

**From:** Hein Verbruggen [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** vrijdag 2 mei 2014 2:28  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: CIRC

Dear CIRC-Members,

Thank you for your answer of April 16 last on my query on the possible CIRC's investigation on WADA/USADA's role.

I am aware of the fact that, based upon paragraph 3 of the ToR, the CIRC can conduct a wide ranging investigation and as such has the possibility to investigate in various fields and areas. But this does not automatically mean that the CIRC will indeed investigate the particular questions/matters I raised in relation to WADA/USADA. In other words, a simple reference to paragraph 3 does not guarantee that the CIRC will seek answers on the questions that I wish to see answered.

To my great regret I cannot read in your answer the confirmation that I was asking for and I presume that this has to be interpreted as that the CIRC does NOT have the intention to investigate the roles of WADA/USADA. In this respect I refer to my March 10th-letter in which I stated: ".....WADA has a keen interest in seeing to it and making sure that the CIRC will NOT investigate WADA/USADA's roles in the Armstrong-saga..." As it looks now, WADA seems to be successful which is in itself a confirmation that my doubts are justified (see my April 4th-mail) as to the CIRC's independence and freedom of action.

So I would appreciate a clear confirmation from your side that WADA/USADA's roles will be investigated. I have obviously no intention to collaborate into a witch hunt on my person that is co-initiated by those with a clear interest to stay out of the picture. In this case I would insist on a preliminary meeting between us in which we first exchange our mutual views on the CIRC's definition of "paragraph 3 of the ToR". After that each of us will then have to determine for himself if further meetings make sense.

Sincerely,

Hein Verbruggen

cc. . IOC-Ethics Commission