



The Pat McQuaid File

Why Cycling Ireland Members should
reject his nomination for UCI President

31 May 2013

Statement Regarding Cycling Ireland's EGM of 15th June 2013:

Concerning the nomination of Mr. Pat McQuaid for election as President of the UCI for a third term, five Cycling Ireland members release their rationale for a No vote.

31 May 2013

We are five cyclists embedded in the Irish cycling scene with a deep passion for the sport. Our strong commitment to cycling has been expressed over decades through various means. Our frustration with those at the top of the UCI led us to each other. We first united to persuade the Board of Cycling Ireland (CI) to put the nomination of Pat McQuaid for a third term as UCI President to the members of CI at an EGM, which Cycling Ireland respectfully agreed to. On the 15th of June, Cycling Ireland Club Delegates will have the opportunity to vote on whether the Irish cycling federation should endorse Pat McQuaid's nomination for President in the upcoming UCI elections.

Having succeeded with our initial objective, we felt obliged to state arguments against Pat McQuaid's nomination. The document that follows outlines why we believe members should vote No at the Cycling Ireland EGM.

Pat McQuaid has been on the UCI Management Committee since 1998. He was elected President of the world governing body in 2005. Over the course of his two terms as President, we believe there have been huge issues with regards to Governance and Doping in cycling. In addition, it is our opinion that the UCI has engaged in mission creep regarding the Globalisation of the sport.

We believe the conflict of interest between anti-doping and promotion of the sport has never been addressed. Anti-doping measures appear to be introduced on the back of yet another crisis. We find it regrettable that the UCI comes across as reactionary, not pro-active in the fight against doping. We think that the UCI's anti-doping efforts have been too narrowly focused on riders as opposed to managers, teams and doctors. What's more, it is our belief that the UCI is reluctant to pursue global stars who become the key asset in its globalisation strategy. It is our view that this sends a bad message to young cyclists considering whether to dope or not. The UCI's actions have resulted in short term commercial gains, however, these gains appear quickly lost in the destructive aftermath of doping scandals. We believe the UCI's public feuding with Anti-Doping agencies such as WADA and USADA cast it in a terrible light. The UCI appears to lack leadership. Without strong leadership we feel there is little opportunity for the sport to progress.

These issues are not as long in the past as Pat McQuaid would have us believe. In the last five years we have seen the UCI provide Contador with the reason for his positive test, provide exemptions on testing periods for Lance Armstrong, sue people who speak out for the sport and fight unsuccessfully to obtain jurisdiction of USADA's investigation into the US Postal Team. Added to this, is the failure in our view of the much trumpeted Biological Passport to spot any erroneous blood values on Armstrong's return - despite the USADA report claiming that there was a one-in-a-million chance his values were

natural. In 2013, one can't help but ask the obvious question, how many other riders have sailed through the UCI's anti-doping net?

For all the apparent failures contained herein there appears to be no accountability for those at the top of the UCI. Any UCI reviews have been heavily criticised publicly for narrow terms of reference and for lack of independence. The UCI's promised review into issues raised by the USADA Reasoned Decision report has still not happened although seven months have now lapsed. We believe that extending Pat McQuaid's tenure as President will only lead to a continuance of policies of the past. We expect this to result in more of the same – an unaccountable President who seems unable to provide the sport with the credibility we believe it sorely lacks.

We would love to have an Irishman as President of the UCI that makes us proud. Unfortunately, Pat McQuaid does not, although he has had every opportunity over the last eight years as President to impress us. Pat McQuaid's clumsy communication and his confrontational style seem to bring the sport and the UCI into disrepute repeatedly. We believe Pat McQuaid's own actions have increased the public's cynicism of cycling. We feel it is McQuaid's own fault that he is seen to be part of the problem, not part of the solution. In our opinion Pat McQuaid's Presidency has long ago become untenable.

Cycling Ireland's EGM provides Irish cyclists with the opportunity to state any dissatisfaction they may have with Pat McQuaid's political style, a style that is outdated in our view. It is time for Pat McQuaid to be held accountable for his record as President of the UCI. We believe his record is poor and that voting No in the Cycling Ireland EGM is the only way to move the sport of cycling forward and to break with the past.

We appreciate your consideration of our arguments that follow.

Yours in Cycling.

Anthony Moran

UCI Code: IRL 19651019 Email: anto.moran@gmail.com

Dr. Conor McGrane

UCI Code: IRL19701214 Email: conormcgrane@eircom.net

Paul Atkinson

UCI Code: GBR19601020 Email: oneunited@btinternet.com

Mark Gill

UCI Code: IRL19770711 Email: mark@thebionicdude.com

Dr. Cillian Kelly

UCI Code: IRL19841025 Email: mail@irishpeloton.com

Contents

Executive Summary	5
Governance	8
General Concerns regarding the UCI's overall responsibilities	8
Concerns Specific to Pat McQuaid throughout his tenure	8
Jurisdictional Battle with USADA	9
Abandonment of Independent Commission	10
Treatment of Whistleblowers	10
UCI's Involvement in Star Riders' Doping Affairs	14
Anti-Doping and the Biological Passport	17
Failure to Lead	17
A Reactionary Response - The Bio-Passport in Context	18
Bernard Kohl Revelations	19
Michael Ashenden's Frustrations	19
Failure to Flag Lance Armstrong	20
Anti-Doping Agencies Remain Critical of the UCI's Efforts	21
Pat McQuaid Denies Failures and Pleads Ignorance	22
Globalisation and Cycling's Boom	24
Globalisation	24
Apparent Abuse of Power	26
Promotion vs Regulation	26
Market Grab	27
Putting the Cart Before the Horse	27
Damaging the Brand	28
Dearth of Sponsors	28
Faulty Development Strategy	29
GCP - Distracting and Costly	29
Conclusions	31

Executive Summary

Governance

It is our view that professional road cycling and the UCI as an institution have lost credibility. People who run a sport should accept some responsibility for what happens under their watch. In the case of cycling the buck stops firmly at the door of the UCI. Pat McQuaid has held senior positions within the UCI for the past 15 years – the last eight of them as its President. This period represents a nadir for the sport with a constant stream of doping scandals.

We believe the UCI has lost the confidence of the sport's stakeholders. These include riders, teams, sponsors, TV companies and fans throughout the world.

Pat McQuaid seems to be constantly surrounded by controversy. It is our view that his clumsy discourse and poorly thought through actions are inappropriate for the leader of a global sport. Pat McQuaid himself has admitted that the sport has lost credibility under his watch.

The UCI appeared to meddle in the 2010 clenbuterol positive of Alberto Contador. In our view this straightforward doping case dragged the UCI through the mud in public for months. Ultimately CAS, not the UCI, had to bring the sorry saga to its conclusion.

The UCI also involved itself in the affairs of Lance Armstrong. It accepted a back-dated prescription for a corticosteroid positive during the 1999 Tour de France, it took no interest in the mounting evidence that Lance Armstrong had doped, it allowed him to return to competition following his retirement before the necessary six months had lapsed and it attempted to wrest control of the USADA case just when it seemed the truth about Lance Armstrong might come out. So desperate did the UCI actions seem, that Travis Tygart stated:

"At every turn, the UCI attempted to obstruct our efforts to reveal the truth,"¹

Anti-doping efforts and the blood passport

It is our belief that the UCI has not prioritised Anti-Doping enough. The introduction of new testing protocols represents only part of the picture. It is our belief that the apparent new era is as a result of leadership from teams and sponsors. We do not believe that the UCI is responsible for any cultural shift within the sport because it is not obvious to us that such a shift has happened at the top of the UCI.

There remain questions over the much trumpeted biological passport with delays in its introduction, a rider explaining how it is helpful to dopers, a lack of funding which resulted in reduced testing (the UCI seemed to be able to tap the World Tour Solidarity and Reserve Fund at the time to soft-fund its loss-making races in China). Anti-doping and Blood Passport expert Dr. Michael Ashenden has also voiced his frustration with the UCI after it sought to gag Biological Passport panel members for eight years. It also appears that it failed to catch Armstrong after his return to competition. The chances of

¹ http://espn.go.com/sports/endurance/story/_/id/8898476/travis-tygart-usada-chief-says-uci-obstructed-lance-armstrong-probe

his blood samples being negative for doping were, according to testimony in the USADA report, *'one-in-a-million'*.

Under Pat McQuaid's tenure as President there have been **148 positive tests or doping violations** incurred by professional cyclists during this period. It is worth naming some of the high-profile cases during the course of his Presidency: Roberto Heras, Operacion Puerto, Patrick Sinkewitz, Floyd Landis, Alexandre Vinoukourov, Andrei Kashechkin, Riccardo Ricco, Michael Rasmussen, Bernard Kohl, Stefan Schumacher, Stefan Matschiner, Alberto Contador, The Freiburg Report, The Mantova Investigation, The Oil for Drugs Raids, Lance Armstrong and Team US Postal, Danilo Di Luca.

To this day Pat McQuaid fails to accept that he could have done anything with regards to catching Lance Armstrong. He continues to plead ignorance, incredibly in our view. On 29 May 2013 he stated:

*"I was fooled. I believed there was no way a man so close to death would go and start putting stuff into his body that could be dangerous" and "my experiences as a cyclist convinced me he was real."*²

Globalisation and Cycling's Boom

Discourse concerning the globalisation of professional cycling primarily emanates from Pat McQuaid. Race promotion is his background, it is no surprise he sees cycling through this lens. It is our view that his approach to globalisation is wrong and that it results in conflicts of interest.

There is no doubt that Lance Armstrong was good for business in the short term. However, the UCI's endorsement of Lance-mania badly backfired. We believe Pat McQuaid should not have favoured any rider as the risks to the UCI's reputation are too great should this rider receive a sanction. In our opinion such scandals have cost the sport many fans and have badly damaged the reputation of the UCI and compromised the sport.

Other factors have contributed to cycling's boom that have nothing to do with the UCI. These include the boom in Triathlon and the rise of the MAMIL (Middle Aged Man In Lycra). There has also been a switch from golf to cycling as the sport is less frustrating for novices and provides greater health benefits. In addition society has become more health conscious leading many people to discover the bike. It helps that it is a family-friendly activity.

Conclusion

Pat McQuaid has had two terms in office at a time when the sport at a professional level has continued to suffer from doping scandals. He has had every opportunity to impress us but we remain dissatisfied with his clumsy communication, his confrontational style and his outdated politics. Regretfully, we do not believe Pat McQuaid is the right man to lead the sport of cycling forward.

We have lost confidence in Pat McQuaid and we believe many other stakeholders have too. Ultimate responsibility for the problems of an organisation rests with its management. In the case of the UCI Pat McQuaid is where the buck stops. In our view

² <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/mcquaid-calls-on-armstrong-to-help-fight-doping>

he has lost credibility and a change in leadership is long overdue.

It is our understanding that a number of candidates are awaiting the result of the Cycling Ireland EGM and that these individuals are reluctant to announce their candidacy while Pat McQuaid remains intent on running for re-election. Rejecting McQuaid's request for his nomination will encourage these individuals to emerge publicly.

Members of Cycling Ireland have a unique opportunity to influence the direction of the sport under the stewardship of the UCI. The forthcoming Cycling Ireland EGM allows members to express their views on Pat McQuaid's tenure as president of the UCI. We ask that members, through their clubs and delegates at the EGM on June 15th, reject Pat McQuaid's request to Cycling Ireland for its nomination for President of the UCI for the upcoming UCI Elections.

Governance

It is our belief that the sport at a professional level and the UCI as an institution has lost credibility. The people who run any organisation should accept some responsibility for what has happened under their watch. In the case of cycling the buck stops firmly at the door of the UCI. Pat McQuaid has held senior positions within the UCI for the past 15 years – the last eight of them as its President.

General concerns regarding the UCI's overall responsibilities

Loss of confidence in UCI by stakeholders :

- The riders, teams and countries who have been cheated out of victories and medals.
- The clean riders forced out of the sport because they were not prepared to go along with the doping culture.
- The sponsors who have seen their brands tainted by being associated with a discredited sport. For example, Rabobank pulled out of pro cycling in October 2012: Bert Bruggink, a Rabobank board member, said in a statement:

*"We are no longer convinced that the international professional world of cycling can make this a clean and fair sport. We are not confident that this will change for the better in the foreseeable future" and "The international sport of cycling is not only sick, the sickness goes up to the highest levels."*³

- TV companies who have been promoting events that are now discredited. German Broadcaster ARD pulled out of covering the Tour de France on the back of doping scandals. It was furious that Bernard Kohl tested positive at the 2008 Tour de France. Kohl was supposed to be part of a new and clean generation of riders.
- The fans who have been cheated out of watching cyclists competing on a level playing field – not being able to trust what they are seeing

Concerns specific to Pat McQuaid throughout his tenure

McQuaid appears always to be surrounded by controversy. His actions seem inappropriate for a leader of a global sport. McQuaid himself has admitted that the sport has lost credibility under his watch. In the UCI Press release of 23.05.2013, Pat McQuaid welcomed the recommendations set out in a summary report following the completion of the UCI Stakeholders Consultation, 'A Bright Future for Cycling'. The first critical priority recommendation made in this report is to 'restore credibility and perception'. Other notable points:

³ <http://www.irishtimes.com/sport/rabobank-pull-out-latest-blow-for-cycling-1.555319>

- Attempt by the UCI to wrest control of the Armstrong investigation from USADA
- Independent Commission established to appease critics, disbanded at first opportunity
- Treatment of Whistleblowers - Suing Kimmage (and Landis) and his derogatory discourse of anyone who speaks out against cycling. The UCI also sued Dick Pound, Head of WADA at the time, for being critical of it.
- UCI's Involvement in star riders' doping affairs (conflict of interest).

Jurisdictional battle with USADA

When USADA announced that they would be officially opening disciplinary proceedings against several members of the US Postal team Pat McQuaid originally said it was a matter for USADA.

*"People can say what they want, and make statements but the UCI is not involved in it so don't ask me to comment. We're not commenting on the Armstrong investigation and that remains the case. Let USADA carry on with this investigation"*⁴

Shortly after however, the UCI changed its mind and demanded that USADA end its involvement in the investigation so that the UCI could hand control to an 'independent panel'.

*"The UCI wants that the whole case file with all the evidence is assessed by an independent panel who shall then decide if the respondents have a case to answer."*⁵

USADA replied with the following statement:

*"The USPS doping conspiracy was going on under the watch of UCI, so of course UCI and the participants in the conspiracy who cheated sport with dangerous performance enhancing drugs to win have a strong incentive to cover up what transpired ... our job is to apply the rules whether someone is famous or anonymous and we will do that on behalf of the millions of people who demand clean sport despite these external pressures."*⁶

When USADA issued its verdict in relation to US Postal practices, Pat McQuaid appeared ignorant of the UCI's responsibility to uphold sanctions against non-cyclists (team managers, doctors such as Michele Ferrari) involved with the doping of riders.

*"From the UCI's point of view we can't see how these guys can be sanctioned for life," said McQuaid. "They are not UCI licence holders, so under what grounds can they be sanctioned?"*⁷

⁴ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/mcquaid-comments-on-usada-lifetime-bans>

⁵ http://velonews.competitor.com/2012/08/news/usada-pushes-back-against-uci-request-for-armstrong-jurisdiction_233043

⁶ http://velonews.competitor.com/2012/08/news/usada-pushes-back-against-uci-request-for-armstrong-jurisdiction_233043

⁷ http://velonews.competitor.com/2012/07/news/mcquaid-stays-mum-on-u-s-postal-probe-but-doesnt-understand-ferrari-other-sanctions_228937?

The applicable Rule:18. 1

- a) Any Person who, without being a holder of a license, participates in a cycling event in any capacity whatsoever, including, without limitation, as a rider, coach, trainer, manager, team director, team staff, agent, official, medical or para-medical personnel or parent and;
- b) Any Person who, without being a holder of a licence, participates, in the framework of a club, trade team, national federation or any other structure participating in Races, in the preparation or support of riders for sports competitions; shall be subject to these Anti-Doping Rules and these Anti-Doping Rules shall apply to each such Person as they apply to a Licence-Holder.

Abandonment of the Independent Commission

The UCI appointed an Independent Commission to deal with the fall-out of Lance Armstrong's conviction and USADA's findings. The UCI's attempt to investigate itself was roundly jeered. WADA and USADA refused to co-operate as they did not approve of the UCI's terms of reference. The commission was disbanded by Pat McQuaid the moment it sought to act independently. The Commission itself stated:

*"Neither the UCI nor interested stakeholders have provided sufficient co-operation to enable the Commission to do its job. This failure to cooperate makes our task impossible. Therefore, the proposed hearing on 31 January 2013 will not take place."*⁸

Pat McQuaid promised to put a truth and reconciliation in place to replace the Independent Commission but seven months on the UCI has failed to address the Lance Armstrong scandal and USADA's findings. Travis Tygart, head of USADA, was frustrated with Pat McQuaid's failure to act:

*"We have seen nothing. It has been over seven months since our report and their declaration that they needed to take decisive action," he said. "So, of course, we are frustrated ... All those who cherish the Olympic values, particularly fair play and a level playing field, deserve more ... They disbanded the independent commission that was set up at the very time it began to actually act independent,"*⁹

Treatment of Whistleblowers

From the accounts of whistleblowers Pat McQuaid's comments appear to demonstrate that he had no desire to listen to them or to learn about doping practices within the peloton. His discourse suggests that their contributions to the fight against doping were

⁸ <http://www.velonation.com/News/ID/13814/UCI-Independent-Commission-stands-down-says-UCI-and-others-didnt-co-operate.aspx#ixzz2UE5a8Tkp>

⁹ <http://www.rte.ie/news/world/2013/0517/450851-ireland-to-host-anti-doping-conference-in-brussels/>

a massive inconvenience to him and unhelpful to the sport. In our opinion his treatment of whistleblowers suggests that he too may have been part of the omerta within professional cycling. His language as UCI President seemed to suggest that if anyone dared to speak out that they would be publicly denigrated and shut out of the sport.

Consider the following:

Jörg Jaksche met Pat McQuaid in 2007. The following is extracted from his affidavit to USADA:

41. Following my admissions to public authorities regarding my doping I spent hours talking with the UCI in 2007. I spoke to UCI lawyers, to Anne Gripper, who was then head of anti-doping for the UCI, and to President Pat McQuaid. I wanted to be fully transparent regarding my doping and the anti-doping rule-violations of others and to fully explain the level of doping of which I was aware and that was taking place on Team Telekom, Once, CSC and Liberty Seguros during my time in professional cycling. However, the UCI showed zero interest in hearing the full story about doping on these teams and did not seek to follow up with me.
42. Moreover, despite my efforts to assist in cleaning up cycling the UCI attempted to push for two years ineligibility in my case, and Pat McQuaid told me he would have liked me to have handled things differently from which I can only conclude he wished I had not been as forthcoming regarding the degree of doping that was taking place in the peloton.
43. To the best of my knowledge, information and belief the UCI did not move forward on any evidence that I provided to them. I have never been subsequently called in for any follow up by the UCI.¹⁰

Comments by Jörg Jaksche to Cyclingnews regarding Pat McQuaid, 15 Feb 2013:

"He shouldn't be the president in the future. We need a president who has a clear line and follows this line. We don't need a president who changes his opinion [every] three seconds depending on where the wind blows. Better having no president at all,"

Jaksche told Cyclingnews.

"I hope the UCI will have a change of leadership. The legal construction of the UCI means it's just like a club where it's really difficult to change things. There's some movement from the French, Australia and the English, and it's nothing against McQuaid as a person, but something has to change with the attitude and ethics of the UCI. He's not going to get back that credibility"¹¹

Frankie Andreu in an interview with Cyclingnews reminds us that his confession (in the New York Times in 2006) seemed to be met with derision from the UCI, with President Pat McQuaid stating:

"If Andreu wishes to say that, that's up to him to say that. I don't know what he's trying to achieve because he cannot achieve anything by saying this."

The interview appears to reveal Andreu's lack of faith in the UCI:

"When Tyler came out with all of his stuff, when Floyd came out with all of his stuff, they just ripped them apart. They didn't investigate it or look into it."

¹⁰ <http://d3epuodzu3wuis.cloudfront.net/Jaksche%2c+Jorg+Affidavit.pdf>

¹¹ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/jaksche-mcquaid-should-be-removed-as-uci-president>

They didn't even contact me."

The article also reported that the UCI has never contacted Jonathan Vaughters:

"In 2010, when Floyd Landis confessed to doping and implicated several other riders, the Garmin team made a public statement that they would universally cooperate with any official body investigating allegations of doping. Team boss Jonathan Vaughters confirmed to Cyclingnews that the UCI had not spoken to him or any of his riders despite several confessions of doping from the team."¹²

Pat McQuaid regarding Bernard Kohl's public admission on German TV:

"I have no desire at all to comment on Mr. Kohl, he is a sanctioned rider for doping and this is extremely significant in my opinion" said Pat McQuaid, adding: "He cheated and I'm not going to discuss our efforts in the fight against doping with someone like him."¹³

McQuaid on Floyd Landis and Tyler Hamilton:

"Another thing that annoys me is that Landis and Hamilton are being made out to be heroes. They are as far from heroes as night and day. They are not heroes. They are scumbags. All they have done is damage to the sport."¹⁴

This comment appears to be in direct contravention of articles 2(d) and 2(e) of the Constitution of the UCI:

Article 2(d) To encourage friendship among all members of the cycling world.

Article 2(e) To promote sportsmanship and fairplay

Honorary President of the UCI, Hein Verbruggen, in an email to Floyd Landis:

"Mr. Landis, you're not worth any further word or attention except perhaps from psychiatrists. HV"¹⁵

Floyd Landis was left broke after Mercury stopped paying him despite being under contract. Having waited patiently for the UCI to take action based on earlier correspondence, Landis complained to the UCI and Hein Verbruggen for not implementing its rules regarding bank guarantees. Lance Armstrong suggested to Floyd that he should ring Hein Verbruggen to apologise.

Landis's recollection of conversation with Lance Armstrong on the matter:

'Look Floyd, you have got to do what this guy says because we're going to need a favour from him at some point. It's happened in the past. I had a positive test in 2001 at the Tour of Swiss and I had to go to these guys.'

Landis concerning his private apology to Hein Verbruggen:

¹² <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/andreu-skeptical-about-uci-doping-hotline>

¹³ http://www2.lequipe.fr/redirect-v6/homes/Cyclisme/brevs2009/20090526_185349_mcquaid-ne-discute-pas-avec-kohl.html

¹⁴ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/othersports/cycling/lancearmstrong/9626832/UCI-chief-condemns-Lance-Armstrongs-whistle-blowers-Floyd-Landis-and-Tyler-Hamilton-as-scumbags.html>

¹⁵ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/verbruggen-wont-take-legal-action-against-hamilton>

*"I didn't do it because I was forced to do it, I did it because I completely understood the situation. I thought 'I'm saying sorry whether I am sorry or not' because now I know how the UCI works. The fact that the highest level was manipulating things left me with two choices – I can quit and not say anything or I can accept that this is how it works and try to figure out how to manoeuvre my way through it."*¹⁶

Pat McQuaid comments to Associated Press regarding Floyd Landis confession:

"These guys coming out now with things like this from the past is only damaging the sport," McQuaid told *The Associated Press*. *"If they've any love for the sport they wouldn't do it."*¹⁷

Concerning Emma O'Reilly's allegation that Armstrong used a back-dated prescription to dodge a positive test. It didn't appear to occur to Pat McQuaid to make inquiries with Emma O'Reilly:

*"We interviewed Armstrong about it [rather than O'Reilly]. Again, there's nothing to interview about. In our documentation yesterday... we explain quite clearly why that was not a positive sample."*¹⁸

David Walsh points out how Pat McQuaid ignored the evidence:

"Pat McQuaid is giving the impression this report (USADA Reasoned Decision) shocked him" said Walsh on RTÉ. *"My question to Pat is, 'how could it shock you?' All the evidence has been out there for a long time. Floyd Landis sent his e-mails two years ago. Did Pat McQuaid ring up Floyd Landis and say 'Floyd what you're saying is unbelievable. I need to speak to you. I need you to give me details'.*

*"If I went back four years before that, in 2006, Frankie Andreu, a former US Postal rider, did an interview with the New York Times where he said 'I doped to help Lance Armstrong win his first Tour de France in 1999. Pat McQuaid was president of UCI at that time. Did he ring up Frankie Andreu and say 'Frankie, you doped to help Lance. Was there much doping in the team? Could we speak? Will you tell me more?'"*¹⁹

Pat McQuaid also sued renowned anti-doping journalist Paul Kimmage for an article he had written which addressed the doping problems in the sport. Kimmage was of the opinion that the UCI did not want the doping issue to be aired publicly, saying:

*"I think it is purely a gagging order. They want to try to shut me up basically."*²⁰

¹⁶ <http://velocitynation.com/content/interviews/2011/landiskimmage>

¹⁷ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/wada-and-uci-issue-statements-on-landis-confession>

¹⁸ <http://sports.espn.go.com/oly/cycling/news/story?id=5632256>

¹⁹ <http://www.irishexaminer.com/archives/2012/1023/sport/kimmage-and-walsh-let-rip-at-mcquaid-211690.html>

²⁰ <http://road.cc/content/news/67942-paul-kimmage-uci-lawsuits-are-attempt-silence-me>

UCI's Involvement in Star Riders' Doping Affairs

Under no circumstances should a governing body be seen to be interfering with the course of justice. Any insinuation of such only risks implicating the organisation in wrongdoing leading to reputational damage.

We believe the UCI's apparent meddling in the doping affairs of Alberto Contador and Lance Armstrong cast the UCI and cycling in an appalling light. In our view, this suggested to young riders that "if it's in cycling's interests the UCI will do its best to protect you no matter what you have been up to." In our opinion the UCI's mixed signals only contributed to the mess that the sport is in. It would have been better for cycling's commercial interest at the time for the UCI to be seen to be cleaning up cycling. Instead the UCI's intervention into the doping affairs of Alberto Contador and Lance Armstrong caused public scorn to be poured on both the UCI and the sport. We believe the UCI's actions sent a signal to dopers that the UCI was still on their side.

Pat McQuaid has declared publicly that the UCI did not give favourable treatment to anybody:

*"the UCI has always done everything possible to get rid of doping from cycling, without fear and without favourable treatment to anybody"*²¹

However, the evidence suggests Pat McQuaid is incorrect.

Alberto Contador's clenbuterol positive

- The UCI delayed announcing that Contador had tested positive for clenbuterol. However, a German journalist had the story from a Spanish source. Having sat on the positive test for 3-4 weeks, the UCI denied to Hajo Seppelt there was a doping case open against a star rider. However, it seemed to quickly realise that the story would soon break in the German media. The UCI was forced to announce, the same evening that it had denied the positive, that Contador had indeed tested positive.²²
- When Contador met the UCI it seems he had no explanation for clenbuterol being in his system. It is after all an exogenous substance. By way of explanation the UCI appeared to provide food contamination as the reason for the positive test. The evidence suggests that the UCI itself provided the inspiration for Contador's tainted beef story, even though the Spanish beef industry stopped using clenbuterol in cattle years before owing to an EU ban.

*"The UCI itself told me to my face that it was a case of food contamination"*²³

The UCI's role is to enforce Anti-Doping Rules. It is up to each rider to defend themselves against any Anti-Doping violations. The rule sets out that the UCI's role is to listen to the rider's grounds and explanations for a positive test.

²¹ http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/mcquaid-calls-for-analysis-of-puerto-blood-bags?ns_campaign=news&ns_mchannel=rss&ns_source=cyclingnews&ns_linkname=0&ns_fee=0

²² <http://www.velonation.com/News/ID/7930/Hajo-Seppelt-Interview-Lingering-questions-about-the-Contador-positive.aspx>

²³ <http://sports.espn.go.com/oly/cycling/news/story?id=5632256>

Chapter IX – Right to a Fair Hearing - Rule 251:

The License-Holder's National Federation shall call the License-Holder before it to hear his grounds and explanations.

- There was also a high level of plasticizers, another exogenous substance, in Contador's sample. Plasticizers do not prove autologous blood transfusion took place but they certainly raise doping-questions in light of an existing clenbuterol positive. Although the UCI could not ban Contador on the basis of high plasticizer-levels, the UCI appeared to ignore the evidence of plasticizers completely. It is our belief that the UCI chose to ignore the evidence of plasticizers to downplay the likelihood of blood doping. Doing so would give Contador's bizarre tainted beef story greater credibility. It didn't.²⁴
- After months of investigations, neither the Spanish Federation nor the UCI seemed to be able to agree on the matter. It was ultimately left up to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) to issue a verdict.

The ordeal cast a shadow on both the Spanish Federation and the UCI. Whether it was the case or not, the public was left to conclude that Contador was treated differently on account of his fame. It is our view that the UCI's actions helped to create the perception (at the minimum) that the UCI at all times wished to prevent a doping conviction for the 2010 Tour de France champion. The never-ending saga dragged the sport through the mud for months and Contador ultimately had his 2010 Tour de France title stripped anyway.

Mounting evidence against Armstrong not investigated

- In 2003 it became public knowledge that Lance Armstrong was working with highly controversial Italian sports doctor Michele Ferrari.²⁵
- In 2004 David Walsh and Pierre Ballester published L.A. Confidential: The Secrets of Lance Armstrong. In the book Emma O'Reilly, Lance Armstrong's masseuse, admitted that Armstrong once asked her to dispose of syringes and asked for make-up to cover up needle-marks in his arms. The UCI never interviewed her about her claims.
- In 2005 L'Equipe reported that six urine samples from the 1999 Tour de France belonging to Lance Armstrong tested positive for EPO.²⁶
- Frankie Andreu admitted in a 2006 New York Times article that he used EPO at the 1999 Tour de France, he was a team-mate of Armstrong. Pat McQuaid never sought to interview Frankie Andreu about doping practices at US Postal.²⁷

²⁴ <http://www.cyclingweekly.co.uk/news/latest/501965/alberto-contador-the-clenbuterol-the-beef-excuse-and-the-traces-of-plastic.html>

²⁵ <http://ftp.cyclingnews.com/riders/2003/interviews/?id=ferrari03>

²⁶ http://velonews.competitor.com/2005/08/tour-de-france/lequipe-alleges-armstrong-samples-show-epo-use-in-99-tour_8740

²⁷ http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/12/sports/othersports/12cycling.html?_r=3&oref=slogin&

- In 2006 Betsy Andreu testified in court that Lance Armstrong had admitted to doctors in her presence that he had used EPO, steroids and growth hormone in 1996. The testimonies were supposed to be kept secret but they were leaked, forcing Betsy to go public with her claims. Pat McQuaid never interviewed Betsy Andreu.
- In 2006, Australian anti-doping researcher Michael Ashenden testified in the SCA Promotions trial vs Lance Armstrong. Based on the evidence of Armstrong's samples Ashenden testified that there was compelling evidence of EPO.²⁸

The UCI did investigate the evidence. In 2006 the Vrijman report was released but its findings were mocked by WADA.²⁹

- In 2010 Floyd Landis stated he observed Armstrong receiving multiple blood transfusions and dispensing testosterone patches to US Postal team-mates. Pat McQuaid denigrated Landis calling him a scumbag.³⁰
- In 2011 Tyler Hamilton told CBS News that he and Armstrong had taken EPO together before and during the 2001, 2002 and 2003 Tour de France. Pat McQuaid also called Hamilton a scumbag.³¹

Public Statements on behalf of Lance Armstrong

According to the UCI Honorary President Hein Verbruggen in May 2011, Lance Armstrong "*never, never, never*" used any doping product or method. Why would he say that? It seems bad enough that a person of his stature was so wrong but these comments were shocking to us when the UCI was already aware of much evidence to the contrary. It is our belief that the only rational reason the UCI would make such comments is if it believed doing so would protect the sport. In our opinion these comments have the opposite effect. We believe the UCI should never be seen to be making a case on any athlete's behalf.³²

Allowing Armstrong to return without requisite time in anti-doping system

In 2008 Lance Armstrong expressed his desire to return to the sport after retiring in 2005. Anti-doping Rule 77 stated that an athlete must announce his return to cycling six months in advance to the UCI. The reason for doing so is to ensure the athlete is tested out-of-competition before any return to racing. Pat McQuaid granted a request by Lance Armstrong to return to competition at the Santos Tour Down Under in January 2009 eleven days before the requisite six months had lapsed. In light of the general public suspicion concerning Lance Armstrong at the time, it is our view that Pat McQuaid should under no circumstances have been seen to bend the rules for the then seven times Tour de France winner or indeed any rider.³³

²⁸ <http://nyvelocity.com/content/interviews/2009/michael-ashenden>

²⁹ http://www.wada-ama.org/rtecontent/document/wada_official_statement_vrijman_report.pdf

³⁰ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/othersports/cycling/lancearmstrong/9626832/UCI-chief-condemns-Lance-Armstrongs-whistle-blowers-Floyd-Landis-and-Tyler-Hamilton-as-scumbags.html>

³¹ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/othersports/cycling/lancearmstrong/9626832/UCI-chief-condemns-Lance-Armstrongs-whistle-blowers-Floyd-Landis-and-Tyler-Hamilton-as-scumbags.html>

³² <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/verbruggen-says-armstrong-never-never-never-doped>

³³ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/uci-allows-armstrong-to-start-the-2009-tour-down-under>

Anti-Doping and the Biological Passport

It is our belief that the UCI has not prioritised Anti-Doping enough. The introduction of new testing protocols represents only part of the picture. Investigative work and positive relationships with anti-doping agencies is also required. Based on several accounts, as detailed above, the UCI seems reluctant to interview anyone with relevant information in the fight against doping. In addition it appears to have very sour relations with WADA and USADA, who have criticised the UCI publicly in an effort to support the sport. These are the very organisations the UCI should be encouraging, not sparring with. The UCI's apparent meddling in the doping affairs of star riders such as Lance Armstrong in 2012 and Alberto Contador in 2010 would, in our view, support doping, not anti-doping. We believe the UCI's apparent refusal to investigate riders who doped in the past does not help to inform anti-doping policy for the future. Having observed Pat McQuaid's comments and actions during his Presidency, we are not confident that things will improve with regards to the fight against doping should he be given another four years as President of the UCI.

We believe, if the UCI's discourse was sincere and its actions forceful, fans would respond to these efforts with support. In our view this has not been the case. When words ring hollow and anti-doping seems an inconvenience, fans become cynical. If the public is cynical of the UCI's efforts against doping the UCI only has itself to blame. It is the UCI's job to make the sport credible, instead Pat McQuaid seems to deny responsibility and blames others for bringing the sport into disrepute. Pat McQuaid has had every opportunity to demonstrate that he is the best person to lead the charge against doping. It is our opinion that he is not the best person for this fight.

Concerns regarding Anti-Doping:

- Failure to Lead – Teams and Sponsors are making the difference, not the UCI it seems.
- The Biological Passport – It was reactionary not pro-active, there are deficiencies, Anti-Doping expert Michael Ashenden's frustrations caused him to resign, it failed to catch Lance Armstrong on his return.
- Criticism – WADA and USADA remain critical of the UCI's efforts.
- Credibility – Pat McQuaid still pleads ignorance and fails to admit mistakes regarding Lance Armstrong.

Failure to Lead

Frustrated fans and sponsors would likely have forgiven the UCI if it had ever drawn a fresh line in the sand and put forward a credible plan. We do not believe they ever did. Instead, change has come as a result of sponsors and teams increasingly regulating

riders to protect their brands. In our opinion the apparent increase in clean riders in the peloton has little to do with the UCI. We believe certain teams and sponsors are showing real leadership. It is their positive actions that help the sport to gain credibility in the fight against doping.

- Johnathan Vaughters and Garmin agreed to insert a break-clause into the sponsor's contract with the team for any doping violations. The financial implication of a doping positive for the riders and anyone involved with the team is clear.
- In 2012 Team Sky carried out a root and branch review of its operations and let go employees linked to a doping past. The team understood its need to maintain credibility and acted positively.
- AG2R will honour its commitment to MPCC by skipping the Criterium du Dauphine following Sylvain George's May 2013 doping violation. The Criterium du Dauphine is AG2R's home race and is important for the sponsor, however, the team wished to do the right thing.

"It's not a question of not having a choice, but simply of doing the right thing," Lavenu told L'Équipe. "We've always done the Dauphiné and this is a big loss for us."³⁴

A Reactionary Response - The Bio-Passport in Context

Operacion Puerto broke before the 2006 Tour de France. It forced a number of pre-race favourites to quit the race in disgrace before it had even started. 'Puerto' was an operation by the Guardia Civil in Spain against the doping network of Doctor Eufemiano Fuentes. The Spanish police acted in response to a series of disturbing interviews in March 2004 with Jesus Manzano in AS, which exposed systemic doping by his former team Kelme. During these interviews Manzano detailed his blood doping and his use of performance enhancing drugs while on the team. The UCI did not take his revelations seriously, the current Honorary President Hein Verbruggen said at the time:

"I don't know if what he says is true, I expect not" and "the majority of the pelotón is clean, I guarantee it."³⁵

The UCI did not seem to be interested in anything that Manzano had to say. Operacion Puerto lifted the lid on blood doping practices within cycling and brought the sport to its knees, once more, as sponsors and broadcasters deserted it. As a result of the fallout from Operacion Puerto, the UCI was forced to take credible action regarding blood doping. If it had done so following Manzano's admission, things might not have turned out as badly as they did for the sport.

The UCI began introducing tests which would contribute towards a rider's biological passport – a profile of various parameters specific to each rider. These values and their fluctuations would provide the UCI with a sophisticated tool to combat sophisticated doping, which was clearly prevalent. Software and a panel of experts would be able to evaluate and determine whether a rider had been doping without requiring the rider to explicitly fail a detection test.

³⁴ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/ag2r-confirm-they-wont-ride-dauphine>

³⁵ <http://autobus.cyclingnews.com/news.php?id=news/2004/apr04/apr22news>

Bernard Kohl Revelations

In June 2009 Austrian cyclist Bernard Kohl (banned for CERA thanks to testing by AFLD not the UCI) suggested that riders found the Biological Passport assisted their doping practices. It provided a benchmark against which riders could measure their own blood values to ensure that they would not be flagged as suspicious. He also went on to assert that doping was still rife within the peloton. Kohl said:

“The top riders are so professional in their doping that they know very well they have to keep their blood values stable [so as] not to be detected. The UCI sent us the values resulting from the controls: we thus referred to those to mark the next ones. In a way, the passport almost helped us. By re-injecting half a litre of blood the blood parameters are not subject to suspect variation. I did not cheat anyone in the peloton, be sure of that – there is like a social organisation [of doping] within the peloton, these things are accepted.”³⁶

Where once riders carried flasks for their EPO, some now carried centrifuges to measure their own blood values.

Michael Ashenden’s Frustrations

Anti-doping expert Michael Ashenden, one of the original members of the biological passport panel, highlighted various flaws with the system and how it was being utilised by Pat McQuaid and the UCI. Ashenden said the following before he resigned from his position:

“[I have] noticed a significant gap between tests in some of the profiles. It’s definitely not in every single profile, but enough to have left an impression on me. What I can’t answer is why those gaps are present. Perhaps the UCI are pursuing a targeting strategy that I’m not aware of, but leaving big gaps doesn’t make any sense to me.”³⁷

Subsequently, recorded minutes from a meeting of the UCI’s anti-doping board revealed that the UCI cut down on passport program tests in 2010 due to budgetary restrictions.

“Following budget cuts, the testing program for 2010 has been reduced, especially for the ‘older’ riders with also a reduction in the number of tests until later this year.”³⁸

Budget cuts can be understandable but teams are the largest contributors of money to the UCI’s anti-doping efforts. Teams are also obliged to contribute to the World Tour Reserve and Solidarity Fund. For some reason, the UCI seems to have imposed budget restrictions on its anti-doping efforts when in the same year it sourced monies from the

³⁶ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/sport/2009/jun/09/berhard-kohl-cycling-drugs-tour-de-france>

³⁷ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/report-ashenden-resigns-from-ucis-biological-passport-panel>

³⁸ http://velonews.competitor.com/2013/01/news/ashenden-uci-cut-back-on-biological-passport-testing-in-2010_273144

teams' Reserve Fund to fund its own vanity project, Global Cycling Promotions (GCP). It is our view that if one of these initiative was short of financial resources that funding for a credible Biological Passport should have taken precedence over GCP.

Ashenden ultimately resigned from the panel because the UCI wanted the panel members to sign a confidentiality agreement, which would prevent them from discussing any matter pertaining to the biological passport for eight years. Ashenden responded:

"Anti-doping exists to protect clean athletes, not the reputation of the anti-doping movement. When push comes to shove, my actions will always be in the interests of clean athletes, even if that means I ruffle feathers by highlighting some inconvenient truths. And just because I serve on their panel, it doesn't give them the right to silence me."³⁹

Dr. Ashenden, who had worked closely with the UCI for a number of years, had the following to say about Pat McQuaid:

"He might surprise me in the future, but I don't see how Pat McQuaid could become any more compromised. [WADA] consider him to be deceitful, [USADA] have said he tried to stymie their investigation into Armstrong, yet McQuaid sees no reason why he should resign. Here is one very good reason: McQuaid flip-flops hopelessly on how to steer cycling forward. One week he says cycling needs an independent commission, the next week he shuts it down. One day he opposes a truth and reconciliation process, the next day he wants to start one up. One moment he accuses WADA of running a vendetta, the next moment he asks them to cooperate with him.

"McQuaid seeks to dodge responsibility for the Armstrong scandal, but he cannot. McQuaid has admitted that he pursued Armstrong and demanded a hundred thousand dollars from him even though [former UCI president Hein] Verbruggen has since acknowledged that the UCI realized that Armstrong had been using drugs. Not once it would seem, but on three separate occasions that have so far come to the surface (cortisone 1999, EPO 2001 Tour de Suisse, EPO 2002 Dauphiné). McQuaid's refusal to step down after such a grimy act speaks equal volumes about his integrity and the UCI's credibility."⁴⁰

Failure to Flag Lance Armstrong

Specifically in the case of Lance Armstrong, it seems Pat McQuaid and the UCI failed to act on the information they had obtained as a result of the biological passport system. As part of the USADA Reasoned Decision, Professor Christopher J. Gore, Head of Physiology at the Australian Institute of Sport, examined Armstrong's blood samples

³⁹ <http://www.velonation.com/News/ID/11524/Ashenden-says-confidentiality-clause-led-to-resignation-from-biological-passport-panel.aspx#ixzz2Ui6HgAgo>

⁴⁰ http://velonews.competitor.com/2013/02/news/ashenden-i-dont-see-how-mcquaid-could-become-any-more-compromised_274311

from the period of his comeback between 2009 and 2011. The USADA report stated:

“When Prof. Gore compared the suppressed reticulocyte percentage in Armstrong’s 2009 and 2010 Tour de France samples to the reticulocyte percentage in his other samples, Prof. Gore concluded that the approximate likelihood of Armstrong’s seven suppressed reticulocyte values during the 2009 and 2010 Tours de France occurring naturally was less than one in a million.”⁴¹

The UCI appeared to be in possession of the evidence they required to open disciplinary proceedings against Armstrong but a decision was made not to present these values to the panel of anti-doping experts. Pat McQuaid claimed that the panel of experts had the opportunity to examine Armstrong’s values and did not view them as suspicious, saying:

“He had something like 30 tests during the 24 months of his comeback. Those 30 tests were evaluated, I’m not sure if all 30 were blood tests for the passport, I’m not sure of the proportions, but anyway, all of the tests were evaluated by independent experts, including, I think, Michael Ashenden”⁴²

However, McQuaid was incorrect with this assertion. The UCI were later forced to clarify:

“Lance Armstrong’s profile was not flagged as being abnormal by the Athlete Blood Passport software at any time during the period 2008 to 2010. Consequently, it was not submitted to the experts”⁴³

Anti-Doping Agencies Remain Critical of the UCI’s Efforts

Bill Bock, general counsel for USADA said the following in the wake of Armstrong’s lifetime ban:

“I think the ultimate tragedy would be if this whole scenario is viewed as ‘The Lance Armstrong Affair’. That’s how the UCI want everyone in this room to view it. Their view is, Pat McQuaid [said] in his press conference ‘Lance Armstrong has no place in cycling’. They want you to believe that, ‘look here’s the problem over here, it was Lance Armstrong, now look over here and it’s a different arrow’.”⁴⁴

Judging by Pat McQuaid’s election manifesto, it seems this is exactly how the UCI would like people to view the Armstrong case. In our view this is an attempt to obfuscate and avoid the facts. USADA’s Reasoned Decision details the doping activities of eleven former team-mates of Armstrong. Active riders received bans while USADA also sanctioned people associated with the team, such as its doctors.

⁴¹ <http://www.velonation.com/News/ID/13931/Armstrongs-blood-profile-was-never-submitted-to-bio-passport-experts-after-May-2009.aspx>

⁴² <http://www.velonation.com/News/ID/13932/Ashenden-The-experts-were-only-allowed-to-see-the-first-nine-of-Armstrongs-38-blood-results.aspx#ixzz2UiytKFmu>

⁴³ <http://www.velonation.com/News/ID/13931/Armstrongs-blood-profile-was-never-submitted-to-bio-passport-experts-after-May-2009.aspx#ixzz2UiyKndp4>

⁴⁴ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/lemond-not-optimistic-about-ucis-stance-towards-anti-doping>

Dick Pound, former head of WADA, challenged the UCI's and Pat McQuaid's attitude towards doping in the past:

"It is not credible that they didn't know this was going on. I had been complaining to UCI for years. The race starts at 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. in the afternoon and there are no tests prior to the race to see if they are bumped up. So then you go in and get saline solutions and other means of hiding the effects (of) EPO and whatever else it is. You have to say, 'I wonder if it was designed not to be successful?'"⁴⁵

John Fahey, current head of WADA, has recently echoed his predecessor's sentiments when speaking in relation to the disbanding of the Independent Commission, which was supposed to investigate the UCI and its actions:

"UCI has again chosen to ignore its responsibility to the sport of cycling in completing such an inquiry and has determined to apparently deflect responsibility for the doping problem in its sport to others"⁴⁶

Travis Tygart, head of USADA, stated his frustration with Pat McQuaid's failure to act:

"We have seen nothing. It has been over seven months since our report and their declaration that they needed to take decisive action," he said. "So, of course, we are frustrated ... All those who cherish the Olympic values, particularly fair play and a level playing field, deserve more ... They disbanded the independent commission that was set up at the very time it began to actually act independent,"⁴⁷

Tygart also stated in January 2013 to a special hearing of the Bundestag Sports Committee regarding the UCI's interference with its investigation into US Postal that:

"At every turn, the UCI attempted to obstruct our efforts to reveal the truth,"⁴⁸

Pat McQuaid Denies Failures and Pleads Ignorance

McQuaid has re-iterated recently that the UCI is blameless in relation to the doping revealed in the USADA Reasoned Decision:

"I do not think the UCI made mistakes. The statistics show the UCI was the most advanced in the fight against doping."⁴⁹

In our opinion McQuaid's insistence that the UCI could not have improved upon its behaviour is insulting to all of cycling's stakeholders. It is now abundantly clear (if it

⁴⁵ http://velonews.competitor.com/2012/10/news/dick-pound-says-ucis-apparent-blindness-regarding-doping-is-not-credible_261380

⁴⁶ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/sport/2013/jan/29/wada-uci-armstrong-affair>

⁴⁷ <http://www.rte.ie/news/world/2013/0517/450851-ireland-to-host-anti-doping-conference-in-brussels/>

⁴⁸ http://espn.go.com/sports/endurance/story/_/id/8898476/travis-tygart-usada-chief-says-uci-obstructed-lance-armstrong-probe

⁴⁹ <http://www.velonation.com/News/ID/14669/McQuaid-says-Armstrong-has-not-yet-come-clean-insists-UCI-is-blameless.aspx#ixzz2UjLsW0yW>

wasn't already before) that information was available to McQuaid regarding Armstrong's doping. Pat McQuaid does not seem to believe his failure to act on this information was a mistake or something he should take responsibility for.

It is our view that McQuaid's focus on Armstrong in his re-election manifesto ignores the abundance of other doping incidents which have occurred during McQuaid's tenure as President of the UCI. There have been 148 positive tests or doping violations incurred by cyclists during this period. It is worth naming some of the high-profile cases during the course of his Presidency: Roberto Heras, Operacion Puerto, Patrick Sinkewitz, Floyd Landis, Alexandre Vinoukourov, Andrei Kashechkin, Riccardo Ricco, Michael Rasmussen, Bernard Kohl, Stefan Schumacher, Stefan Matschiner, Alberto Contador, The Freiburg Report, The Mantova Investigation, The Oil for Drugs Raids, Lance Armstrong and US Postal, Danilo Di Luca.⁵⁰

Somehow Pat McQuaid continues to deny mistakes and to plead ignorance. As recently as 29 May 2013, McQuaid had this to say:

"I do not think the UCI made mistakes."⁵¹

Regarding Lance Armstrong:

"I was fooled. I believed there was no way a man so close to death would go and start putting stuff into his body that could be dangerous" and "my experiences as a cyclist convinced me he was real."⁵²

⁵⁰ <http://www.dopeology.org/statistics/incidents/>

⁵¹ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/mcquaid-calls-on-armstrong-to-help-fight-doping>

⁵² <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/mcquaid-calls-on-armstrong-to-help-fight-doping>

Globalisation and Cycling's Boom

Globalisation

Discourse concerning the globalisation of pro cycling primarily emanates from Pat McQuaid. Race promotion is his background, it is no surprise he sees cycling through this lens.

Global Cycling-Promotions (GCP) is the company set up by the UCI in 2009 to help 'promote' professional cycling around the world. Pat McQuaid is its President. GCP has been a loss-making experiment to date and borrows heavily on other sources of revenue for the UCI.

The zeal with which Pat McQuaid wishes to promote races suggests to us that it would make more sense for him to spin Global Cycling Promotions out of the UCI. We believe he should pursue this as a personal and private enterprise instead of applying for a third term as UCI President.

We are of the view that there are a number of issues with a profit-oriented approach to the globalisation of cycling. These concerns relate to both conflicts of interest and bad strategy:

Conflicts of Interest

- Apparent Abuse of Power – Inclusion of GCP's own fledgling races in the World Tour boosts their profile over the more-established races of others promoters.
- Promotion vs Regulation - Promoting races for profit compromises ability of UCI to regulate them.
- Market Grab by UCI antagonises stakeholders

Strategy

- Putting the Cart Before the Horse - Globalisation of professional cycling can only be relevant if global corporations are involved. For as long as the sport has no credibility global corporations can not invest in cycling for fear of tainting their image. McQuaid should focus on repairing the sport's credibility to attract large global sponsors ahead of exporting a damaged brand. Global races offer little benefit to small sponsors focused on local markets. Globalisation requires increased travel budgets, an extra financial burden for sponsors.
- Damaging the Brand – We believe McQuaid has failed to get to grips with the sport's problems. His bitter feuds in public highlight his confrontational style. His discourse and actions have only helped to increase the public's cynicism in our view. Whether he likes it or not, we believe Pat McQuaid is seen to be part of the problem, not part of the solution. We are of the opinion that his continued presence at the head of the

sport hurts cycling's image.

- Dearth of Sponsors – the lack of credible change in our view has led to dwindling sponsorship for race organisers and teams. Fewer businesses seem willing to risk associating themselves with cycling. The collapse of public interest in German Cycling owing to doping scandals is an example of how the UCI's failure to address the sport's problems have hurt the business of cycling.
- Faulty Development Strategy – We believe promoting the sport from the top-down by focusing on stars (Lance-mania) and by promoting its own World Tour races risks the UCI's credibility further. This strategy appears to incentivise the UCI to protect its business ahead of the sport because it puts the UCI too close to the scene of a scandal. In our opinion the UCI needs to disassociate itself from this business strategy by promoting the grassroots instead.
- GCP Distracting and Costly - Global Cycling Promotions is costing the UCI money and we think it is distracting it from its broader brief, that of developing and regulating the sport.

The Boom in Cycling

There is no doubt Lance Armstrong was good for business. However, the UCI's apparent endorsement of Lance-mania catastrophically backfired in our view. Such scandals have cost the sport many fans and compromised the sport's public image. We believe these scandals have badly damaged the reputation of the UCI.

Other factors have contributed to cycling's boom that have nothing to do with the UCI:

- The Internet – Multiple sources of online cycling content have allowed a minority sport to feel mainstream to those who indulge it. The web encourages fans' interest in the sport and acts as a catalyst for purchasing decisions.
- Triathlon – The boom in triathlon numbers and the spendthrift of triathletes has been significant for the business of cycling. Triathlon has created a swell in numbers out riding and has introduced many new faces to cycling clubs and the bike-racing and leisure scene. The International Triathlon Union is wholly separate from the UCI.
- The Rise of the MAMIL - The rise in cycling coincides with Silicon Valley executives endorsing cycling as the new golf. This idea spread throughout the global business community leading to a surge in middle-aged men in lycra prepared to spend lots of money on bike gear and cyclo-sportives. Cycling is seen to be as sociable as golf and as competitive too. Crucially it is less frustrating for novices and provides greater health benefits than golf.
- Health Matters - Society has become increasingly health-conscious. This has led people to seek out exercise that is accessible. Health professionals promote cycling as a suitable activity for those prone to injury or returning from injury. It also has the benefit of being family friendly.
- Bike-to-Work Scheme – This tax-based incentive scheme has been a boon to retailers of bikes and gear in Ireland. It is important to keep the Irish cycling boom in context, it is a local phenomenon, not a global one. It is an Irish government scheme, not a UCI one.

Apparent Abuse of Power

The UCI is a non-profit company (article 1 of UCI constitution), however, the UCI's Global Cycling Promotions (GCP) is a for-profit commercial enterprise. The UCI's vision as a race-promoter puts it in direct competition with existing race organisers because the UCI controls the World Tour and the overall race calendar. For example the UCI's Tour of Beijing was instated as part of the UCI's World Tour in its first year in 2011. The UCI's Tour of Hangzhou was also instated as part of the Word Tour in its first year, although this race was later cancelled. It seems clear to us that the UCI's fledgling races are obtaining World Tour status ahead of more established races. As ProTour teams are rule-bound to take part in World Tour races, the UCI appears to be abusing its power to boost the profile of its own races and to support its own business-model. GCP's President is Pat McQuaid.

Promotion vs Regulation

In our opinion promoting races for profit compromises the UCI's ability to regulate them. The desire to protect one's own image and business interests will surely always take precedence over self-regulation? We believe the UCI has always tended to business first, the evidence indicates that suggestions it can police itself are foolhardy. Pat McQuaid has expressed a wish to promote cycling rather than regulate it. In our view it is alarming that Pat McQuaid favours promoting new races over what is essentially the UCI's *raison d'être*.

Article 46 of UCI Constitution:

1. Without prejudice to Article 45, the Management Committee shall, in particular:
l) establish the Drug Test Regulations and all other Regulations relating the sport of cycling in general;

In an interview with Velonews:

Pat McQuaid: We'd love it (Anti-Doping) to be truly independent. The UCI has said that for years. We'd love it to be truly independent. We'd love to have somebody running it for us. But the fact is, the rules don't allow us. The WADA Code states, very clearly, that the international federation is responsible for anti-doping within the sport. So the rules don't allow us to do that. Having said that, we have created, and step-by-step we are creating, that situation.

The CADF [Cycling Anti-doping Foundation] has been set up as a separate foundation to the UCI. It has a separate board, a separate funding committee. I'm currently president of the board, and that's something I am going to relinquish.

VN: That doesn't sound independent.

PM: We'll find somebody independent to be president.⁵³

⁵³ http://velonews.competitor.com/2013/02/news/exclusive-interview-with-uci-president-pat-mcquaid-part-2_274287

Market Grab

Is it the job of the UCI to remove the commercial incentive from other race organisers by getting to new markets first? No, in our view, its role is to facilitate those who wish to engage the sport by introducing them to interested parties and to support these commercial endeavours where appropriate. ASO is able to host races in Qatar and Oman and RCS will host one in Dubai next year. Why is the UCI in China? There is no reason for the UCI to involve itself directly in race promotion beyond the World Championships and Olympics when doing so antagonises stakeholders in our view. Race-promoters already contribute significantly to UCI revenues through fees and licensing. We believe the UCI should let race organisers promote new races and instead commoditise the regulation and administration of races by charging promoters for this expertise. As more races are put on, more revenues will come on-stream for the UCI too. A couple of races in China might not seem like a big deal but this is the genesis of a plan, it is where this is leading that is concerning.

Alain Rumpf, Director of GCP, in an interview with Velonews:

"In general terms, we do have other projects. We are talking to other cities and countries to develop cycling events."⁵⁴

Alain Rumpf in an interview with Cycling IQ:

CIQ: Because the strategy is to globalize cycling, does that mean GCP will only be targeting races in emerging countries, and not developed countries like the USA? For example, the USA does not currently have a World Tour event.

AR: No, I don't think it is only emerging countries. It could be any region in the world where there is potential for the whole sport; I think the US is a key territory. If a project can be developed in this country, I'm sure the UCI will look at it with a positive eye.⁵⁵

Putting the Cart Before the Horse

The UCI's vision for the World Tour requires increased travel budgets for teams placing greater financial demands on sponsors. In our view it currently does not make much sense for a Belgian tiling company to showcase its team in Beijing or Oman. We believe local sponsors want local media coverage. It is our opinion that it would make much more sense for a global corporation to support a truly global World Tour. For as long as the UCI does not appear to address properly the sport's lack of credibility we believe the globalisation project will suffer. We believe small sponsors can't afford the travel budget to finance the UCI's vision and that global corporations with adequate resources can't be seen to be getting involved in a sport perceived to be dirty. For the globalisation project to work it needs to be relevant to global corporations who are active in more than one market. In our view Pat McQuaid is wrong to put the cart before the horse.

⁵⁴ http://velonews.competitor.com/2012/10/news/gcp-president-alain-rumpf-defends-ucis-role-in-china_255671

⁵⁵ <http://cyclingiq.com/2011/09/28/alain-rumpf-global-cycling-promotions/>

Damaging the Brand

Pat McQuaid's bitter and very public feuds with WADA, USADA, AFLD, ASO, Change Cycling Now and whistleblowers have brought the sport into disrepute in the mainstream press. The UCI President seems to deny the UCI's failings preferring to blame others for the sport's problems. It is our view that McQuaid's discourse and actions have severely damaged his and the UCI's credibility in broad view of the public. We believe he is personally responsible for increasing the public's cynicism. In our opinion his apparent confrontational style is not the type of leadership the sport needs currently.

The words of Tour de France boss Christian Prudhomme in 2007 are hardly indicative of positive relations with UCI at the time:

"I respect the UCI, but right now I trust nobody — least of all the UCI. We were ready to work with the UCI to fight doping and have supported them financially. But when you have made an alliance, looked the other person right in the eyes, then you expect to be told the truth. But that didn't happen... ...You can't make the Tour de France responsible for everything... We also have an international federation, but they are worth nothing. The UCI never wanted a clean Tour."⁵⁶

Dearth of Sponsors

We are of the view that a lack of credible change at the top of the sport causes potential sponsors to expect similar outcomes as in the past. Owing to the sport's lack of credibility sponsors remain hard to find. We believe that for as long as this is the case cycling-sponsorship is billed at a discount relative to other advertising media to compensate for the risks involved. If the risk of being tainted with scandal is eliminated, we feel there will be an increase in the amount of sponsorship available and the price teams and race organisers can charge for it. Women's teams, teams from lower divisions and smaller races could expect a trickle-down effect. This would make for increased job security and for more livelihoods to be made from cycling. We believe that new sponsors can't risk investing in cycling because it is hard for them to believe that with Verbruggen and McQuaid still involved that the risks of bad publicity are reduced.

Consider the collapse of German Cycling. The disappearance of sponsorship euros is not a result of the German economic situation, which is largely stable relative to a country such as Spain, where a scarcity of sponsors is to be reasonably expected. Jan Ullrich's links to Operacion Puerto in 2006, the announcement of Patrick Sinkewitz's positive test during the 2007 Tour de France, Stefan Schumacher's CERA positive from the 2008 Tour de France all led to the decline of German Cycling and dwindling interest from German fans. The Austrian rider Bernard Kohl's admission was the nail in the coffin as he was part of the supposedly new clean generation of cyclists coming through.

Teams such as T-Mobile and Gerolsteiner left the sport in disgrace. The third German sponsor, Milram, did not renew its contract and the team was forced to disband at the

⁵⁶ http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/sport/more_sport/cycling/article2155568.ece

end of the 2010 season owing to an unfruitful search for mainly German sponsors.

The Deutschland Tour has not taken place since 2008. Its organiser Kai Rapp said:

"Due to recent events (CERA positives) in professional cycling we can no longer commercialise this race in a good way and finance it."

Also, the Stuttgart, Dortmund and Munich six-day races have disappeared owing to lack of sponsors and public interest.⁵⁷

Faulty Development Strategy

Verbruggen appeared to establish a top down approach to growing the sport. Instead of developing the sport from the grassroots up he seemed to consider 'golden boys' to be cycling's best promotional tool. It is our view that Pat McQuaid continued with this business model. We believe the UCI's involvement in the affairs of Lance Armstrong and Alberto Contador, despite their positive tests, epitomises this approach. The UCI appeared to sit on Contador's clenbuterol positive until German journalist Hajo Seppelt discovered the results. The UCI seemed to ignore the evidence of plasticizers in Contador's sample and touted food contamination as being responsible, despite being illogical in our opinion. The UCI also accepted a back-dated exemption from Lance Armstrong in 1999 and allowed him to return to racing in 2009 before he had completed the requisite 6 months in the doping-control pool. The UCI's active involvement in these two riders' affairs highlights that the UCI seems to consider its role to protect the business of cycling, not the sport itself. We believe the UCI's actions sent clear signals to young riders and the public that the UCI would overlook cheating where possible should a young rider become a big enough star.

Pat McQuaid to Antoine Vayer regarding Hein Verbruggen:

"Verbruggen did a lot for the sport, to develop the sport but his decisions were – and this is between you and me – any decisions he made in a certain period to do with doping and so forth... It certainly wasn't that he was pro-doping or encouraging doping, but he would always protect the sport," McQuaid said. *"If he had to take a decision on something and he could see that the sport would be damaged because of that decision then he wouldn't take the decision. I think that his was sort of his philosophy: 'to protect the sport.'"*⁵⁸

GCP - Distracting and Costly

We believe that the apparent zeal with which Pat McQuaid wishes to 'promote' the sport for profit distracts him from the UCI's other traditional objectives, that of developing the grassroots and regulating the sport. It is our opinion that the UCI should be much more focused on the Continental Circuits, instead of Global Cycle Promotions (GCP), as we believe this initiative is of greater relevance to growing cycling globally from the grassroots up.

⁵⁷ <http://www.velowire.com/article/132/en/german-cycling----where-will-it-go-from-here-.html>

⁵⁸ <http://www.cyclingnews.com/news/mcquaid-verbruggens-philosophy-was-to-protect-the-sport>

GCP appears to be a drain on the UCI's resources. The UCI has used ca. €758,000 over the last three years from the WorldTour Reserve and Solidarity Fund to finance operations of GCP. In terms of solidarity, only the GP de Plouay received €30,000 from this reserve fund.

The Teams are obliged to make significant contributions to both the WorldTour Reserve and Solidarity Fund as well as the UCI's Cycling Anti-Doping Foundation (CADF). If there are funds available in the Reserve Fund for pro-cycling objectives, it is our belief that these would be better channelled to CADF than to GCP. It seems the UCI has extra resources to fight doping but it prefers to use these for its own race-promotion instead, even when it must impose budget restrictions on testing for athletes' Biological Passports as it did in 2010.

The following is the view of cycling writer inrng:

"GCP remains a big concern. Events like the Tour of Beijing mean more money flowing into the UCI coffers but the business was still draining money from the Pro Tour Reserve fund for a third year in a row; if it wasn't for the soft funding from the Pro Tour, GCP would be in a perilous state. GCP is only in balance after taking money from the teams."⁵⁹

Financial Losses:

For the first time we get a summary set of accounts for Global Cycling Promotions, the events' company created by the UCI to organise races. It is now linked to the ill-fated Tour of Hangzhou but in 2011 it was only concerned with the Tour of Beijing.

- In 2011 it collected an impressive CHF 3.0 million in revenue for one single race, the Tour of Beijing. But the Chinese race had equally impressive expenses of CHF2.8 million. For comparison the Tour de Romandie in the UCI's Swiss backyard has an annual budget of about CHF4 million francs
- The reported surplus of CHF256,000 is offset by personnel and other general costs of CHF427,000
- Therefore despite being created to earn money for the UCI, GCP is losing money. It reported a modest loss of CHF10,000
- But without the CHF165,000 (€136,000) injection this loss would have been, by arithmetic extension, a loss of CHF175,000 in 2011 which would have wiped out most of the equity in GCP.

Note: Reserve Fund accounts are in EUR, whereas GCP is in CHF

⁵⁹ <http://inrng.com/2012/09/uci-financial-accounts-2011/>

Conclusions

Pat McQuaid has had two terms in office at a time when the sport at a professional level has continued to suffer from doping scandals. He has had every opportunity to impress us but we remain dissatisfied with his clumsy communication, his confrontational style and his outdated politics. Regretfully, we do not believe Pat McQuaid is the right man to lead the sport of cycling forward.

We have lost confidence in Pat McQuaid and we believe many other stakeholders have too. Ultimate responsibility for the problems of an organisation rests with its management. In the case of the UCI Pat McQuaid is where the buck stops. In our view he has lost credibility and a change in leadership is long overdue.

It is our understanding that a number of candidates are awaiting the result of the Cycling Ireland EGM and that these individuals are reluctant to announce their candidacy while Pat McQuaid remains intent on running for re-election. Rejecting McQuaid's request for his nomination will encourage these individuals to emerge publicly.

Members of Cycling Ireland have a unique opportunity to influence the direction of the sport under the stewardship of the UCI. The forthcoming Cycling Ireland EGM allows members to express their views on Pat McQuaid's tenure as president of the UCI. We ask that members, through their clubs and delegates at the EGM on June 15th, reject Pat McQuaid's request to Cycling Ireland for its nomination for President of the UCI for the upcoming UCI Elections.