

WADA ExCo and Foundation Board Meetings November 2016 Glasgow, UK

Dear Colleagues:

This is the latest in iNADO's thrice-a-year review and summary of the documents prepared for upcoming WADA ExCo and Foundation Board (FB) meetings. It is prepared with the NADO / RADO community in mind. Please use this summary to brief your government colleagues so that our Public Authority representatives are properly equipped to participate fully and constructively.

Because of the exigencies of time, not all WADA documents are summarized or even mentioned below. This is not to say that they are not all important; of course they are. Unfortunately there is little coverage of the proposed 2018 WADA Budget. However, experience shows that the government officials who prepare Ministers turn to these documents first and do a good job of analysing them. With the limited time available what follows are the other most important points to consider.

3.0 Directors General's Report (see also 3.0 Attachment 1, DG's Report September 2016, and Attachment 2 report on Cyber-Attacks)

- An update from the report given to the ExCo September 2016 (which is Attachment 1).
- McLaren Report:
 - Exact date of second report unknown. Note WADA announcement October 26th indicating early December.
 - McLaren and WADA cooperating with IOC Disciplinary Commission created relating to individuals in Russian sport and Ministry of Sport named in McLaren Report.
 - Names of athletes uncovered by McLaren being forwarded to IFs for ADRV prosecutions.
- Cyber-Attack:
 - ADAMS not penetrated.
 - "Joint Defence Agreement" with IOC in information sharing and security.
 - Cost to WADA of dealing with the Fancy Bears cyber-attack estimated at \$500,000 (WADA is consulting with its insurers).
- Council of Europe:
 - WADA to sign MOU with CoE at November Ministerial Meeting for closer collaboration on Code and Convention monitoring of Convention Signatories and their NADOs.

- Investigations Fund:
 - Approximately \$450,000 donated by governments but not yet matched sport.
 - Will be used entirely for McLaren investigations; no reserve for future investigations.

4.1 President's Term Renewal

- The Foundation Board is asked to approve renewing Sir Craig Reedie for a second three-year term.

4.2 Election of Vice-President

- There four nominees for decision by the Foundation Board:
 - Ms. Linda Hofstand Helleland (Minister of Culture, Norway)
 - Hon. Makhosini Hlongwane (Minister of Sport and Recreation, Zimbabwe)
 - Mr. Happy Ntshingila (Chairman, Hashirika Holdings, South Africa)
 - Dr. Ousman Sanyang (Medical Practitioner, Edward Francis Small Teaching Hospital, Islamic Republic of Gambia)

4.3 WADA Statutes (and 4.3.1 Compliance Review Committee) (see 11.1.2 and 11.1.3 below)

- It is proposed to amend the WADA Statutes concerning the status of the independent Compliance Review Committee (CRC) giving it the ability to operate under its own by-laws.
- Jonathan Taylor is proposed as the new chair of the CRC. A very well-known English sport lawyer, and anti-doping expert, most recently he was head of the WADA IO Team at the Rio Olympic Games.

5.1 Think Tank Outcomes (Lausanne, September 2016) (and Attachments 1 and 2) (see also 5.7 below)

- Briefly, consensus of participants is reported on:
 - Enhanced compliance with proportionate and graded sanctions, better funding, regular auditing of Code Signatories and fines against non-compliance organisations.
 - Enhanced WADA intelligence and investigations capacity and activity.
 - A whistleblower programme (see 10.2 below).
 - Improved doping control with enhanced training and auditing of DCOs.
 - Improved WADA monitoring of accredited laboratories, and stronger requirements for laboratory autonomy.
 - Confirm WADA is first and foremost a regulatory body (and increase financial contributions to enable this role properly).
 - Governments must enhance their commitment to the UNESCO Convention.
 - Strengthen WADA governance (possibly, for example, through an independent president, ExCo and FB term limits, more athlete representation, etc.).

- More Think Tanks in 2017, broader Stakeholder consultation on outcomes in 2018, World Conference in 2019.

5.2 Olympic Summit Declaration (and Attachment 1) (see also 5.7 below)

- The declaration of the 5th Olympic Summit is attachment 1.
- It reiterated the important principle that anti-doping should be conducted independently of international sport organisations.
- However, it said nothing explicit about state-sponsored doping in Russia or at the Sochi Winter Olympic Games.

5.3 Governments Forum

- To be held in London November 17 - 18 prior to the meetings in Glasgow.
- Attended by public authority representatives on the WADA ExCo and FB.
- An opportunity to raise any issues to be brought forward to the ExCo and FB meetings

5.4 NADO Leaders' Summits (and Attachments 1 and 2) (see also 5.7 below)

- NADO leaders met in Copenhagen in August. They proposed a reform agenda for anti-doping including steps to reform WADA governance to eliminate conflicts of interest and enhance its independence, and steps need to confront state-sponsored doping, including new Code violations and enhanced WADA investigatory and sanctioning. [See press release here.](#)
- NADO leaders also met in Bonn in October. They renewed the reform agenda (noting the considerable athlete, national sport organisation and government support it is receiving) and emphasised the need to reform WADA governance by ensuring that all executive functions are overseen by a board of independent persons. [See press release here.](#)
- NADO leaders will meet again in Ireland in January 2017.
- iNADO will host a leaders' meeting for all of its Members in the second half of 2017.

5.6 Independent Testing Authority (and Attachments 1, 2 and 3)

- A technical working group met in September to consider a consultant's report on the feasibility of a new independent testing authority (ITA).
- A higher-level steering group will meet later in November.
- The technical group takes the view an ITA "could" be set up to provide high-quality services for:
 - International Federations that delegate the majority of their anti-doping responsibilities to such an authority including testing, management of therapeutic use exemptions, results management and prosecution of cases in front of an independent first instance body.
 - International Federations that have been declared non-compliant through the enhanced WADA Compliance Programme. (Whether they are required to temporarily or permanently subscribe to the ITA would need to be a consideration. In addition, whether

a NADO could be referred to the ITA for noncompliance was also discussed, but this would need further discussion and consultation with NADOs.)

- Major Event Organizations (MEOs) that wish to delegate authority for the task of organising anti-doping controls during their events.
- At present and depending on the number and size (of the anti-doping programmes) of IFs that would delegate responsibilities and obligations to the ITA, the consultant PWC estimates the costs to be in the range of US\$20-70 million per year (refer to the PWC report – Attachment 2 – for the detailed numbers).
- The model is based on the use of NADOs and private sample collection organizations performing sample collection. It was suggested by a WG member that the ITA could potentially have a number of its own doping control officers which may deliver cost efficiencies and increase effectiveness. It was felt by some others however that this would have a significant financial and human resource cost and should be carefully evaluated. Such costs were not accounted for in the PWC study.
- *[Comment: While there is no explicit mention of the iNADO working paper on ITA options submitted to the technical group, a number of the ideas discussed at the technical group meeting outcomes reflect analysis and proposals in the iNADO working paper. Particularly the proposal that an ITA may not be necessary at all, or only for some international sport organisations, and that leading NADOs have the expertise and interest in partnering with international sport organisations to provide independent doping control to them.]*

5.7 Way Forward in the Fight Against Doping (and Attachment 1)

- *[This is an important document and worth careful study. However, it does not fully reflect the reform agenda presented by NADO Leaders in Copenhagen and in Bonn (see 5.4 above).]*
- This analysis prepared by WADA staff synthesises the outcomes of the NADO Leaders' Summit (August, but not October) (5.4 above), the WADA Think Tank (September) (5.1 above) and the Olympic Summit (October) (5.2 above).
- This “way forward” document aims to summarise in a coordinated fashion the views expressed by all of the parties mentioned above; as well as, to indicate what actions have already been taken by WADA and to suggest a way forward.
- Among the document's recommendations:
 - Code Compliance: The Foundation Board to recommend an increase of WADA's budget for more resources to be dedicated to the WADA compliance programme and mandate the WADA Finance Committee to include that in the proposed 2018 Budget.
 - WADA Investigations: The Foundation Board to support the implementation of a policy giving the WADA Investigation Department more independence.
 - : The Foundation Board to accept the proposed WADA Whistleblower Programme (10.2 below) with the understanding that it be regularly reviewed and improved upon over time.
 - : In light of the cover-up at the Sochi and Moscow laboratories, it is proposed that a working group be set up to discuss how the accreditation process can be further

improved in the future. Furthermore, there has been discussion as to whether the system should be changed so that there are fewer laboratories, with a better geographical distribution, each receiving a bigger volume of analyses, or potentially laboratories acting as reference laboratories for confirmation analysis. We would propose therefore that the same working group look into this proposal as well. Recommendation:

- The Foundation Board to accept the creation of a working group comprised of the Chair of the Health, Medical and Research Committee, the President of the World Association of Anti-Doping Scientists (WAADS), another laboratory representative, an independent lawyer and representatives from the WADA Science and Legal Departments. The group would report on its work at the Foundation Board meeting in May 2017.
- WADA Governance: Changing the governance of the organization will require careful thinking and consideration of many different parameters. It is therefore proposed to appoint a working group to study the matter carefully, including what works well within the existing WADA Governance structure and what might be improved, and to come back to the WADA Foundation Board with some concrete proposals. This group should include two athlete representatives, two government representatives, two Sport representatives, two independent experts in governance to be supported by WADA Management. WADA would cover the costs of the experts and of the athletes; all other costs would be covered by their constituent groups. Recommendation:
 - The Foundation Board to approve the setup of a working group on governance with the intent of having an initial report made available in May 2017.
- National Legislation: Having appropriate national legislation in place to support the fight against doping is necessary. Having model legislation that could be adopted by governments that have no legislation in place is certainly worth exploring. Almost four years ago, UNESCO had initiated a project along these lines which led to the evaluation of anti-doping policy in seven countries. WADA Management therefore suggests re-engaging UNESCO to discuss with them the possibility of having a research project funded by the UNESCO Voluntary Fund to develop model legislation that could then be promoted around the world. Recommendation:
 - The Foundation Board to support the initiation of such discussions with UNESCO.
- : That the Foundation Board accept the idea that once the new elements in relation to the way forward have been identified, the Finance Committee, in cooperation with WADA Management, be entrusted with the task of putting together a budget mirroring the expectations of the WADA Foundation Board.
- ADAMS IT Security: The Foundation Board to agree that an increase of WADA's budget to allow more investment towards improvement of the ADAMS system is required; and, the WADA Finance Committee to include this recommendation in the 2018 budget.

7.5 (Attachment 1) 2017 Budget Strategic and Operational Plan Explanations

- There is a continuing grant of \$170,000 to support of Sport Accord (p. 26) but no corresponding support for iNADO (p. 26).

8.2 Education Report

- Athlete Learning Programme about Health and Anti-Doping (ALPHA): ALPHA, which is an online learning tool for elite athletes, was officially launched at the 2014 ADO Symposium in Lausanne. ALPHA currently has over 7,700 users who have successfully completed the course, in over 200 countries from over 100 sports. In the last year, the focus with ALPHA has been on translation to facilitate reaching a wider audience. French and Spanish were completed in 2015 with Croatian and Japanese now in the final stages of production, following collaboration with the Croatian and Japanese NADOs.
- Anti-Doping Organization Online Resource: This is an online tool being developed for anti-doping organizations to consolidate anti-doping information in a way that is accessible, easy to understand, and available in one place. As well, it provides an extensive overview of the main anti-doping processes. The system is due to be launched at the end of 2016.

9.2 Science Report

- New tests and new doping substances (which have unspecified budgetary implications for laboratories and NADOs/RADOs) – hGH Biomarker Assay:
 - Following the publication of a second, improved version of the Guidelines on the hGH Biomarkers Test in April 2016, and the successful participation in the WADA EQAS study, 15 laboratories are now routinely applying this method. It is foreseen that the number of laboratories will increase gradually over the next 1-2 years until all accredited laboratories have the analytical capacity to perform this test.
 - The new Guidelines have simplified the interpretation of test results and provided specific instructions for the application and interpretation of the bottom-up LC-MS/MS method for IGF-I analysis. The application of this method for a passport-like longitudinal application is currently being explored.
 - At the same time, a new top-down approach for IGF-I analysis by LC-MS/MS is being developed. Once both LC-MS/MS methods are available, this would make possible stopping the dependency on commercially available immunoassays, which are susceptible to changes or withdrawal from the market by the manufacturers.

9.3 Medical Report

- Leak of TUE Information: As reported in the Director General's report, many TUEs of athletes who were attending the Rio Olympic Games were accessed through a specific IOC ADAMS account. Despite the fact that hackers had access to TUEs and medical information for a large number of high profile athletes going back many years, the leaks demonstrated, if anything, that the TUE process was, by and large, fair and rigorous. A number of the leaked TUE certificates

were revealed to be fabrications that could not be authentically generated in ADAMS because they were associated with TUEs that were rejected, cancelled, in process or otherwise non-approved TUEs. Forensic document analysis in cooperation with the ADAMS team intended to establish the extent of document fabrication is ongoing.

- Integrity of the TUE Process: The information leak has raised many questions regarding TUEs, including the most core question: do we need TUEs at all? Over years of engagement with athletes, physicians and other anti-doping stakeholders, TUEs have been deemed to be overwhelmingly necessary to sport and the anti-doping movement. The notion of precluding athletes that suffer from illnesses and conditions such as diabetes, asthma, inflammatory bowel disease, rheumatological conditions, etc. from sport cannot be given serious consideration. It would undermine a fundamental value of sport that is the right of access and participation to sport and play, which has long been recognized by numerous international conventions.
 - Can TUEs be used to cheat? Are other athletes at a disadvantage? The granting of a TUE follows a rigorous review process as defined in the Code and the ISTUE. This process includes the evaluation of TUEs by three physicians specialized in sports medicine and/or other relevant specialities. A TUE provides a limited exemption to use a particular prohibited substance or method at a prescribed dosage, frequency, route of administration and duration to treat a specific medical condition.
 - The majority of athletes needing TUEs often remain at a disadvantage because of their illness/condition despite the exemption to use medications. In fact, the granting of a large number of TUEs is not in the least controversial as it is commonly agreed that the combination of sport and substance do not present a possibility of ergogenesis, e.g. a curler treated with insulin for diabetes. Furthermore, a large number of the TUEs leaked were for substances such as inhaled beta-2 agonists that have since been removed from the Prohibited List and therefore no longer require a TUE.
 - In late September, the TUE Expert Group drafted an open letter supporting the integrity of the TUE process which WADA made public via its website. WADA also posted a comprehensive new TUE Fact Sheet as well as regular communications to keep the public, athletes and other stakeholders accurately informed during the period of the leaks.

10.2 Whistleblowing Programme and Policy (and Attachment 1)

- Recent cases have shown that the question of how to handle whistleblowers has to be addressed without delay. WADA needs to implement a programme that would encourage athletes and other persons to report wrongdoings. A comprehensive whistleblowing programme should ensure that wrongdoings can be reported in total confidence with appropriate security mechanisms, to provide greater assurance for those that come forward with valuable information.
- The proposed WADA policy is the legal framework in support of the whistleblower programme. It describes what can be reported, how it can be reported, how the information received will be processed and stored, and who will have access to this information. A further key point is the scope of support that WADA can offer to whistleblowers, which is made clear in the policy.

- This policy is a legal document which aims at clearly defining the process to be followed and the obligations and rights of both the Informant/Whistleblower and WADA. Another document, shorter and more user-friendly, addressed to the general public and athletes in particular, will be prepared once this policy is approved.
- The WADA whistleblowing programme will also include the setup of an IT system with all the security that is required to ensure that information is handled and maintained in an appropriate fashion. WADA has entered into agreement with the company Got Ethics A/S which will provide an online platform and an application for smartphones. (Anti-Doping Denmark and Anti-Doping Norway already use the Got Ethics system, and iNADO has just announced a partnership with Got Ethics to provide access to other iNADO member NADOs.) This is currently being developed in consultation with the WADA IT Department and the external expert on data protection. The Got Ethics product offers very good solutions in terms of security and encryption, as well as very practical tools to manage the information received. It is planned that the server on which the information will be stored will be in Canada. The back-up system will be carried out by Got Ethics and thus separated from other WADA servers. Access to the information will be given exclusively to the WADA Intelligence and Investigations Department.
- It will also be crucial to devote attention and resources to ensuring effective implementation of the policy, i.e. to creating a culture of whistleblowing on doping across sports and countries. Putting in place comprehensive and continued athlete training and engagement, as well as external communication measures will be critical success factors along with adequate human, technical and financial resource allocation. Comprehensive stakeholder engagement in the further development of the Policy will also be critical in ensuring continued support and effective implementation. The launch of the whistleblowing programme is set for January 2017.
- *[Comment: Cultural change cannot be over-emphasised. Measures to create a positive culture of reporting suspected wrongdoing in sport will take time and proper research. This will be a long-term effort, much like prevention and education for clean sport itself.]*

10.3 Intelligence & Investigations Report

- *[Comment: what follows gives an indication of the depth and breadth and completeness of the investigation being conducted by Richard McLaren and his team, and why such investigations to be conclusive are costly and take time.]*
- WADA Support for McLaren Report – Phase 1: Following the revelations made by Dr. Rodchenkov in the New York Times in early May 2016 regarding doping manipulation methods during the Sochi Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games, Prof. Richard McLaren was appointed by the WADA President as the Independent Person (IP) to investigate these allegations. In this regard, WADA's I&I Manager was seconded full-time to the McLaren investigation team. The main tasks of the WADA I&I Manager were:
 - To lead all researches and reports (approximately 1,200 checks) into ADAMS, in order to identify and collect data on Russian targeted athletes.
 - To liaise with the relevant WADA accredited laboratories regarding different forensic requests.

- To manage, with the support of the WADA Medical Manager, the identification (within the 3,800 urine samples seized by WADA in Moscow) of the selected urine samples and their extraction.
- To manage the secure shipment (of the abovementioned samples) via refrigerated box, to the London WADA accredited laboratory, selected by the IP for forensic platform for DNA analysis, Salt rate analysis, scratch and marks forensic evaluations.
- To liaise with the IOC Medical Department (Dr Richard Budgett) to receive IOC authorization to remove and transfer the Sochi urine samples of the Russian Olympic athletes (including medalists) from the Lausanne laboratory to the London laboratory. This included the support of a joint team of staff and experts in order to identify and extract the IOC urine samples from Sochi. Ten persons were involved due to the specific IOC extraction protocol.
- To physically travel with the abovementioned samples, to ensure their security (as expressly requested by the IOC and Lausanne laboratory Director). In this regard, road shipment (24 hour mission) was selected. The I&I Manager liaised with the London laboratory to ensure proper reception, classification and storage within their cold room. The samples were safely delivered, the chain of custody duly documented, and the data logger confirmed the constant chain of temperature. A detailed report of the mission was provided to Dr Budgett by email.
- To interview, with Martin Dubbey (key investigator of the IP team), key witnesses and selected WADA Independent Observer members from Sochi.
- To prepare with the McLaren investigation team, the final draft of the IP report, before publication in July 2016.
- WADA Support for McLaren Report – Phase 2 (September until release): WADA's I&I Manager has continued his work with the McLaren investigation team in Phase 2 of the report. This has included:
 - Coordination with WADA's Science Department and WADA accredited laboratories (predominantly European), to identify urine samples of targeted athletes, and to organize anti-doping analyses (long term metabolites) as well as DNA testing.
 - Management secure shipment of urine samples from Lausanne to London.
 - Coordinating (with Martin Dubbey) DNA forensic analyses, and cross-checking the examination of these between the London DNA and Lausanne DNA units.
 - Leading all ADAMS researches.

11.1.2 Consequences of Non-Compliance (and Attachment 1)

- *[Comment: This is among the most important and urgent matters on the ExCo and FB agenda.]*
- A verbal update will be presented.
- Cases of non-compliance – what we have seen so far:
 - Currently, typical cases of non-compliance that the independent Compliance Review Committee has dealt with include the following:

- A few specific components of an anti-doping programme having limited impact are determined not to be in line with the Code or International Standards (IS);
 - Significant components of the anti-doping programme with high impact are determined not to be in line with the Code or IS;
 - Legislation and/or regulation are determined not to be in line with the Code or IS;
 - Demonstrated and deliberate attempt/s either by the Government, IF, NOC or, NADO through interference to circumvent the rules of the Code or IS.
 - Up until now, cases have been treated in essentially the same manner. In other words, the same types of sanctions have been imposed by WADA no matter:
 - - What the case of non-compliance is;
 - - How long the signatory has been non-compliant; or,
 - - How many times the signatory has been non-compliant.
 - The reason is simple - WADA does not have a tool box of consequences, has limited power as to what it can do and believes that the consequences for breaches should be consistent. The objectives of increasing WADA's capacity to impose consequences is to compel signatories to be compliant, to have a deterrent effect on other signatories, and to allow WADA to recover all, or a portion, of costs of investigation and audit. It is also to allow WADA to implement consequences that are appropriately adjusted to the level of infraction.
- Proposed Guiding Principles for Consequences of Non-Compliance:
 - **Basic guidelines**
 - WADA existing compliance monitoring programme is certified ISO 9001; 2015.
 - WADA is the anti-doping regulatory organization accountable for the imposition of certain consequences on non-compliant signatories.
 - The imposition of consequences is a last resort mechanism to motivate non-compliant signatories to regain compliance. It follows a corrective action period and a warning. Consequences are, however, important tools and will be imposed without hesitation when required.
 - Prior to declaring a signatory non-compliant, WADA will collaborate with the signatory to resolve the relevant issues by: favoring engagement, identifying the corrective actions and establishing timelines, providing advices, support and sharing of best practices.
 - The imposition of consequences penalising signatories and athletes will be used as the last resort mechanism to require non-compliant signatories to achieve or regain compliance.
- *[Comment: This last point is critical. Up to now, there has been no regard for the "collateral damage" clean athletes suffer when they are deprived of the protection of a full anti-doping programme when due to a legislative or other isolated problem an entire programme is declared non-compliant and is suspended. For example, in Spain, a major sporting nation. So there should be a sixth "basic guideline" or guiding principle: even in "the last resort," consequences must*

include measures to provide clean athletes with anti-doping protection while corrective measures are taken.]

- **Additional Considerations.**Consequences will:
 - be graduated depending on the particular context (light, moderate and severe);
 - be added (new ones) in the event that the issues are not resolved within a prescribed time limit or in the case of a second or a third declaration of non-compliance;
 - be clear, published on WADA website and communicated more widely, easy to understand, prescriptive and automatic;
 - include significant financial consequences (compensatory financial consequences are already included in the reinstatement contractual agreement) which will take into account the gravity of the non-compliance as well as the signatory's capability to pay, and will be imposed in addition to other consequences, not in isolation;
 - be imposed on the signatory and, where appropriate in respect of identified problem areas, to avoid, or minimize, as much as possible, collateral damages that may weaken the anti-doping system (e.g. avoiding zones in which no anti-doping activities are occurring as a result of non-compliance);
 - come into effect the day that WADA's Foundation Board declares a signatory non-compliant (Decisions by the WADA Foundation Board may be taken between formal meetings); and
 - come to an end when WADA's Foundation Board reinstates a signatory.
 - The reinstatement process will include:
 - a review of the non-compliance case by the WADA internal Task Force to ensure that conditions set by the Foundation Board have been met by the signatory and all consequences have been fully implemented;
 - a review by the CRC and a recommendation to the Foundation Board; and
 - a decision of the Foundation Board.
 - Signatories have the right to appeal WADA's Foundation Board declaration of non-compliance to the Court of Arbitration of Sport (Code: Art. 23.5.4).
 - Additional consequences, in accordance with the Code, may be implemented by sports organizations (IOC, IPC, IF and MEO) as appropriate.

11.1.3 New Declarations of Non-Compliance

- WADA Foundation Board is asked to declare the following Anti-Doping Organizations non-compliant with immediate effect, based on the recommendations from the Compliance Review Committee:
 - Azerbaijan Anti-Doping Agency (AZADA)
 - Autoridade Brasileira de Controle de Dopagem (ABCD)

- Guatemala National Anti-Doping Agency
 - Hellenic National Council for Combating Doping (ESKAN)
 - Lembaga Anti-Doping Indonesia (LADI)
- *[Comment: It is puzzling that Code compliance continues to focus solely on countries and on national anti-doping programmes. Are the anti-doping programmes of international sport organisations being scrutinised in exactly the same way as are national anti-doping programmes? Do any IF anti-doping programmes have operational or policy issues revealed to WADA through ADAMS, through anecdotal reports or other information reaching WADA? For example, in light of the major failures in the IOC's doping control programme at the 2016 Rio Olympic Summer Games revealed by the WADA Independent Observer Team, why is the IOC not being considered for non-compliance by the FB at this time? Some will say there seems to be an emerging double standard. If this is not addressed, it will threaten the credibility of the entire Code compliance monitoring exercise.]*

11.1.4.1 Update on Russia (Attachment 1)

- There have been several challenges with testing in Russia during RUSADA's period of non-compliance to date. The WADA Foundation Board in May 2016 was presented with these challenges and a second report was posted on the WADA Web site on 15 June 2016 (Attachment 1). Some of the key challenges to date:
 - Lack of compliance by athletes to provide whereabouts;
 - Access to closed cities is restricted;
 - Lack of cooperation by National Federations;
 - Failure to provide information on competitions;
 - Lack of cooperation during testing sessions;
 - Lack of cooperation of coaches, doctors and venue staff; and
 - Reports of doping control packages being opened by Russian Customs authorities before leaving the country.
- Since this report in June, WADA has also learnt that all samples at the Moscow laboratory have been sealed by the Russian Independent Investigative Committee and access to the samples by WADA and International Federations have been denied. Several letters have been sent to the Minister of Sport requesting access to samples at the laboratory. To date access is still denied.
- While a project plan has been put in place to assist RUSADA in achieving compliance there needs to be a fundamental cultural change in Russia toward doping free sport before the Compliance Review Committee can recommend to the WADA Foundation Board the reinstatement of RUSADA activities.
- It is also important to point out that to date there has been no official acceptance of wrongdoing by RUSADA or the Russian Government based on findings from the Independent Commission (IC) Report chaired by Mr. Richard Pound or the Independent Person (IP) report chaired by Professor Richard McLaren.

12.0 ADAMS Report

- Security Enhancements: ADAMS was under moratorium during much of this reporting period in regards to ADAMS development, due to the Olympic and Paralympic Games. During the moratorium, efforts continued with regards to performance and stability. However, due to the “Fancy Bear” attacks on WADA and its systems, the entire focus was redirected towards addressing this threat. Consequently we prioritized security related releases to ADAMS. Security related updates to ADAMS included:
 - Increased enforced since 22 August 2016;
 - Forgot Password function from the ADAMS login page has been temporarily disabled; it will be reinstated following the implementation of security improvements currently under development;
 - Full password change in the *ADAMS Training* environment executed by WADA;
 - Retired inactive accounts for ADAMS Production;
 - Newly created ADAMS 10 days after their creation should they remain idle;
 - Improved login security with the use of Personal Verification Questions (PVQs) to be implemented as an additional method for users to authenticate their identity when changing their password or logging in via a new device; and
 - Improved logging with regards to security and monitoring of user activities.

14.0 NADO/RADO Relations

- WADA continues to work directly with a number of NADOs in various stages of development and with various Code compliance issues, including those of Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, Nigeria, Russia, Thailand, Turkey and Ukraine.
- NADOs continue to support RADOs, and other NADOs, around the world. In particular, those providing assistance include ADCH (Switzerland), ADNO (Norway), ADoP (Portugal), AEPSAD (Spain), AFLD (France), ASADA (Australia), CCES (Canada), CNCD (Chile), Columbian NADO, DFSNZ (New Zealand), FINCIS (Finland), JADA (Japan), NADA Germany, PANDA (Poland), SAIDS (South Africa), UKAD (United Kingdom) and USADA (United States of America).

15.0 Government Relations and UNESCO Update

- *[Comment: It is puzzling that there is no mention of how the intergovernmental organisations UNESCO and the Council of Europe are dealing with state-sponsored doping in Russia contrary to fundamental obligations of the anti-doping conventions of those two bodies. Both bodies have been formally notified by WADA of the facts of the non-compliance.]*

17.0 Standards and Harmonisation Report (and Attachment 1)

- Code Implementation and Compliance: The Department continues to work closely with the WADA internal Compliance Task Force in the development of a programme to monitor and


- assess signatories' compliance with the 2015 Code and International Standards. The programme was certified in April 2016 against the ISO9001:2015 standard and an ISO consultant continues to work closely with WADA to further develop and improve the programme. In addition, WADA continues to develop an online system that will house the compliance questionnaire which signatories will be required to complete.
- The development of the compliance IT system is well underway and is scheduled to be released to signatories early in 2017.
 - 2015 Testing Figures Report: It has been published [here](#). Some highlights of the report in comparison to 2014 are:
 - the total number of samples analyzed in 2015 was 303,358. This was an increase of 20,054 or (12.4%);
 - there was an increase of 5,249 (51.5%) non-ABP blood samples collected;
 - there was an increase of 2,163 (9%) Athlete Biological Passport (ABP) blood samples collected; and
 - there was an increase of 656 (20.8 %) Adverse Analytical Findings (AAFs).
 - Doping Control Forms and ADAMS and ABP: Standards & Harmonisation continues to work alongside the Medical, Science and Legal Departments to ensure the ABP progresses in a manner that is accessible and practical for all ADOs. One key aspect is improving the number of Doping Control Forms (DCFs) being entered into ADAMS by ADOs so the steroidal module profiles reported by the laboratories can be integrated into individual athletes' steroidal Passports. Following the Foundation Board's decision at its May 2016 meeting that all DCFs were to be entered in ADAMS within 15 days following the sample collection session (effective 1 June 2016), the input of DCFs into ADAMS has increased to 84%, up from 56% total entries in 2015. WADA continues to monitor this mandatory requirement and is providing training and assistance in conjunction with ADAMS staff to a number of stakeholders that have requested support. There remains some backlog of DCFs to be entered into ADAMS (i.e. samples collected from 1 January to 1 June 2016), which WADA is monitoring those ADOs involved.
 - Pre Rio Intelligence Gathering Task Force: To emphasize the importance of anti-doping efforts prior to the Summer Olympic Games in Rio, the IOC funded an anti-doping 'Taskforce' made up of six NADOs to ensure a coordinated effort amongst all relevant ADOs in the months leading up to the Games. WADA provided oversight of this Taskforce on behalf of the IOC in order to see that all relevant ADOs were actively engaged and coordinating their efforts at the National and International level to ensure that prospective athletes were subject to robust testing programmes prior to their arrival in Rio.
 - The primary objective of the Taskforce was to identify potential testing gaps of athletes qualified for the Games with a focus on ten high risk sports and to recommend that the relevant organizations with jurisdiction take the necessary action to conduct testing on those athletes. The Taskforce's work was not to replace an ADO's pre-Games testing programme but complement it.
 - The Taskforce identified and made over 1,300 recommendations to IFs and NADOs to target test specific athletes in the lead up to the Games. Of those athletes identified within the Taskforce's recommendations, 15 returned Adverse Analytical Findings (AAFs) either as a direct result of the


ADO following the recommendation, or the ADO was planning such testing anyway. This highlights that the work of the Taskforce was focused on “at risk” athlete groups which overall led to a number of athletes not participating in Rio.

- The outcomes of the Taskforce were handed over to the IOC and Rio2016 Organizing Committee in the week prior to opening of the Athlete Village so that targeted testing could continue and be incorporated into the Games-time test distribution plan along with other intelligence received from IFs or NADOs during the Games period.
- *[The success and effectiveness of the Task Force was identified as a positive outcome from the Rio Olympics in the WADA IO Team Report that otherwise identified major failures in the doping control programme there. See Attachment 1.]*

iNADO is the Institute of National Anti-Doping Organisations. It promotes best practices by NADOs and RADOs, and is their collective voice.

 iNADO Website

 iNADO on Facebook

 iNADO on YouTube

iNADO Partners

 **berlingerspecial**
feel safe



DOPING.nl
THE ANTI-DOPING KNOWLEDGE CENTER

INFORMED-SPORT
.com
Trusted by sport

GOT ETHICS