

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Video Conference

Wednesday 17th February 2021

Minutes

1. Welcome and Opening

1.1 President's opening remarks

The ITTF President, Mr Thomas Weikert, welcomed everyone and informed them that he wanted to address several issues to the EC.

Mr Weikert complained that at the moment he had absolutely no information about the work done by the first working group regarding the DTTB letter and in his point of view it was his right and duty as the ITTF President to be informed.

Mr Weikert expressed having the feeling that every concern that he addresses to the EC is interpreted by the other members as a major problem and considered that as president he should be able to make suggestions and express his disagreement. Mr Weikert asked the EC members to express themselves in case they don't support him, so he can know where he stands.

Mr Weikert considered that he should be able to make suggestions to working groups without being perceived as an inappropriate interference.

Mr Weikert emphasized that during the last EC meeting, he didn't attend the specific part of the meeting and he was not aware of the discussions regarding the WTT matter and DTTB Letter. He stressed that he was not updated yet and still hasn't receive any draft of the minutes of the meeting. Mr Weikert explained that is the EC that will eventually take a final decision regarding this matter and not the working group.

On a different topic, Mr Weikert informed the EC that he received an anonymous email concerning the ITTF Deputy President, Mr Khalil Al-Mohannadi, and his involvement in Qatar Sports. Mr Weikert mentioned that the content of the email could affect the composition of the EC as the email makes a reference to the point 1.5.9.8 of the ITTF Handbook regarding the eligibility criteria of the EC members.

Mr Weikert only wished to inform the EC about this issue and suggested that further discussions should be held in that regard at a later stage. Mr Weikert indicated that the original email will be forwarded to all the EC members after the meeting. He insisted that this matter must be clarified and asked Mr Al-Mohannadi to comment on this as soon as possible.

The EVP, Mr Bruce Burton, considered that the EC cannot take in consideration an email that was sent anonymously to the President's email, especially since the ITTF has established a formal process which should be followed in case of formal complaints.

Mr Weikert stated that he could not conceal the content of this email and there was no other alternative than report it to the EC, especially as he was previously accused for not sharing the information he receives with the other members.

The EVP, Mrs Petra Sörling was in agreement with Mr Burton, and given the nature of the letter insisted on following a formal process. Mrs Sörling underlined that she herself went through a similar experience in her private job and talked about the negative impact that such action may have on those persons involved. Based on experience, Mrs Sörling preferred not to be involved in this matter and recommended to use a different approach and discuss this issue between Mr Weikert and Mr Al-Mohannadi.

Mr Al-Mohannadi thought that it was unacceptable and unprofessional for the ITTF President to take into consideration such anonymous letter and then present it in front of the EC. Mr Al-Mohannadi suggested it was clear that this was a political attack and he ensured had nothing to hide and that he was ready to defend his name.

The EVP, Dr Alaa Meshref, considered that when receiving an anonymous letter, it would be wise not to discuss such matter in front of the EC but rather solve it privately between President and Deputy President. Dr Meshref suggested that it was not very pleasant to receive such information at the beginning of the meeting and particularly didn't appreciate the tone used by the President when referring to the letter and its content "which may change the composition of the EC" as Mr Weikert said.

Dr Meshref outlined that the ITTF cannot take decision based on anonymous letters and it was everyone's preference to minimise the politics within the EC.

In regard to the first point addressed by the President in its opening remarks, Dr Meshref reminded that it was the President that appointed the members of the legal working group and gave them the mandate to deal with the DTTB Letter issue. Dr Meshref ensured that the working group was trying to do its mandate in the best and most professional way possible.

Dr Meshref explained that Mr Weikert did not participate in the specific part of the last EC meeting due to the perceived conflict of interest in his capacity of ITTF President and DTTB legal counsel. Moreover, Dr Meshref emphasized that the legal working group did not appreciate the fact that Mr Weikert's suggested the other EC members not to reply to the questionnaire that was send to the EC.

Mr Weikert stressed about the fact that he had no information about the legal WG work and considered that he was acting properly without influencing anyone nor interfering in any of the matters. The only reason he asked to postpone the deadline to answer the questionnaire was due to the tight timelines.

The Secretary General, Mr Raul Calin, suggested that it was understandable if the President decides himself to postpone his own answer to the questionnaire, but the problem was to recommend other EC members not to respond, emphasizing that the legal working group was trying to fulfil their duties as per the mandate entrusted by the EC, however, the suggestion of Mr Weikert to not answer the questionnaire was perceived as an attempt to delay the process.

With respect to the anonymous letter against the Deputy President, Mr Calin suggested the pattern of this action was similar to others from the previous ITTF President. Mr Calin also considered that the decision of the President to exclude the CEO from the BoD meeting without any notice nor consultation with the other EC colleagues was not ideal.

On a question from Mr Weikert about if Mr Calin was comparing him with Mr Sharara, Mr Calin said that he was not comparing the persons, but the actions, adding that the situations happening in the last days and weeks are putting the staff under a lot pressure, being impossible for them to continue doing a normal work in these circumstances.

The ITTF CEO, Mr Steve Dainton, outlined that it was important to be professional and follow the EC Agenda, especially as in the several previous meetings additional points proposed by the other EC members were declined particularly for that reason.

Mr Al-Mohannadi mentioned similar times when Mr Weikert acted on his own and addressed subjects and issues that were not on the agenda and reminded that there was still no official answer from Mr Weikert to his fellow EC members to why he denied the active participation of the CEO in the 2020 BoD meeting. Mr Al-Mohannadi added he was surprised by Mr Weikert's behaviour, and that he did not expect such actions from the ITTF President.

Mrs Sörling and Mr Burton indicated to Mr Weikert that they didn't want to receive such anonymous email.

1.2 Roll Call

Thomas Weikert	ITTF President
Khalil Al-Mohannadi	ITTF Deputy President
Petra Sörling	Executive Vice-President – Finance
Bruce Burton	Executive Vice-President
Masahiro Maehara	Executive Vice-President
Nestor Tenca	Executive Vice-President
Alaa Meshref	Executive Vice-President
James Morris	Executive Vice-President
Zoran Primorac	Athletes Commission Chair
In attendance	
Steve Dainton	CEO
Raul Calin	Secretary General
Iulia Necula	CEO's Office Projects Director
Claudia Vatheuer	Assistant to the President
Michael Brown	CFO – only for the correspondent point
Gabor Felegyi	Competition Director – only for the correspondent point
Mounir Bessah	Member Relation Director – only for the correspondent point
Polona Cehovin	HPD Director – only for the correspondent point
Dylan Mah	Legal Counsel – only for point 9.1
Pierre Killian	PwC – only for point 9.1
Anthony Indaimo	Withers – only for point 9.1
In absence	
Shi Zhihao	Executive Vice-President
Ryu Seungmin	IOC Member

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The Agenda was adopted with the following amendment:

6.1 Belgium TTA and Swiss TTA Letters.

3. First WG report (legal) on the DTTB Letter

Dr Meshref updated about the questionnaire sent by the legal working group to the eleven (11) EC members and the CEO.

Mr Raul Calin reported that seven EC members and the CEO completed the questionnaire in due time.

3.1 Proposed "formal" incorporation of the ITTF Legal Counsel, Dylan Mah, as the third supporting staff to the WG

Mr Calin updated the EC on the work done by the first working group in the last weeks, indicating that due to his expertise, it was considered adequate to incorporate as a third supporting staff to the legal working group the ITTF Legal Counsel.

The EC unanimously decided to formally appoint the ITTF Legal Counsel, Mr Dylan Mah as supporting staff to the working group.

20210217-EC-01

The Executive Committee decided to incorporate the ITTF Legal Counsel, Mr Dylan Mah, as the third supporting staff to the legal working group on the DTTB letter.

3.2 Proposed actions towards DTTB

Mr Anthony Indaimo, explained the process followed by the Legal WG in terms of formulating the Options Paper. Mr Indaimo indicated that Mr Weikert and Mr Dainton had not received the document and are not aware of the available five options.

Mr Weikert repeated that he had no information about the discussions held in during the specific part of the last EC meeting nor regarding the steps to be taken into this process.

Mr Dainton also confirmed that he was not aware of the discussions as he did not take part of the meeting where the available options were discussed.

Mr Indaimo reminded that the Legal WG was tasked as per its terms of reference to conduct a forensic review and investigation which led to a very clear and unambiguous Executive Summary **(ES)** and Conclusions.

In regard the next steps, the advice on further actions made available and necessary as a result of the distribution of the DTTB Letter were to protect and preserve the image, reputation and good will of ITTF as a whole, WTT, the ITTF Foundation, the ITTF EC and the ITTF Staff.

The EC noted that following the distribution of the letter sent by ITTF on 22nd of January, DTTB requested full copy of PwC report.

PwC Forensic Director, Mr Pierre Killian, confirmed that PwC has no contractual relationships or obligations to DTTB, and no obligations to release the report to DTTB. Mr Killian continued indicating that the first step was the distribution to the ITTF Member Associations of the Conclusions and, at that time PwC, was favourable to release the ES to DTTB. However, following the comments that DTTB made in the media in regard to those Conclusions, the management of PwC asked Mr Killian to act cautiously and put the necessary measures to avoid any similar leaks in the media, especially as the ES was a confidential document.

Mr Indaimo suggested to explain verbally to the EC the options available, to what Mr Weikert emphasised that not having received the Options Paper and receiving just a verbal report was not an adequate process in his opinion. Mr Weikert suggested he should receive it in written, insisting on his right to be informed, and asked what the reasons were for not having such Options Paper, and wanted this to be on the minutes.

Despite having full trust in the work done by the Legal WG, Mr Dainton, was in agreement with Mr Weikert regarding the lack of information but suggested to continue as per Mr Indaimo's recommendation.

Mr Indaimo explained that the Legal WG wanted to ensure a process that is capable of withstanding the accusations (from DTTB), doing the work with integrity, and following the right process, reason why individual questionnaires were circulated to the EC members and the CEO.

Mr Indaimo outlined once again, as he did on 4th February meeting, that disturbing articles were published in two newspapers i.e., *insidethegames*, and The Strait Times, expressing his concerns regarding the confidentiality and the potential leaks of the Conclusions document that was provided to the MA's.

Mr Weikert asked if there was any potential leak withing PwC and Mr Killian confirmed that following internal security checks, there were no leaks from PwC.

Mr Indaimo suggested it was inappropriate for a MA to use the Conclusions Document, a legally privileged document, to give information to the media.

Mr Killian emphasized that in terms of outstanding actions in relation to DTTB, the priority step was for the EC to determine how they wish to respond to DTTB's request to have a full PwC Report.

In terms of formulating the potential options that are available, the legal working group took in considerations the following objectives of the ITTF:

- regain the trust and confidence of the MAs, Officials and current potential investors and partners, defined as interested parties
- reassure the ITTF Staff who was targeted by the letter, defined by name and individuals, that they have the full trust, confidence and support of the ITTF
- to seeks response from DTTB which appropriately acknowledges the harm done by the letter

- to explore what recourse, remedies or sanctions are available to the ITTF that may be appropriated to peruse against the DTTB to try to undo the harm done by the letter
- act as deterrent to the other MA's and officials to prevent taking similar actions like those of DTTB and distribute a letter containing a series of 22 serious allegations that was sent more than 225 separate individuals and entities, reminding that PwC's report was clear and unequivocal in relation to the matters raised by DTTB's letter
- to move forward in a way that promoted ITTF's core values of transparency and good governance

Mr Indaimo continued by summarising the available options formulated by the legal working group:

- 1) The Legal WG recommended as a priority to respond to allegation made against the named individuals who were targeted by the letter and to confirm that they have the full support of the ITTF EC: *"To engage with the Staff and to find out from the staff how they have been affected or impacted by the DTTB letter and what they believe they need in order to feel that they have the full support of their employer."*
- 2) Use the internal systems and protocols including the newly formed ITTF Tribunal, the ITTF Integrity Unit or the existing Ethics Commission to investigate and/or sanction DTTB for their actions.
- 3) To seek an external legal opinion on possible civil or criminal actions in response to the unfunded allegations done by the DTTB Letter and any possible recourse in CAS.
- 4) To meet with DTTB to discuss PwC's ES and to receive feedback from DTTB on the PwC Conclusions send in the letter on 22nd of January, and the possible options for the party moving forward.
In light of the recent events i.e., the publications of the two articles by DTTB in the public media – which seems to indicate a total lack of remorse from DTTB to date, the legal working group questions the merits and benefits of option 4.
- 5) To communicate to DTTB what are the options that ITTF is considering including public apologise, sanctions and/or possible litigations, and to solicit and understand DTTB's reactions to this and its intentions as to the next steps before deciding on how best to proceed.
Will require the WG to draft a letter that will set out that particular option in order to solicit a feedback from DTTB.

Following the recommendation of the Legal WG, Mr Indaimo stressed that Option 1 should be acted as soon as possible and asked Mr Dainton what minimum actions should be taken in addition to what was completed in the questionnaire.

Mr Dainton indicated that it was complicated to make any comment when being hearing the available options for the first time and had no further information. Mr Dainton mentioned that it has been a very stressful period for the staff, especially for him, as the statements in the letter directly targeted the ITTF CEO.

Mr Dainton considered that the ITTF, WTT and himself as ITTF CEO were negatively impacted, and felt not being the right person to give comments on the Options available as he believed his opinion might be biased. Although there is no COI, Mr Dainton preferred to recuse himself from the meeting because he didn't want to be seen as influencing the decision taken by the EC and on what actions should be taken by the ITTF.

Mr Weikert asked if the Legal WG ever considered to have a call with DTTB.

Mr Calin reminded that following the circulation of the Conclusions documents to all the members, DTTB send an email to the ITTF requesting the full PwC report. Before communicating the conditions under which DTTB would be able to receive the ES, the Legal WG was informed about the publications of the articles in the media.

Mr Calin reported that when DTTB was asked about the leak to the media, they deliberately started to mix up the duties of the two WG created by ITTF, which was seen as an attempt to hide the severe accusation that they have made against the ITTF and the CEO.

In light of the recent events, the Legal WG felt it was more appropriate to discuss with the EC, particularly with the members that have no COI, and decide what are the next steps to be taken by the ITTF in that regards.

The decision taken by the EC will be then communicated to DTTB.

Mr Weikert echoed Mr Dainton, indicating that he preferred not to answer the question about the Options because it could be perceived as a biased comment. Mr Weikert added that being Law his profession, he wanted to be informed, but he preferred not to express his views.

On behalf of the Legal WG, Dr Meshref considered that the recusal of the President and the CEO was an appropriate step at this point.

Mr Weikert indicated that not having seen the minutes of the last meeting, particularly of the part which he didn't attend, he would follow the recommendation but minuting that it was not his opinion and not being sure if it was the right process.

The Legal Counsel, Mr Dylan Mah, recalled the definition of COI how is found in the ITTF's code of Ethics and recommended that as per the COI policy, each individual shall avoid any situation that could lead to COI or perceived COI. The COI must be declared, and actions should be taken by the individual to remove himself from a situation where a COI may arise and it's the personal responsibility of each person to avoid any COI.

Mr Indaimo explained that it was in Mr Weikert's best interest not to be part of the decision-making process being the ITTF President and DTTB Legal Advisor.

In the case of Mr Dainton, Mr Indaimo indicated that he was in a different position of COI, due to his possibility to seek private legal action against DTTB for the direct accusations make against him in the DTTB Letter.

Mr Weikert and Mr Dainton then recused themselves from the discussions and left the meeting temporarily at 12:20 CET.

In relation to the Options document circulated among the EC, Dr Meshref reported that the recommendation of the Legal WG was to pursue Option 1 and Option 5.

However, Dr Meshref indicated that is if DTTB doesn't accept the proposal of the legal WG then Option 2 and Option 3 may be enforced.

Dr Meshref invited then the EC members to discuss the proposed options and encouraged the other members to include any other option that they may consider appropriate.

The EC praised the professional work done by the WG including PwC together with the support of the experts from Withers.

The initial consensus from the questionnaires circulated via email was to follow the recommendation of the Legal WG to pursue Option 1 and Option 5.

The AC Chair, Mr Zoran Primorac, suggested to also pursue Option 4 and to try to give another chance to DTTB and the other MAs that supported the DTTB Letter, to discuss and try to solve the problem in a peaceful manner and try to find a settlement.

Dr Meshref emphasized that Option 4 was one of the initial preferred options and priorities but was re-considered after the leaking confidential information in the public media in regard to the Conclusions of the PwC report.

Mr Indaimo stated that there should be a clear distinction between the two working groups with different scope:

- The Legal WG to deal with the legal affairs resulted from the distribution of the DTTB Letter
- The WG dealing with the concerns of the European MA's focused on communication and building relations with the European countries.

Mr Indaimo outlined that the DTTB letter raises serious allegations:

- *The CEO of the ITTF seems to act and behave – also in his additional new function as Director WTT – as the determining person within the ITTF, more and more acting against the intentions and advice of the ITTF President.*

In Mr Indaimo's opinion, either DTTB is inventing this, or they are being led to believe by someone that the CEO is acting against the intentions and advice of the ITTF President.

Mr Morris asked for clarification on whether the "Secret Deal" will be addressed and how, and its relation with any of the options being considered.

Mr Indaimo considered that actions are needed to be taken in regard to the Secret Deal letter, to what Mr Killian agreed, adding some context.

Mr Killian explained that when addressing this issue of the Secret Deal to DTTB, they indicated that Mr Hans Wilhelm Gäb was only occupying an advisory position and didn't have the authority to go make a deal on behalf of DTTB, suggesting that the letter refers to a confidential deal as always was done in the past.

Based on his experience, Mr Killian explained that according to the timelines of the DTTB Letter and DTTB conduct's, it was looking like an attempt to take revenge from not accepting a secret deal.

In reference to the "advisory" position of Mr Gäb, Mr Calin reminded that in a previous correspondence, the DTTB appointed Mr Gäb as an interlocutor to carried out negotiations on behalf of DTTB with Mr Dainton.

Mr Indaimo raised a compliance issue, in the sense that "confidential" and "secret" words were used in the same email, words that have different meaning, and that in terms of Singapore law, WTT is obliged to report this matter to the WTT Board, particularly when, in light of the recent investigations, the commercial relations which QG have been frozen pending on the decision of this Legal WG.

Mr Indaimo suggested to take different course of actions for the DTTB Letter and for the Secret Deal.

Mrs Sörling, similarly to other EC members, praised the work of the Legal Working Group, and indicated that although she understood and was also in the agreement with some of the points of concern raised in terms of European table tennis, she was very much against the tone used and all the accusations made in the DTTB Letter, which had damaged the image of the ITTF staff and the ITTF business. While seeking diplomatic ways to talk with each other is important, in order to avoid similar actions in the future, a clear action from the ITTF is needed.

Dr Meshref lamented the harsh tone and unfounded accusations, which caused so much harm to the ITTF staff, the ITTF EC and the reputation of the ITTF as an IF, and to the ITTF business. Dr Meshref added that the ITTF cannot afford to delay this matter and it was fundamental to show that the ITTF is a strong and respected IF, and firm actions are to be taken.

Mr Burton indicated that given the negative impact on the commercial partners there need to be repercussions. He wished to see some form of sanctions towards DTTB but also believed it was important to take into consideration the value and the tradition of the DTTB.

Mrs Sörling updated the EC on the work done by the second WG (relations) and the discussions held with the European MA's. Mrs Sörling outlined that despite the technical nature of the meeting held between the second WG and the ETTU, particularly the event calendar and the WR, the President suggested not to involve the professional staff at the first meeting.

The EC members in attendance at the ETTU Congress questioned the speech of ITTF President, as in their opinion it wasn't portraying the ITTF properly.

With respect to the relationship between the ITTF President and the ITTF CEO, Mr Indaimo indicated that it's an issue that the EC had to further discuss and come to a conclusion.

Mr Calin indicated that at the initiative of the Deputy President, a meeting was held between nine EC members to discuss this matter and a follow-up meeting was proposed between Mr Weikert and Mr Dainton, with the attendance of Al-Mohannadi, Mrs Sörling and Mr Calin to clarify matters and relations. The meeting was however postponed as the President indicated that it was not urgent.

Mr Calin suggested that these tensions in the relationship are affecting not only themselves but the whole organisation.

Speaking about communication, Mr Indaimo reminded that the Master License Agreement (MLA) between the ITTF and WTT includes a provision in relation to the creation of a Steering Committee (SC) consisting of two ITTF members and two WTT members with the scope to discuss, among other things, the World Ranking. Due to the current situation, the steering committee has not been yet activated and Mr Indaimo offered to make a refreshment session about the MLA for the EC.

In regard to the composition of the second working group (relations) the EC believed that more expertise was required, and additional professional staff should be involved in these discussions, i.e., the CEO and the Competition Director, Mr Gabor Felegyi.

The EC agreed that the structure, the scope of work and timelines of the WG in charge of European Relations needs to be reconsidered and not to be confused nor to interfere with the work done by the Legal WG.

After thorough deliberations, the EC unanimously agreed to follow the recommendation of the Legal Working Group to pursue the Options 1 and 5.

The EC unanimously agree that the secret deal is subject to investigation and according to the official process it should be formally sent to Mr Dylan Mah, in his capacity as Integrity Officer and Ethic's Commission Officer, to determine which actions should be taken.

20210217-EC-01

The Executive Committee decided to follow the recommendation of the working group to pursue the Option 1 and Option 5 on the matter of the DTTB Letter.

ACTION 20210217#01	In charge: Legal Working Group	Deadline: 2021-03-14
To draft a letter to the ITTF staff to repair the harm done by the DTTB Letter.		

ACTION 20210217#02	In charge: Legal Working Group	Deadline: 2021-03-14
To draft a letter to the DTTB explaining them the options the ITTF is considering.		

ACTION 20210217#03	In charge: Legal Working Group	Deadline: 2021-03-14
To determine under which provisions or circumstances is ITTF ready to share the PwC Executive Summary with DTTB and agree on the timelines.		
ACTION 20210217#04	In charge: CEO	Deadline: 2021-03-14
To send the secret deal letter to the ITTF Legal Counsel for him to determine which actions should be taken.		

Mr Weikert and Mr Dainton returned to the videoconference and both were informed about the discussion and decision taken by the EC.

Mr Weikert suggested to make the communication with the DTTB not only in written.

Mr Dainton stressed that it was important for the ITTF President and himself to understand what the next steps in the process will be. Mr Dainton added that this is important to ensure that ITTF is moving forward in the right direction and in the best interest of ITTF.

Mr Weikert asked if the EC has already considered whether the PwC report is correct and if there is a conflict of interest either in Withers or in PwC, what -in words of Mr Weikert- was not said in a negative way but wanted to point out the potential conflict of interest of Mr Killian.

Mr Dainton expressed he has a slightly different opinion of Mr Weikert, adding he was confident that the work from the WG, which includes PwC, was very professional. Mr Dainton concluded suggesting that whichever decision the EC would take on the recommendation of the WG he would be comfortable with; but insisted to be as much informed as possible.

In answer to Mr Weikert, Dr Meshref indicated that the WG was requested to choose an independent expert to support on the forensic review, and PwC was chosen with the unanimous decision of the EC, including the President; therefore, raising doubts about a potential conflict of interest on PwC was not understandable, and asked Mr Weikert for clarification.

Mr Weikert indicated being in full agreement with Dr Meshref and indicated that maybe his comments were more about Withers than about PwC, apologizing for the confusion.

Dr Meshref indicated that also in the case of Withers, all questions raised have been systematically responded, including the twenty-two allegations made by DTTB, highlighting that Withers was only involved in the legal WG work once PwC cleared through their report Withers participation in the WTT establishment.

Mr Weikert stated it wasn't said negatively and Mr Indaimo accepted his comment.

Mr Killian suggested that as the PwC report was discussed at the 4th February meeting, and further discussions were held on 17th February, he was making himself available to speak with Mr Weikert if the rest of the EC was in agreement about PwC ES, to dissipate any doubts Mr Weikert may have in the work having been conducted.

Mr Weikert asked if the EC it was in agreement with that possibility, to what the EC agreed.

The ITTF Secretary General added that it would be important to have such call between Mr Weikert and Mr Killian to help in clarifying any doubts the President may have on the process, insisting the ITTF aim is to have clarity and that nobody in the EC feels that there is anything hidden or illegal.

3.3 Proposed actions towards other members, entities, individuals supporting DTTB Letter

Dr Meshref asked the EC for advice on how to treat the European MAs who supported the DTTB letter in order to identify if their concerns were in relation to the technical aspects or to the accusations brought to the institution and the ITTF CEO.

Mr Dylan Mah indicated that from the content of the letters that were sent in support to DTTB's letter it can be identified who was supporting partly or the whole of DTTB Letter.

The WG agreed to take further considerations in this matter.

4. **Second WG report (relations with European Member Associations)**

This point was deferred to the next EC meeting.

Following the two meetings that were already held by the second WG (relations), Dr Meshref requested a report including supportive documents that will help the EC to make a decision.

5. **Table Tennis Canada and Paul Kyle complaints**

This point was deferred to the next EC meeting.

6. **Any other business**

In reference to the letter sent by the Belgian Table Tennis Association, Mr Al-Mohannadi indicated that he would prefer to reply in his capacity as Qatar table Tennis Association (QTTA) as the president of BEL TTA is complaining about the hospitality conditions and hotel rates offered during the 2021 WTT ME Hub in Doha.

In reference to the letter received from the Swiss Table Tennis Association, Dr Meshref indicated that he considered that Mr Silberschmidt used unappropriated language when stating that the letters supporting Hungary Table Tennis Association are mostly coming from "small associations" while referring to the Belgian Table Tennis Association as a "big federation" with tradition.

In Dr Meshref's opinion, that language is not acceptable when dealing with 226 MAs and when ITTF's motto is Table Tennis. For All. For Life.

Mr Dainton indicated that he will reply personally to the Swiss TTA letter as it was addressed to him.

7. Next EC Meeting

The next EC meeting to be held on Sunday, 28th February 2021.

8. Adjournment

Without further points on the agenda, the Executive Committee Meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm (CET time).

Thomas Weikert
ITTF President

Date

Raul Calin
ITTF Secretary General

Date