

EXHIBIT 73

BEFORE THE AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION

North American Court of Arbitration for Sport Panel

United States Anti-Doping Agency,)
)
 Claimant,)
 v.)
)
 Floyd Landis,)
)
 Respondent)
 _____)

AAA No. 30 190 00847 06

DECLARATION OF CORINNE BUISSON

I, Corinne Buisson, declare :

1. I make this declaration based on my personal knowledge, and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the matters set forth herein.
2. I have a doctoral degree in analytical chemistry and a specialty in IRMS analysis.
3. I am an employee of the *Laboratoire National de Dépistage du Dopage* (LNDD).
I am LNDD's IRMS supervisor.
4. I am fluent reading and writing English and semi-fluent speaking English.
5. I have reviewed the declaration of Paul Scott submitted in this case. It contains a number of inaccurate statements. It also does not mention important facts that bear on the matters described.
6. I was present at LNDD for my normal work schedule on 16 April 2007. I had earlier been made aware that several individuals would be present during the week to observe athlete B sample analysis.

7. These individuals were Paul Scott and Dr. Simon Davis, whom I understood had come on behalf of Mr. Landis. I also understood that Dr. Rodrigo Aguilera and USADA's counsel, Dan Dunn, were present on behalf of USADA.

8. During the course of my employment at LNDD, I have participated in one other B sample confirmation test. I am familiar with LNDD's general policy regarding the scope and nature of the athlete representative's rights at the B sample test.

9. As a scientist, I believe it is important to prevent interference with the testing process by outside observers. The IRMS testing that I oversee is complex and requires careful attention to detail. Athlete representatives must not distract the lab staff during sample analysis.

10. During the six days that Mr. Scott and Dr. Davis were in the lab, I observed them on several occasions attempt to engage laboratory employees conducting analysis on the B samples in conversation, asking them questions and, on occasion, crowding their personal space.

11. USADA representatives did not request or direct LNDD to prevent or limit the ability of Dr. Davis or Mr. Scott to view IRMS data reduction or processing. Mr. Scott's assertion in paragraph 5.c.i. on page 4 of his declaration that he asked to witness the operation of the IRMS as well as the data processing but was denied access in each instance, is inaccurate or misleading. So too is his statement in paragraph 5.c.xi. on page 5 that he was never permitted to observe data processing for any sample. Mr. Scott or Dr. Davis were invited to observe the IRMS analysis for all samples but sometimes they decided not to come and other times they had already decided to leave for the day when the processing occurred. One or both of them observed the data processing for samples 825423, 825426, and 825428. Mr. Scott was given the opportunity to view the data reduction or processing in the IRMS room for another sample, but chose instead to observe the sample preparation activities occurring in another room.

12. Mr. Scott and Dr. Davis were permitted into the sample preparation room and the IRMS room on dozens of occasions throughout the week. During that time, Mr. Scott and Mr. Davis were able to and did in fact view SOPs contained in a binder in each room. His description paragraph 5.b. on pages 3 and 4 of his declaration creates the misimpression that his and Dr. Davis' review and access to SOPs regarding the sample preparation and IRMS analyses were improperly limited. On the contrary, the SOPs regarding sample preparation were in the documentation packages that Mr. Landis had already been provided and that Dr. Davis or Mr. Scott had with them. In addition, the SOP for the IRMS analysis was available for Dr. Davis to view in the IRMS room.

13. In paragraph 5.b.i. on page 3 of his declaration, Mr. Scott states that he asked me about the SOPs in the laboratory documentation package and that I told him they were incomplete. This is incorrect and itself an incomplete description of what occurred. On Tuesday morning, April 17, Mr. Scott observed me reviewing our Quality Assurance (QA) Manual regarding that day's tests. He asked what I was reviewing. I told him I was looking at the standard laboratory documentation package that we always send to athletes, which had already been produced to Mr. Landis, including the operating procedure for GC/C/IRMS (M-EX -24) At that point, Mr. Scott asked if there were other documents. In response, Ms. Mongongu – not I, as asserted by Mr. Scott – explained that LNDD had quality assurance documents called *Document Qualité*. At that point, Mr. Scott asked for copies of documents from a different part of the QA Manual. Mr. Dunn objected because they were beyond the scope of what had already been provided to Mr. Landis or allowed in the arbitration. Mr. Scott replied that he thought he would ask "just in case" he could get them, or words to that effect.

14. Mr. Scott's statement in paragraph 7 on page 6 of his declaration that Mr. Dunn and Dr. Aguilera had "unfettered" access to laboratory employees is incorrect. As with all outside parties who are allowed to have access to the laboratory area, Mr. Dunn and Dr. Aguilera were accompanied by an LNDD employee at all times when they were in the laboratory area. I do not recall conveying any substantive information to either of the USADA representatives regarding the B sample analyses that was not also given to Mr. Landis' representatives.

15. Mr. Scott states in paragraph 5.b.vi. on page 4 of his declaration that, on Tuesday April 17, I instructed him that he could review only materials approved by Mr. Dunn and that any other documents were off-limits. I do not recall ever making this statement. I do recall, however, telling Mr. Scott that the documentation package he already had in his possession contained SOPs that were in the binder he was reviewing in the lab and that he should limit his review to those.

16. On Friday 20 April I was present while the parties discussed the remaining schedule of results reporting. Because all the samples would be prepared by Saturday, both the USADA representatives and Mr. Landis' representatives agreed that none of them would stay after Saturday. They also agreed that neither party would receive the remaining test results without the other having the same and simultaneous opportunity. They agreed that the exclusive means by which they would obtain the sample results would be by way of an email to be sent simultaneously by LNDD to each side on Sunday and Monday when the results became available.

17. Mr. Scott's statement at paragraph 8.d. on page 7 of his declaration - - that at 11 a.m. on Saturday 21 April, he informed me, Dr. de Ceaurriz, and Dr. Aguilera that he wanted to be present, if possible, on Sunday - - is not accurate. Mr. Scott did not make a statement

regarding the possibility that he might be present on Sunday until Saturday afternoon, not in the morning. I know this because Mr. Dunn had already left on Saturday when Mr. Scott said this, and I remember that Mr. Dunn left in the early afternoon. I found Mr. Scott's statements unclear at that point on his intentions to return.

18. When I arrived at the laboratory for work on Sunday 23 April at approximately 12:00 p.m., I observed Mr. Scott and his interpreter sitting on a bench outside of the laboratory. Mr. Scott was knitting what appeared to be a sweater, and I made a joke to him about knitting on such a warm day. I had not observed Mr. Scott with knitting on any other day of the week.

19. Neither on Monday 16 April nor any other day during which I observed Mr. Scott or Dr. Davis at the lab did any person associated with Mr. Landis voice an objection to proceeding with the analysis of the samples in the absence of an expert appointed by the arbitration panel.

20. Neither on Monday 16 April nor any other day during which I observed Mr. Scott or Dr. Davis at the lab did any person associated with Mr. Landis make any request that the remaining B samples should be split or divided in some way to preserve them for other testing.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of France and the State of California
that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on April 30, 2007.

Corinne Buisson

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Corinne Buisson', written over a horizontal line.