

This summary of "A Report on Corruption in the Leadership of the Union Cycliste Internationale" (The Report), which has also been referred to in the media as "The Dossier," is being provided as clarification to some of the misperceptions surrounding The Report. The individual providing this information has seen the entire Report consisting of 54 pages and 26 document exhibits, and he/she has knowledge of the individuals described in detail in The Report. The release of this summary was not directed by anyone who commissioned or owns The Report. The individual providing this information has been told that the reason the entire Report has not been made publicly available, is because it has been turned over to law enforcement authorities for follow-up.

The Report was investigated and written by two senior law enforcement and intelligence officials who claim to have more than 60 years of investigative experience. They claim to have been assisted by an internationally known private investigative firm with offices across the globe. The Report claims the following:

1. There is testimonial and documentary evidence that in the late summer of 2012, Pat McQuaid and Hein Verbruggen solicited what amounted to a bribe of 250,000 euros from a named pro-cycling team owner. The monies were allegedly for the UCI to help further promote the named team, and cycling in general in the country of the team and team owner. The named team owner declined to pay the requested monies.
2. There is testimonial and documentary evidence that neither UCI nor its private promotional arm known as Global Cycling Promotion, S.A. was officially involved in the solicitation of the funds, and that the funds were supposed to be paid to a specifically named front company located in the UAE, involving a named secret bank account with ties to a named finance company in Switzerland.
3. There is testimonial evidence that when employees of another named professional cycling team tried to involve UCI in a disagreement with team owners over the failure of team owners to pay employees, UCI instead became involved in a corrupt relationship with the team owners and allowed the illegal non-payment of salaries to continue. The witness who provided this testimonial evidence claimed to have documentary evidence of this corrupt relationship including documents from a named international accounting firm that were altered.
4. There is testimonial evidence that after the rider Alberto Contador failed a doping test in 2010, UCI tried to engage in a cover-up of the failed test in exchange for money. The witness

who provided this testimony advised the efforts were not successful because the media became aware of the story before the cover-up could be completed. The witness claims there are other witnesses who can provide corroborative testimony.

5. There is testimonial evidence that in 2009 when Lance Armstrong was making a comeback to cycling, he had not been in the UCI doping testing pool for the previously proscribed period of time. Mr. McQuaid agreed to a bending of these rules, which allowed Mr. Armstrong to ride in the Tour Down Under for an appearance fee of \$1 million and in exchange, Mr. Armstrong agreed to ride in the Tour of Ireland for free – a race he otherwise would not have participated in. Further, that Mr. McQuaid benefited from this agreement because his relatives or friends were involved in directing the Tour of Ireland. The witness claims a personal, first-hand account of these facts.

6. There is testimonial evidence from more than one witness concerning the well-known 1999 Tour de France urine samples that allegedly eventually contained evidence that Mr. Armstrong failed doping tests, and that Mr. Verbruggen arranged for a friend of his, Emile Vrijman to conduct the independent review and report about the incident. Further, that Mr. Armstrong's personal attorneys wrote and edited portions of the report so they were most favorable to Mr. Armstrong. It is further alleged that Mr. Armstrong helped pay for the report. One witness stated that there is email evidence between Mr. Armstrong's attorneys and UCI officials, which prove these facts. There is testimonial and documentary evidence that the night before Mr. Armstrong appeared on the Oprah Winfrey Show, Mr. Verbruggen was very concerned these events were going to be disclosed during the interview of Mr. Armstrong.

7. On 18 May, 2013 at approximately 1500, Mr. McQuaid was interviewed extensively for several hours by the two investigators about the allegations in The Report. The Report states he denied all of the allegations, but the investigators claim there is testimonial and documentary evidence that he lied about his knowledge and role in the allegations. Mr. McQuaid has never disclosed that he was interviewed during the investigation, and that he knows the nature of the allegations as contained in The Report.

8. On 8 June, 2013 at the UCI Management Committee meeting in Bergen, Norway some of the contents of The Report were disclosed to and discussed by Management Committee members. Mr. McQuaid said he was going to bring the allegations to the UCI's Ethics Commission for investigation.

9. During the week of 10 June, 2013, there is testimonial and documentary evidence that Mr. McQuaid communicated with at least one of the members of the UCI Management Committee and demanded a copy of The Report so he could personally refer the allegations concerning himself to the UCI Ethics Commission.

10. There is testimonial and documentary evidence that On 29 June, 2013 at approximately 1700 in Corsica, France, Mr. McQuaid was given an opportunity to read the entire report and ask questions or make comments concerning the contents of The Report. The investigators claim that he spent approximately one hour reading the report, making notes, and that he asked no questions, and made no comments.

11. There is testimonial evidence from more than one witness that after Mr. McQuaid read The Report in Corsica, France, he communicated with Mr. Verbruggen about the contents of The Report. Further, that Mr. Verbruggen then contacted several of the witnesses in The Report in an apparent effort to distance himself from Mr. McQuaid.

12. It thus appears the recent statements in the press last week by Mr. McQuaid that he has never seen The Report are false. It appears the statements to multiple witnesses by Mr. McQuaid that he intended to bring the allegations he was aware of in The Report to the UCI Ethics Commission are false. It appears the statements by both Mr. McQuaid and Mr. Verbruggen in the press last week that they have not recently communicated, and that Mr. Verbruggen no longer has anything to do with Mr. McQuaid or UCI, are also false.