

2013 June 20

INADO Update #30

Dear Colleagues:

Membership

Here are iNADO's 36 current Members:

- Dopingautoriteit (Netherlands)
- UKAD (United Kingdom)
- ASADA (Australia)
- JADA (Japan)
- USADA (United States)
- DFSNZ (New Zealand)
- SAIDS (South Africa)
- CCES (Canada)
- ADN (Norway)
- ADD (Denmark)
- NADA Germany
- Antidoping Switzerland
- Singapore AD
- AFLD (France)
- NADA Austria
- NADA Romania
- NADC Barbados
- FINADA (Finland)
- ISC (Irish Sports Council)
- PRADO (Puerto Rico)
- QADC (Qatar)
- BSADA (Bermuda)
- AEA (Spain)
- NOC of Slovenia
- San Marino CPA
- KADC (Kuwait)
- JADO (Jordan)
- BADC (Bahamas)
- Indian NADA
- CyADA (Cyprus)
- LTU ADA (Lithuania)
- PANDA (Poland)
- KADA (Korea)
- ALAD (Luxembourg)
- SSC (Swedish Sport Confederation)
- EADA (Estonia)

I encourage you to join iNADO as early in 2013 as possible. This will increase iNADO's influence and broaden efforts to share best practices and to raise standards. The membership application and the list of membership subscription fees are posted in the "About iNADO" section of the iNADO website under the heading "Finances": www.inado.org. It typically takes 1 -2 business days for the iNADO Board to consider and approval membership applications. Once a membership application is approved, iNADO will issue an invoice for the membership fee.

What are your Views about the Pound Report? (Reminder)

iNADO Update #28 provided a summary of WADA's Pound Report (into the "ineffectiveness" of testing). Through iNADO, WADA has formally asked for feedback from the NADO/RADO community by July 31, 2013.

iNADO Update #29 asked for your preliminary views. This will assist you in making your own final comments to WADA, and permit iNADO to give feedback on behalf of the NADO/RADO community as a whole. While comments on any portion of the Pound Report are welcome, could you please answer these questions:

1. Which recommendations aimed at NADOs and at Governments do you **most** support? Why?

WWW.INADO.ORG

2. Which recommendations aimed at NADOs and at Governments do you **least** support? Why?
3. What are the most important actions that WADA should be taken in light of the Pound Report?
4. What are the top three actions your NADO/RADO will take in response to the Pound Report?

It would be especially helpful to identify any further recommended changes to the proposed 2015 Code or International Standards in response to the Pound Report. iNADO will share your comments by posting them in the iNADO website, unless you ask that they not be shared.

Of the reaction received so far, Graziela Vajjala of the NADA Romania emphasises supporting the recommendations for NADO independence and that funding partners not interfere with NADO operations. Others state that deterrence is at least as important a purpose of testing as detection; we must not lose sight of it in improving testing programmes. I have also received several comments that the Pound Report does not address the issue of disparity of anti-doping programmes: some are much more comprehensive and effective than others. Lessening disparity and raising standards, through bilateral and multilateral cooperation between ADOs, should be important feature of anti-doping world-wide as we go forward.

So what are your thoughts? Please share as soon as possible.

Anti-Doping Norway – WADA Seminar on Bilateral Cooperation

Last week Anti-Doping Norway celebrated its 10th Anniversary as an independent NADO. The significance of this milestone was highlighted by the participation of King Harald of Norway: <http://www.antidoping.no/internet/nyhetsarkiv/kongen-besokte-antidopingseminar/>

Among the important events ADN hosted last week to mark its 10th Anniversary was a two-day seminar with WADA on bilateral cooperation between NADOs. Over the years, ADN has made remarkable efforts to work with other NADOs around the world, most recently with the China Anti-Doping Agency (CHINADA) and the Russian Anti-Doping Agency (RUSADA). For brief descriptions of these projects, see <http://www.antidoping.no/internet/english/china-and-norway-collaboration/> and <http://www.antidoping.no/internet/english/norway-and-russia/>.

These mutually-beneficial bilateral cooperation projects, facilitated by WADA, continue a long tradition of NADOs working with each other and with RADOs to raise the quality of anti-doping programmes, and to enhance trust and understanding between anti-doping professionals. Stay tuned for more information about how your NADO/RADO can conduct bilateral and even multilateral cooperation with other NADOs and RADOs.

Independent Dutch Commission into Doping by Cyclists

An independent commission that investigated doping by Dutch cyclists has reported. Established by the Dutch Olympic Committee/Dutch Sports Federation, and Royal Dutch Cycling Union, and headed by former Dutch Justice Minister Winnie Sorgdrager, the commission conducted anonymous interviews with dozens of riders and team staff. The report concluded that doping was endemic among Dutch cyclists and has been reduced only by the introduction of measures including biological passports and out-of-competition testing. Here is a link to the report, with an English version of the conclusions and recommendations at pages 61 – 70: <http://www.commissie-ada.nl/EINDRAPPORTCOMMISSIEADA.pdf>

Among the more interesting passages from the conclusions and recommendations:

“In fact the use of banned substances was still scarcely seen as cheating [in the 1980s and 1990s]; instead, it was seen as part of the good preparation needed to produce a superb performance. In that context, each person determined his own limits. Anyone who was caught had failed. Someone who prepared as well as possible with innovative doping substances and passed the tests safely was practising his sport in a professional way.” (p. 61)

“A carefully-cultivated culture of ‘organised ignorance’ prevailed in the cycling peloton. To minimise the denials and lies that needed to be told to the outside world, riders, team leaders, sponsors, journalists and others involved in the sport closed their ears to any overly specific information about other people’s use of banned substances.” (pp. 61 – 62)

“In the Dutch teams, this [team-managed doping] system appeared to be largely inspired by a consciousness that without the use of banned substances, it was impossible to fulfil the expectations of the riders themselves, the team leaders, the sponsors, or the public. The team management and physicians supervised the riders’ drug use because of the associated health risks, the risk of testing positive, the effectiveness of the substances used, and the chances of the rider concerned achieving sporting success.” (p. 63)

“Team physicians have a two-pronged set of responsibilities. On the one hand, they are responsible for the riders’ health, while on the other hand they feel partly responsible for the team’s sporting performance. These split responsibilities may put in jeopardy the independent position that one would wish such a physician to enjoy.” (p. 63)

“We do not have any indications that sponsors deliberately put teams under pressure or incited them to use doping. However, at the very least it can be called naive if a sponsor trusted blindly that the team was adhering to the contractual agreement that sport would be pursued without the use of doping after 1998, when it became increasingly clear that doping was being used on a large scale within the peloton.

“Especially after the introduction of an effective EPO test in 2001, riders went in search of alternatives, including blood doping, largely on an individual basis. Whether the team leaders and the team management were aware of what each individual member of the team was using cannot be stated with certainty. That they were aware that their riders were not ‘clean’, as already stated above, seems highly probable.” (p. 64)

“Another measure that could encourage people to work as a team would be introducing a system of punishing teams, rather than riders, for infringements. If riders test positive for doping, this would increase pressure on the team to supervise all riders closely, including during preparation. Sanctions might include financial penalties or points deducted in the context of the Pro Tour. This could be further elaborated in a dialogue between the UCI and the teams.” (p. 67)

“It is important that physicians should bear primary responsibility for riders’ health and not for their performance. It is possible to make good agreements about this within a team. Guidelines were drawn up in this connection at the request of the Ministry of Health, Welfare

WWW.INADO.ORG

and Sport, following the Intralipid affair in the PDM team. An idea that frequently surfaced during the interviews was the need for a specific code of conduct for medical and paramedical supervisors. The existing guidelines would provide a suitable basis for developing such a code of conduct.” (p. 67)

“We observe that the UCI’s interest in preserving the image of professional cycling may have acted as a brake on the development of anti-doping policy. Removing the responsibility for doping tests and punishing offenders from international sports organisations would be a way of preventing this conflict of interests. Ideally, national and international sports federations are responsible for developing the sport and for the associated anti-doping policy, including providing the necessary information. But the responsibility for testing for banned substances and for the related disciplinary procedure should be transferred elsewhere.” (p. 69)

Where to get Anti-Doping Information

Information is increasingly the key to effective anti-doping. There are already many public sources of anti-doping information that can benefit NADO staff training, communications, prevention and results management activities. Here are key sources:

iNADO: the website (www.inado.org) has an increasing collection of resources, especially for Members. iNADO is always looking to add to its collection. Please send me your model documents, research papers, and all other materials that would benefit fellow iNADO Members. All languages welcome.

If you have not already done so, please add a link to the iNADO website (www.inado.org) on your organisation’s own website.

ADKC: the Dutch Anti-Doping Knowledge Center (www.doping.nl) has a terrific collection of hundreds of important documents, and a very easy-to-use and robust search engine. It has a feature that allows you as a registered user to save previous searches for future reference. Registration and use is free. Contributions of scientific, educational, testing, results management, information sharing, investigations, legal and other ADO documents are always welcome. This site is operated by the Netherlands Dopingautoriteit, iNADO’s very first paid-up Founding Member, and deserves the active support of all NADOs and RADOs. Think of it as our collective archive of important and useful anti-doping resources of all types.

WADA: the digital library (<http://library.wada-ama.org/>), the education and awareness page (<http://www.wada-ama.org/en/Education-Awareness/>) and the legal library (<http://www.wada-ama.org/en/World-Anti-Doping-Program/Legal-articles-case-law-and-national-laws/>) are especially helpful.

ADDB: the Anti-Doping Data Base is maintained by sports journalist Trond Husø of Norway (<http://www.dopinglist.com/>). It includes information about over 6,300 ADRVs (5,506 by men and 869 by women)! One of the current strengths of this site is to be able to search easily for ADRVs by prohibited substance (or non-analytical violation), sport, country, year, athlete name, etc. NADOs and RADOs are welcome to register for free. In 2013, besides registering doping cases, Trond is also focusing on money and testing statistics. He would very much welcome testing statistics and budget information from NADOs.

WWW.INADO.ORG

CAS: no list of sources would be complete without the website of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (<http://www.tas-cas.org/>). By my count, nearly 400 CAS decisions going back to 1996 are archived. The majority are decisions on doping matters.

Jim Ferstle: this American journalist produces a daily doping news clippings service that is the most comprehensive of its kind. It captures items in English and in other languages. Many of you are already subscribers. For those who are not, a subscription is well worth the US\$250 cost. Contact Jim at: jferstle@gmail.com.

UKAD Agreement with NHS on Information Sharing

UK Anti-Doping (UKAD) has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the United Kingdom government agency National Health Service Protect, setting out clear guidelines for sharing information in the fight against the supply and trafficking of doping-related substances and activities in sport: <http://www.ukad.org.uk/news/article/UKAD-agreement-with-nhs-protect/>.

NHS Protect leads on work to identify and tackle crime across the National Health Service (NHS), including fraud and theft of controlled drugs. The aim is to protect NHS staff and resources from activities that would otherwise undermine their effectiveness and their ability to meet the needs of patients and professionals.

Such information-sharing arrangements with government agencies are an important element of building intelligence and investigation capacity within NADOs to deal with sources of prohibited substances.

Concluding Words



Yesterday, the NADA Germany and iNADO held an “office-warming” BBQ at the new NADA/iNADO house in Bonn. iNADO Board member and Treasurer Paul Evans of UKAD joined us. The cake was delicious! (Thanks to NADA Germany’s Eva Bunthoff for the photo.)

Never hesitate to contact me if you need assistance. Let me know what is happening in your country and in your organisation. Tell me how iNADO can help you do a better job.

Joseph de Pencier, J.D.
Chief Executive Officer
jcdep@me.com
www.inado.org

Heussallee 28, 53113 Bonn, Germany
+49 (0)175 829 6704 (m)

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