have only constructive intentions in the interest of the sport of cycling and its governing body, the UCI, to which we all have been very dedicated during long periods.

Sincerely,

Ray Godkin (Honorary Vice-President).  
(Honorary President)

Hein Verbruggen

PS. You will appreciate that we have copied both the IOC and the UCI's Ethics Commissions.