

2016 April 25

**iNADO Update #70**

**WADA ExCo and Foundation Board Documents May 2016**  
**Key Matters for NADOs / RADOs / Public Authorities**

Dear Colleagues:

To assist you prepare government colleagues who sit for the Public Authorities on the WADA Executive Committee and Foundation Board, this iNADO Update includes a review of many (but by no means all) of the documents issued by WADA for the upcoming ExCo and Foundation Board meetings in Montreal on May 11 – 12, 2016. Furthermore, these documents contain much useful, interesting and current anti-doping information. The documents deserve careful review for that reason alone.

iNADO Members may access the documents on the iNADO website:

<http://www.inado.org/nc/documents.html>. If it is not in the list of recent documents set out just below the search box, please search File Category: WADA Document, Topic: Communications. iNADO Members will also be invited to an iNADO telephone briefing on Monday May 2, 2016 to review and exchange views on key issues.

The WADA agenda is very full. As in the past, this summary follows the agenda for the ExCo and the Foundation Board meetings. I suggest that most important items for NADOs, RADOs and/or their public authority colleagues include:

- Single Testing Authority (Agenda Item 3.2)
- Athlete Committee Report (Agenda Item 5.1): Request for further investigation
- 2017 Budget – Preliminary Planning (Agenda Item 6.4)
- Science Department Report (Agenda Item 8.2): Prohibited List process
- Code Compliance and Accredited Laboratories (Agenda Item 10.1.1)
- Code Compliance Update (Agenda Item 10.2, including Attachments 3 and 4)
- New Compliance Decisions (Agenda Item 10.3)
- Legal and Investigations (Agenda Item 11.1 and Attachment 1): Meldonium; Discipline of accredited laboratories
- Whistleblower Policy (Agenda item 11.2)
- NADO / RADO Relations (Agenda Item 15)

**DG's Report (Agenda Item 3.0)**

- Promotion of Rob Koehler to Deputy Director General and Fred Donzé to Chief Operating Officer. This is to manage increased management work related to compliance and to working with Code Signatories to improve the quality of their programmes. (Rob will continue to direct NADO / RADO relations and education / prevention.)
- Compliance work is taking much more effort and money than anticipated. Furthermore, reacting to non-compliance reduces resources for proactive work to improve the quality of anti-

doping programmes.

- In principle, the costs of investigations into non-compliance should be borne by non-compliant Signatories. Furthermore, WADA should consider monetary penalties on non-compliant countries to pay for WADA's costs. See proposals in Code Compliance Update, Agenda Item 10.2, Attachment 4. **[Query: should not the same principle apply to non-compliant international sport organisations?]**
- Revised WADA priorities for 2016:
  - Protecting clean athletes in all WADA does
  - WADA policy and action for protection for those who report wrongdoing (See Agenda Item 11.2)
  - New ADAMS (See Agenda Item 12)
  - Self-sustainable investigations (See Agenda Item 11.1)
  - Athlete Biological Passport (See Agenda Item 9)
  - RADOs (See Agenda Item 15)
- Special Research Fund support by Public Authority contributions from China, France, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Turkey and United States.
- Special investigations fund supported by Public Authority contributions from Canada, New Zealand and Romania.
- WADA advising the National Hockey League on the testing programme for the September 2016 World Cup of Hockey.
- Concerns about ongoing issues in Brazil and Kenya, and the legal bases for anti-doping (and the NADOs) in those countries. See NADO/RADO Relations, Agenda Item 15.
- WADA's "NADO Partnership Programme" is working with 9 NADOs, while 6 more will be added this year. See Agenda Item 15 for the details. Note that in each case an established NADO is partnering or will partner with the NADO under development. Partner NADOs currently include:
  - ADNO (Norway)
  - ASADA (Australia)
  - CCES (Canada)
  - CHINADA (China)
  - Colombian NADO
  - NADA Germany
  - PANDA (Poland)
  - SAIDS (South Africa)
  - UKAD (United Kingdom)
- Rio Pre-Games Intelligence Task Force is operating with UKAD acting as the secretariat, involving 5 other NADOs, one from each Olympic Region.

- Non-compliance by National Federations will receive more WADA attention in the future, including working with IFs which are responsible for ensuring NF compliance.

#### **Independent Commission Report (Agenda Item 3.1)**

- Report not yet available.

#### **Single Testing Authority (“Olympic Summit Proposal”) (Agenda Item 3.2)**

- This is a proposal for a new doping control body for international sport organisations, including responsibility for testing and for results management (including prosecution of cases before a single first instance hearing body).
- It is to be independent and free of the conflict of interests of international sport organisations, which are primarily responsible for promoting sport, not for anti-doping.
- An informal WADA technical working group of international sport organisation representatives has met to consider the concept. It recommends further consideration.
- Technical feasibility is being studied by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, paid for by the IOC.
- It is recommended that the ExCo decide:
  - To continue to explore the concept of a “single testing authority” both technically and politically
  - Expand the informal technical working group of international sport organisation representatives to include 2 NADOs, and for it to meet again before the September meeting
  - Establish a political “steering group” of 5 representatives of Public Authorities and 5 of international sport organisations (to be chaired by Valerie Fourneyron of France) to advise the ExCo at the September 2016 on
    - A draft business plan based on the PWC feasibility study
    - Whether the single testing unit should be mandatory or non-mandatory
    - The budget and funding mechanism of a single testing unit
    - Should a single testing authority be a new organisation or be hosted in an existing one **[Note: WADA has a clear conflict of interest that prevents it from being the host: the global anti-doping regulator cannot also be an operating doping control agency and oversee itself.]**
- **[Query: Is this the only possible model for providing doping control and results management to international sport organisations? What about the model of independent NADOs and RADOs providing doping control and other services in partnership with IFs, as is already the case in many circumstances. In fact, some IFs already rely entirely on NADOs to provide their anti-doping programmes. Should not alternatives to a single testing authority be considered at this early stage?]**

- [Query: if doping control including results management (and presumably TUE administration and intelligence and investigations) is to be separated from international sport organisations, will they continue to be responsible for anti-doping education and prevention? If so, how will IFs make the necessary commitment (financial and otherwise) to this vital element of anti-doping? If not, who will?]

#### **2019 World Anti-Doping Conference (Agenda Item 4.1)**

- The ExCo is asked to decide that WADA begin planning for the next World Anti-Doping Conference for 2019.
- In that year, the WADA Presidency will turn over to the Public Authorities.
- WADA will celebrate its 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary.
- The next version of the World Anti-Doping Code should be determined by stakeholders. Note that WADA management does not currently forecast a major revision to the Code.
- Offers to host the conference should be solicited for consideration by the ExCo and Foundation Board in November, 2016.

#### **Athlete Committee Report (Agenda Item 5.1)**

- The WADA Athlete Committee met on 10-11 March 2016 in Canmore, Alberta. Committee members provided updates and/or insights regarding their activities within anti-doping:
  - Claudia Bokel
    - German Athlete Commission would like WADA to be stronger, taking away results management from IFs and to have independent doping controls.
    - Would like IOC to work with IFs to finance anti-doping.
    - General feeling of not enough transparency, and flaws in the collection process.
  - Lauryn Williams
    - Feels the athlete voice is being dismissed.
    - Wants further investigations.
    - Questions arbitration costs and its speed.
    - Need to progress the IOC proposal for independent testing.
    - Distrust of IF processes by athletes.
  - Koji Murofushi
    - Member of IAAF Athlete Commission (IAAF AC).
    - Talked about protecting Yuliya Stepanova, the whistleblower.
    - IAAF AC backed increased sanctions to those that lie or provide false information.
    - Prize money should be returned after a positive drug test.
  - Kaveh Mehrabi
    - Financial rewards creating temptation to cheat.
    - Badminton Federation (BWF) – issue of transparency and athletes lacking trust of IFs.

- Francis Dodoo
  - Need strong penalties for non-compliance and no “bending” for political reasons.
  - Ironical that a doped whistleblower has done more for clean athletes than we have. **[Note: This is a telling comment.]**
- Committee members had an ‘in camera’ session to discuss the topic of investigations and how they would like to move forward. Together they wrote a letter addressed to WADA President, Sir Craig Reedie:
  - “Dear Sir Craig: The WADA Athletes’ Committee met today in Canmore, Alberta. The most important discussion item for us, as the voice and representatives of clean athletes world-wide, was the request we put forth in November to the WADA Foundation Board: a request to extend the mandate of the Independent Commission. We are of the firm opinion that there needs to be further investigation into other sports in Russia, and other countries identified in the report.  
 “Since November, we have received many calls and requests from athletes and athlete committees, from many sports, across many nations, for the same. Today we considered those, and have again reviewed the detailed content of the report issued in November, during an in-camera session. Many comments and statements within the report indicate that other sports and countries are implicated, and as such, require further investigation. Our view as a committee is that the response to date - to such an evidence-based, incriminating report - has been unsatisfactory, and we wish to express our strong position, once again, in renewing our call for WADA to extend the mandate of the Independent Commission to sports in Russia other than athletics, as well as other countries named in the report.  
 “WADA states clearly that it supports clean athletes and at the moment, clean athletes are disappointed with the lack of action that has been taken. The principles of fair sport are very close to our hearts. We believe that extending the mandate will be a sign of our commitment to clean sport, and a sign that the voice of the clean athlete is being heard. In addition, we as a committee wish to publicly announce our strong support and gratitude to the whistleblowers, Vitaly and Yuliya. They have made a courageous contribution to the anti-doping movement and to clean athletes in particular. Their bravery and risk-taking has brought about personal changes to their way of life which are substantial.  
 “We recognize them for their contribution, and we trust that the world of sport will likewise support and appreciate them.  
 “Yours sincerely, Beckie Scott, Chair”

#### **2016 Draft Financial Audit Report (Agenda Item 6.2)**

- WADA received a clean audit report.
- There is an operating deficit of over US\$1.116 million in 2015 (compared to a deficit of US\$1.136 million in 2014).

- The number of WADA employees increased in 2015 to 81 from 75 in 2014.

#### **2017 Budget – Preliminary Planning (Agenda Item 6.4)**

- The development of a budget for 2017 has not yet commenced as there are a number of items which the WADA Finance Committee must consider in detail in July before recommending a proposed 2017 budget to the Executive Committee in September 2016.
- Certain items however, can already be considered, and these include both anticipated revenue and some forecast expenditures, as follows:
  - Contributions: A 4% increase in contributions will be sought in 2017 to enable WADA to meet the reinstatement of air travel costs of its members to attend Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings. This increase equates to a US\$566,000 increase in contribution income from both the Public Authorities and Sports Movement, whilst member travel costs is estimated at US\$685,000. This increase also ensures that WADA complies with its policy of not depleting cash reserves of more than US\$500,000 in a current year.
  - The additional grant of 300,000 Euro (approximately US\$336,000) received from Russia in past years will not be included in the 2017 Budget. This follows the Board decision in Colorado Springs last November.
  - Expenditure: In 2015, most WADA Departments operated at their budgeted costs; therefore it can be expected that there is little opportunity for cost reduction without a change or decrease in programs and activities.
  - The 2017 Budget will need to account for an increase in travel expenditures, in order for WADA to meet the air travel costs of its members attending the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings.
- The Executive Committee and Foundation Board are requested to defer to the WADA Finance Committee meeting in July 2016, the development of a Draft 2017 budget which will be presented to the WADA Executive Committee at its meeting in September 2016. A proposed 2017 Draft Budget will then be submitted for approval to the Executive Committee and Foundation Board in November 2016.
- **[Query: consistent with previous calls from Public Authorities for multi-year financial planning, shouldn't the 2017 draft Budget include some projections into 2018 and 2019 (especially as that latter year will have the additional costs of the next World Anti-Doping Conference)?]**

#### **Science Department Report (Agenda Item 8.2)**

- 2017 List of Prohibited Substances and Methods
  - The draft 2017 International Standard for the Prohibited List is being prepared following meetings of the WADA Prohibited List Expert Group in Montreal on 29 January and on 21-22 April 2016.

- The draft 2017 Prohibited List, along with an explanatory note on the modifications from the 2016 List, will be circulated to stakeholders in late April to allow comments to be made prior to mid July 2016.
- All the comments from the stakeholders will be reviewed by the List Group in August, and any modifications, having considered relevant comments, will be incorporated in a new draft of the Prohibited List to be reviewed by the Health, Medical and Research (HMR) Committee at its annual meeting on 30-31 August 2016.
- As soon as it is reviewed by the HMR Committee, the draft 2017 Prohibited List will be circulated to the WADA Executive Committee members for final review and approval at their meeting on 21 September 2016.
- The approved 2017 Prohibited List will be officially released by WADA on 1 October 2016 at the latest, and will come into effect on 1 January 2017.
- Some of the key items discussed by the List Expert Group:
  - Review of some substances or methods for possible inclusion on the Prohibited List.
  - A working group for reviewing the status of different routes of administration of glucocorticoids and establishing urinary thresholds to distinguish these routes and/or establishing norms for returning to competition following administration.
  - The status of narcotics and alcohol on the List.
  - The possibility of a “Unique List” (all substances and methods prohibited at all times), and establishing a working group for a Unique List.
  - Update on the 2015/2016 Monitoring Programs.
  - Review of some substances or methods for their current status and/or their possible inclusion on the Prohibited List (e.g. nickel, higenamine, hyperbaric oxygen, nicomorphine, tramadol).
  - Report from the Glucocorticoid Working Group.
  - In-depth analysis of different routes of administration of beta-2-agonists and thresholds.
  - Drafting of the 2017 List, the related Explanatory Note, and the 2017 Monitoring Program.
- **[Query: what process changes are being considered in light of criticism of the inclusion of Meldonium on the 2016 Prohibited List?]**

#### **Blood Analytical Requirements (Agenda 8.3.2, including Attachments 1 and 2)**

- This is an important technical matter. The ExCo is asked to decide on modifications to the Technical Document on Blood Analytical Requirements for the ABP (TDBAR).
- A limitation in the delivery of effective ABP programs has been the practical limitation of collecting biological samples in remote locations and transporting them to WADA Accredited or Approved Laboratories within the required 36-hour timeframe. Proposed changes in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI) introduce the concept of a ‘Blood Stability Score’ (BSS) which can extend the permitted transport period when the temperature of



the sample is optimized over the course of transit.

- According to the ABP Report (Agenda Item 9), section 2.1, the stability of blood samples transported for analysis may be as long as 60 hours (36 hours is the current limit). See also proposed modifications to the ISTI, Agenda item 10.5.
- It is proposed that the TDBAR be published on approval in 2016, however that 2016 be considered a transition year to allow preparation for WADA, ADOs and Labs to prepare for the BSS. The same time delay is being proposed for the ISTI. WADA expects full implementation by 1 January 2017.

#### **Athlete Biological Passport (Agenda Item 9)**

- This report summarises the continuing development of the ABP as a key strategic tool in anti-doping detection and deterrence, leading directly to numerous ADRVs. Indirectly it also enhances intelligent (i.e., targeted) testing. And it generates information and intelligence that support investigations (including recently into Russia and Athletics).

#### **Code Compliance (Agenda Items 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3)**

##### **Code Compliance and Accredited Laboratories (Agenda Item 10.1.1)**

- The Executive Committee to approve the amendment of Article 4.4 of the International Standard for Laboratories to mitigate the inadvertent impact on Code-compliant ADOs of a laboratories loss of accreditation.
- The current version of Article 4.4 of the International Standard for Laboratories (ISL) requires the laboratory's host country National Anti- Doping Organization and/or National Olympic Committee to be Code compliant (as determined by WADA) to maintain its accreditation.
- This provision was implemented in 2009. The main rationale for the insertion of this clause was two-fold:
  - 1) Quality of the samples: A laboratory is in general intimately linked with the national anti-doping program of the country where it is located as the samples sent by the local National Anti-Doping Organization (NADO) normally constitute the majority of the samples analyzed by the laboratory. Furthermore, the said provisions can also be seen as a consequence of the fact that non-compliant NADOs cannot conduct any testing activity and that in order to maintain their accreditation, laboratories need to analyze at least 3,000 samples per year.
  - 2) Instrument of political pressure: The possibility of suspension for the anti-doping laboratory was considered to be an efficient tool to ensure NADOs' (and national) compliance. As an example, certain governments have explicitly mentioned to WADA during in-person meetings that the willingness to maintain the local laboratory's accreditation was the main reason why they had been ready to quickly amend legislation or take similar steps needed to avoid a possible declaration of non-



compliance on their NADO.

- However, on 25 February 2016, 23 March 2016 and 24 March 2016, WADA received correspondence respectively from the World Association of Anti-Doping Scientists (WAADS), the Institute of National Anti-Doping Organizations (iNADO) and the Anti-Doping Authority of the Netherlands, asking us to consider the possibility of amending this provision in order to increase its flexibility. The concern was that suspending or revoking accreditation hurts foreign Code-compliant anti-doping organisations (IFs and NADOs) using the laboratory.
- The Compliance Review Committee (CRC) discussed the issue at its meeting of 5 April 2016, taking into consideration the rationale for the insertion of this clause in the ISL, the effectiveness of such clause in relation to NADOs' compliance, and the arguments provided by WAADS, iNADO and the Anti-Doping Authority of the Netherlands.
- Following this discussion, on one hand the CRC acknowledged the importance of this provision as an efficient tool to ensure the NADOs' compliance in a timely manner, whilst on the other hand, they recognized the need to ensure flexibility in relation to laboratories who are serving mainly Anti-Doping Organizations (ADOs) other than the local NADOs and whose link with the local NADO is therefore not relevant and does not have an influence on the quality of samples.
- In light of the above, the CRC recommends to WADA's Executive Committee to amend Article 4.4 by introducing an exception in relation to laboratories having analyzed, the year before the declaration of non-compliance, a majority of samples provided by ADOs other than the local NADO. The proposed threshold of 60% has been identified in light of the statistics related to analysis conducted by WADA-accredited laboratories worldwide and it is based on the criteria recommended in this respect by the CRC. The proposed language is:
  - "In order for the Laboratory to maintain its accreditation status, the Anti-Doping Organization of the country of the Laboratory (National Anti-Doping Organization and/or National Olympic Committee as applicable) shall be Code compliant (as determined by WADA) and the Laboratory host country shall maintain its status of a country having ratified the UNESCO Convention against Doping in Sport.
  - "Should a Laboratory's accreditation be suspended in this context, the Suspension will be effective until the country ratifies the UNESCO Convention against Doping in Sport and/or until the non-compliant Anti-Doping Organization of the country of the Laboratory is taken out of the non-compliant list by WADA's Foundation Board. With the exception of the duration of the Suspension which shall be as defined above, the other ISL provisions with subject to the Suspension of a Laboratory's accreditation remain applicable.
  - "WADA may decide not to suspend the Laboratory's accreditation in case of non-compliance of the Anti-Doping Organization of the country of the Laboratory if, in the year before the declaration of non-compliance, at least 60% of samples analyzed by that Laboratory were provided by Anti-Doping Organizations other than the Anti-Doping Organization of the country of the Laboratory, or if it is highly likely that in the year of the declaration of non-compliance at least 60% of samples analyzed by that Laboratory are going to be provided by Anti-Doping Organizations other than the Anti-Doping Organization of the country of the Laboratory."

Code Compliance Update (Agenda Item 10.2, including Attachments 3 and 4)

- The Compliance Update summaries ongoing compliance issues due to laws of Mexico and Spain with result in their NADOs being deemed non-compliant.
- For a status update on Russia, see Attachment 3. Note the role of UK Anti-doping in working with WADA to manage testing during the period of non-compliance and to assist RUSADA to regain compliance. But it appears that Russian Code-compliance under WADA supervisions will take a considerable amount of time.
- Consequences of non-compliance are set by the Code (Articles 20.1, 20.2, 20.3, 20.4, 20.6 and 23.6), the International Standard for Laboratories (Articles 4.1 and 4.4), WADA's Statutes (Article 6), as well as by the policy adopted in November 2015 by the Foundation Board (in relation to participation to Independent Observer missions and the Outreach program, and to the possibility for WADA to directly or indirectly fund activities implemented by ADOs).
- Furthermore, consequences of non-compliance are set out in other documents such as the IOC Charter, the IPC Handbook and the UNESCO Convention.
- Practical consequences of non-compliance on ADO activities have also already been identified by WADA and communicated to all stakeholders in recent months.
- The above-mentioned consequences are not directly related to financial aspects, such as expenses and costs incurred by WADA and possibly other entities in the lead-up to the declaration of non-compliance (e.g. expenses related to an investigation required to unveil a non-compliance situation) or as a result of the declaration of non-compliance (e.g. expenses needed to assist the signatory to solve the non-compliance issue or to monitor whether the issue has been solved). In order to address the financial aspects related to a declaration of non-compliance, upon recommendation of the CRC, WADA has developed a template agreement (Attachment 4) that signatories declared non-compliant will be asked to sign. This template agreement contains provisions related to financial aspects addressed from a cost recovery perspective.
- The signing and the implementation of the agreement will represent a necessary condition to be fulfilled by the signatory in order to be taken off the non-compliance list, when all other conditions are also met.
- See also the Standards and Harmonisation Departmental Report, Agenda Item 18.
- **[Query: when a Code compliance issue has to do with a legislative issue (i.e., within the authority of the government), why should the NADO be suspended if it operates a robust and**

**otherwise Code-compliant national anti-doping programme, thereby denying clean athletes anti-doping services and protection?]**

New Compliance Decisions (Agenda Item 10.3)

- The WADA Foundation Board is asked to declare the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya non-compliant with immediate effect, based on the recommendation from the Compliance Review Committee.
- The WADA Foundation Board is asked to consider and accept the recommendation of the Compliance Review Committee that the Polish Commission against Doping in Sport shall be considered automatically non-compliant on 12 August 2016 should the outstanding issues not be resolved by that date.
- The WADA Foundation Board is asked to consider and accept the recommendation of the Compliance Review Committee that the Andorran Anti-Doping Agency should be removed from the list of non-compliant signatories.
- Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya: A new National Anti-Doping Organization (NADO) was created under the name of Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya (ADAK). In order for ADAK to have jurisdiction, become operational and be able to implement a program in line with the requirements of the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code (Code) in all mandatory areas, the following legal instruments need to be in line with the Code and subsequently need to be formally adopted by the competent Kenyan authorities:
  - 1. Anti-Doping Bill;
  - 2. Anti-Doping Policy; and
  - 3. ADAK Anti-Doping Rules.
- WADA has been informed that ADAK and the Kenyan public authorities decided to initiate the process to formally adopt all three legal instruments simultaneously. Despite numerous exchanges of correspondence and discussions however, these three legal instruments, in line with the Code only since 21 March 2016, have not yet been formally adopted (and consequently have not entered into force). In light of the above, the CRC recommends that ADAK is declared non-compliant with immediate effect by the WADA Foundation Board.
- Polish Commission against Doping in Sport: The Polish legal system was previously deemed in line with the Code. Amendments to the Polish Act on Sport were recently formally adopted without WADA's involvement in the process, and the revised version of the Act now currently in force is not in line with Articles 2 and 13 of the Code. Article 2.10 of the Code (Prohibited Association) has not been incorporated. Concerning Article 13 (Appeals), there is no general recognition of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) as last instance jurisdiction for all anti-doping cases (as the Polish Supreme Court can be the last instance jurisdiction). The timelines to appeal set forth in the Code are not complied with, and the right of appeal has not been granted to all entities having such right in light of the corresponding provisions of the Code.

- The Polish Commission against Doping in Sport and the Ministry of Tourism acknowledged the issues and informed WADA that a new draft law meant to amend the Act on Sport is going to be drafted in the coming weeks.
- In light of this commitment, the Compliance Review Committee recommends a procedure where the Polish Commission against Doping in Sport enters the “watch list” and should be given an additional three months (from the date of the Foundation Board meeting, i.e. 12 May 2016) to resolve the issue. Should it fail to do so within the three months, the CRC recommends that the Polish Commission against Doping in Sport be automatically declared non-compliant by a decision taken at this meeting by the Foundation Board.
- Andorran Anti-Doping Agency: This signatory was declared non-compliant due to the lack of implementation of the 2015 Code in its legal system. Following the declaration of non-compliance, the Andorran Government indicated that the Code was going to be implemented in the national legal system through a law and the NADO regulations. The latest versions of the draft law and draft NADO regulations were considered by WADA to be in line with the Code and on 12 April 2016 WADA received the confirmation that both the law and the NADO regulations had been formally adopted.
- The CRC subsequently assessed the situation and recommends in light of the recent development to acknowledge that the Andorran Anti-Doping Agency is no longer in a non-compliant situation since it has resolved the outstanding issues related to the implementation of the Code in the legal system, and therefore recommends to remove the Andorran Anti-Doping Agency from the non-compliant list.

#### **Mandatory Entry of Doping Control Forms and TUEs into ADAMS (Agenda Item 10.4)**

- The Foundation Board is asked to approve:
  1. That it is a mandatory requirement for all ADOs under the World Anti-Doping Code to enter all Doping Control Forms and Therapeutic Use Exemptions into ADAMS no later than 15 business days after sample collection or receipt of the TUE; and
  2. That failure to do so will result in a declaration of non-compliance.
- One of the clear recommendations from the Independent Commission (IC) Report was:
 

“No. 10: that WADA insists that RUSADA, along with all other Code signatories, comply with its obligation to provide complete and timely data for ADAMS by 31 December 2015”.
- It is obvious that the only way for WADA to monitor and bring transparency to the anti-doping system is to have an overview of information related to anti-doping programs. This includes in particular and at a minimum, having access to all doping control forms (DCFs) as well as all Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) information.

- DCFs must be entered into ADAMS in order for a meaningful steroidal and hematological passport to operate globally. Without all DCFs, the system is unable to attribute lab results to specific athlete profiles and therefore does not allow WADA to monitor those profiles, nor ensure that testing by multiple ADOs are compiled into a single athlete passport.
- Of equal importance is that the information about a TUE being granted and the underlying reason for such a decision is made transparent via ADAMS. Without this information, WADA cannot control that TUEs are being granted for legitimate reasons nor that TUEs have been inappropriately granted after an AAF has been declared. WADA not having the aforementioned information is a clear loophole in the current system as identified by the IC report.
- In addition to these IC recommendations, it remains the fact that the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code (Code) and International Standards already require all signatories to report to ADAMS this information in addition to whereabouts and results management data. The recommendations of the IC therefore merely reinforce the need for WADA to strengthen the enforcement of these existing requirements in order to ensure the transparency of all signatory programs by providing the potential for full third party oversight.

**Modifications to the International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI) (Agenda item 10.5 and Attachment 1)**

- The Executive Committee is asked to consider proposed changes to the ISTI, including the inclusion of certain annexes pertaining specifically to the Athlete Biological Passport, with the date of effect being 1 January 2017.
- Following approval at the World Conference in 2013, the International Standard for Testing and Investigations took effect on 1 January 2015. Since that time, the Athlete Biological Passport (ABP) has reached a level of maturity in implementation and adoption by stakeholders such that the current Technical Documents (TDs) required for the ABP now warrant inclusion as annexes in the ISTI itself.
- The current TDs on sample collection, transportation and results management are therefore proposed to be integrated into the ISTI as annexes, and pursuantly, applicable to all ADOs operating an ABP program. In light of the fact that an approval to change the ISTI for the ABP is required at this time, WADA has taken the opportunity to also make some additional minor enhancements.
- Requirements for establishing an Anti-Doping Rule Violation (ADRV) based on the ABP have been altered to clarify the process by which an Atypical Passport Finding (ATPF) is declared (to reflect changes regarding the Adaptive Model) and subsequently reviewed by both the Athlete Passport Management Unit (APMU) and relevant experts. Improvements were also required to reflect recent changes to the TD for Endogenous Anabolic Androgenic Steroids (TDEAAS) affecting the Steroidal Module of the ABP.
- A limitation in the delivery of effective ABP programs has been the practical limitation of collecting biological samples in remote locations and transporting them to WADA Accredited or

Approved Laboratories within the required 36 hour timeframe. The ISTI introduces the concept of a 'Blood Stability Score' which can extend the permitted transport period to 60 hours when the temperature of the sample is optimized over the course of transit. The ISTI sets out the practical requirements to adopt the BSS and consequently benefit from extended transportation windows.

- A number of minor provisions have been clarified and or accentuated unrelated to the ABP to provide greater clarity to ADOs. Editorial improvements have also been made to reflect and correctly reference all current WADA Guidelines.
- It is proposed that the ISTI and its annexes be published on approval in 2016, however that 2016 be considered a transition year to allow preparation for WADA, ADOs and Labs to prepare for the BSS. WADA expects full implementation by 1 January 2017. It is important to note that the 2015 ISTI will remain in effect until 1 January 2017.

#### **Legal and Investigations (Agenda Item 11.1 and Attachment 1)**

- In cooperation with the Cycling Anti-Doping Foundation (CADF), WADA has prepared a document for Doping Control Officers to assist them in gathering intelligence information during the sample collection process.
- WADA Communication's Department has updated the Agency's website and the web-based "report doping" mechanism in order to better streamline the type of information WADA receives in this format. This tool will be further enhanced and play an integral role in the broader whistleblower policy.
- Intelligence and investigations training was provided to several Central Europe NADOs who attended a Council of Europe meeting in Bonn, Germany in late February 2016. Training was also provided to various Asian NADOs in Tokyo, Japan during a regional symposium which was held in January 2016.
- Various work has been conducted in the advancement of specific investigations:
  - In coordination with Interpol, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed between WADA and the General Administration of Sport of China (GASC) on 22 September 2015. A copy of the MoU is attached to this report.
  - A joint international operation (GASC, WADA, INTERPOL and Chinese law enforcement) targeting illegal manufacturing and shipment of Performance-Enhancing Drugs (PEDs) or raw materials used to manufacture PEDs will be established by the end of 2016.
  - A meeting was held in Beijing on 9-10 March, which was attended by WADA, a representative of the Interpol Anti-Doping Unit and key personnel representing various Chinese Government Departments. The meeting was successful in progressing the joint work, and in particular, was extremely beneficial for Interpol to meet and make contact with their Chinese counterparts.
  - A weightlifting coach suspected of providing PEDs to Albanian athletes but who is no longer active in sport was identified and WADA informed the International Weightlifting

- Federation and the relevant National Federation of this case. The information has been provided to Greek law enforcement through Interpol.
- The Department supported the International Athletics Federation (IAAF) in locating a top-level coach suspected of providing PEDs to athletes. This also included coordination with Interpol to obtain support from law enforcement (e.g. search warrant).
  - The Department supported the Lithuanian NADO in establishing an investigation strategy (e.g. interviews) regarding a national-level coach suspected of providing PEDs to weightlifting athletes.
  - An investigative journalist from The Times was approached to determine a safe method of establishing contact between WADA's Investigations Department and the Chinese whistleblower(s) regarding doping issues in swimming.
- The EU Commission, Member States and the EU Parliament have agreed on a final text for the EU Data Protection legislation. It was adopted on April 13th by the EU parliament and will enter into force in two years.
    - Recital 87, which indicates that the fight against doping is an example of public interest, has been included in the text. However, the fact that the public interest "must be recognized in Union law or in the national law of the Member State to which the controller is subject", means that every Member State will have to ensure that by the time the new EU legislation enters into force, they have a provision in their law that recognizes the public interest of anti-doping. WADA will keep liaising with the Commission to see how WADA can cooperate to help raise awareness on this issue.
  - WADA has been invited to partake in an EU Anti-Doping Conference that will be organized on 14-15 June 2016 by the current EU Presidency, the Netherlands, and the EU Commission. Data protection will be a part of the discussions and the Conference will offer a good forum to raise awareness about this subject matter.
  - Meldonium: Given the high number of cases involving this substance which was included in the 2016 Prohibited List, and the numerous queries received from stakeholders with respect to the management of these cases, the WADA Legal Department, together with WADA Science Department, issued an information notice on this subject on 12 April 2016 (Attachment 1). The WADA Legal Department will be closely monitoring these cases.
  - The WADA Legal Department has recently been administering a number of disciplinary proceedings regarding the non-compliance of several WADA-accredited laboratories with the International Standard for Laboratories (ISL):
    - Moscow Laboratory: Further to the recommendation of the Independent Commission (IC), the Moscow Laboratory was provisionally suspended by decision of the Chairman of the WADA Executive Committee on 9 November 2016. A Disciplinary Committee was formed to issue a recommendation on the basis of the IC findings. Consequently, the disciplinary proceedings became moot and WADA took the necessary steps for the Executive Committee to give effect to the revocation by circulatory vote. The WADA Executive Committee decided by decision dated 15 April 2016 to revoke the accreditation of the Moscow Laboratory.



- Lisbon Laboratory: Further to a report of the WADA Laboratory Expert Group (LabEG) indicating several matters of non-compliance with the ISL relating to different areas (inter alia, independence from the local NADO, delays in the reporting of results, participation in the EQAS program by the Lisbon laboratory), a Disciplinary Committee was formed to consider a recommendation. Based on the recommendation issued by the Disciplinary Committee, the Chairman of the WADA Executive Committee decided on 15 April 2016 to suspend the Lisbon laboratory's accreditation for a period of six months.
  - Bloemfontein Laboratory: Further to a report by the LabEG indicating matters of non-compliance by the Bloemfontein Laboratory with respect to the EQAS program, a Disciplinary Committee was formed to issue a recommendation. The case is pending.
  - Beijing Laboratory: Further to a report by the LabEG indicating matters of non-compliance by the Beijing Laboratory with respect to the EQAS program, a Disciplinary Committee was formed to consider a recommendation. The case is pending.
  - Almaty Laboratory: The LabEG issued a report indicating matters of non-compliance with the ISL by the Almaty Laboratory. A Disciplinary Committee is being formed to review the case and to issue a recommendation.
- **[Query: What is the contingency plan for analysis of samples currently held by these laboratories without jeopardising the protection of clean athletes?]**
  - Code Article 5.7.1 (Return to Competition): Since the Code came into effect on 1 January 2015, WADA has received 15 exemption requests from International- and National-Level Athletes. Such requests are handled by WADA's Legal Department and the final decision is issued by WADA's Director General. Out of the 15 exemption requests received, WADA has granted the request in six cases, denied the request in six cases, and decided, in one case, that it did not have authority to render a decision pursuant to Article 5.7.1 of the Code because the Athlete in question had returned to competition prior to the coming into force of the 2015 Code and was therefore subject to the rules in force at that time.
  - Code Article 10.6.3 (Prompt Admission): Pursuant to Article 10.6.3 of the Code, an Athlete or other Person potentially subject to a four-year sanction may, by promptly admitting the asserted anti-doping rule violation (ADRV) after being confronted by an Anti-Doping Organization (ADO), and also upon the approval and at the discretion of both WADA and the ADO with results management responsibility, receive a reduction in the period of Ineligibility down to a minimum of two years, depending on the seriousness of the violation and the Athlete or other Person's degree of Fault.
  - Since 1 January 2015, WADA has received 23 applications pursuant to Article 10.6.3 of the Code. Of these 23 cases, WADA agreed to a reduction in 19 cases and did not agree to a reduction in four cases. WADA's main considerations when deciding the appropriate reduction are the Athlete or other Person's degree of fault and the seriousness of the violation. In this regard, WADA has been unwilling to agree to reductions longer than 3-6 months in cases involving serious prohibited substances or serious or particularly egregious ADRVs. However, in certain circumstances, such as where the ADRV involved low-level athletes or less serious ADRVs, WADA has agreed to reductions in the range of 8-12 months and, in one instance, exceptionally,

two years. As mentioned above, in four cases, WADA refused to agree to any reduction where the ADRV was so serious and the person's degree of fault was at such a level that granting any reduction was unwarranted.

- Litigation Involving WADA:
  - Operation Puerto: Since the beginning of this case in 2006, WADA has been actively attempting to obtain access to available evidence of doping in order to share it with the appropriate authorities. By decision dated 29 April 2013, Eufemiano Fuentes was sanctioned with a one-year jail sentence and was prohibited from practicing sports medicine for four years. José Labarta received a four-month jail sentence and was prohibited from carrying out any function in relation to cycling for four months. In the same decision, the Judge decided not to grant anti-doping authorities access to the blood bags. WADA appealed this decision to the Spanish Provincial Court on 17 May 2013. WADA expects that a decision will be rendered in the near future.
  - Intervention in a case before the European Court of Human Rights (Whereabouts): The French Federation of Sports Syndicates (FNASS) filed a complaint before the European Court of Human Rights against certain provisions of the French Code of Sport regarding the obligation for athletes to provide whereabouts information. They consider that this obligation violates specific provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights. The first respondent to the complaint is the French State. However, given the importance of the issue at stake for the World Anti-Doping Program, WADA decided to file a request for intervention in this matter. The request was filed on 24 September 2013. The matter is still pending.
  - Kristen Worley (CAN – Cycling): This athlete, an XY female transitioned athlete, instituted a case before the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (HRTO) against the International Olympic Committee (IOC), the Union Cycliste Internationale (UCI), Cycling Canada (CC) and the Ontario Cycling Association (OCA) on 30 June 2015 on the grounds that the OCA and CC's policies on gender verification and anti-doping – which are based on an adherence to the UCI and IOC's policies – violate her human rights on the basis of sex as provided in the Ontario Human Rights Code. On 30 November 2015, the athlete sought to add WADA as a party to the proceedings before the HRTO on the grounds that WADA's policies, TUE Guidelines, Standards and the Code discriminate against her because they do not take her situation as an XY female transitioned athlete into consideration. WADA, the IOC and the UCI challenged the HRTO's jurisdiction and a hearing was scheduled to be held on this issue on 21 April 2016 before the HRTO.
  - Essendon (AUS – Australian Football): This case involves 34 former and current football players from the Essendon Football Club who were acquitted of using a prohibited peptide by the Australian Football League Anti-Doping Tribunal. WADA considered that the Panel utilized an inappropriately high burden of proof and that this precedent would make it overly difficult for ADOs to establish a violation for "use". WADA appealed this decision to CAS requesting an appropriate sanction to be pronounced against these players. CAS upheld WADA's appeal and imposed a two year period of ineligibility against each of the 34 athletes (CAS 2015/A/4059). The players have subsequently appealed the CAS decision to the Swiss Federal Tribunal. The case is pending.
  - Criminal case in France against former IAAF officials: Criminal proceedings were instigated in France based on the documents provided by the Independent Commission to Interpol. WADA has filed a request to intervene as a civil party in this case but the

tribunal has not yet rendered a decision on the request.

- The report contains summaries of many other anti-doping cases where WADA is an appellant, most having to do with sanctions that are not Code-compliant.

### **Whistleblower Policy (Agenda Item 11.2)**

- The Independent Commission made the following recommendation in Part 1 of their report:
  - “17. THAT WADA develop and implement a whistleblower assistance and protection policy and train its staff to be careful in how they respond to and handle whistle blower information.”
- Coupled with the evolution of anti-doping in recent years, and specifically the recognition of (e.g. International Standard for Testing and Investigations, Information Gathering and Intelligence Sharing Guidelines) and the importance that intelligence now plays in our work, WADA Management has progressed its work in looking into the aspects surrounding the development of a whistleblower policy.
- WADA’s Objectives:
  - To collect strong and reliable evidence in order to establish anti-doping rule violations (ADRVs) and identify the individuals that committed these ADRVs, including athlete support personal.
  - All evidence of any criminal offences related to ARDVs to be provided to INTERPOL.
- Collection: In most cases, WADA investigations based on information provided by whistleblowers cannot rely only on statements alone. While whistleblower statements are often good starting points to initiate investigations, stronger evidence such as written reports or documents, audio or video evidence, or other material evidence is required to corroborate information provided by whistleblowers. The whistleblower policy currently being developed will address, among other things, the expectations of whistleblowers and the extent to which efforts may be made to obtain stronger, more reliable evidence.
- WADA could agree to suspend the execution of an athlete or other person’s period of ineligibility based on substantial assistance, if information is provided that satisfies the requirements in Article 10.6.1 of the World Anti-Doping Code (Code). In certain cases and in specific circumstances, WADA could consider providing legal assistance to support individuals providing substantial assistance when complex issues are involved. This could be done by WADA but it is advisable that it be provided by external counsel. WADA cannot offer whistleblowers any physical protection, or residency in foreign countries, career opportunities, cover-up or expunge any criminal offences or any other support that is beyond the scope of WADA’s Code of Ethics.
- The internal management (registration and follow up of whistleblowers) must follow a strict internal process led by the WADA Investigations Department. The qualification of whistleblower status to an informant is proposed by the Investigations Department and approved by the

Director General.

- To ensure that confidentiality is strictly respected, only WADA's Director General, the Director of Intelligence and Investigations, and the Director/Head of Legal will be involved in the management of whistleblower cases.
- WADA is in the process of developing a web platform and transparency policy for the purposes of providing whistleblowers with the possibility to contact the Agency with information related to doping. In developing this platform and policy, WADA will seek to provide potential whistleblowers with a safe, reliable and user-friendly web platform where they can feel comfortable and safe to disclose evidence to WADA.
- The software must be secure against cyberattacks or leaks and the transparency policy (data policy) should be highlighted within the platform and included on WADA's website.
- WADA's whistleblower policy and platform could be promoted via social media, WADA's website and media publications.
- When using WADA's web platform, whistleblowers will be required to provide certain information so that WADA can conduct a first assessment of the information and follow up, as appropriate.
- **[Query: Does this do enough to encourage and protect from retaliation whistleblowers, especially those that have not committed an ADRV but who come forward with useful information / evidence for reasons other than offering "substantial assistance"? Shouldn't WADA be preparing a model whistleblower policy for all ADOs to adopt?]**

#### **NADO / RADO Relations (Agenda Item 15)**

- WADA continues to work with developing NADOs in Argentina, Brazil, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Nigeria, Egypt, Belarus, Ukraine, Turkey, Azerbaijan, Greece, Ethiopia, Morocco and of course Russia. In 2016, additional assessment meetings are being planned with the NADOs of Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Thailand.
- WADA continues to work closely with the Institute of National Anti-Doping Organizations (iNADO) to ensure it is focusing on its key strategies and objectives. WADA has been pleased with the direction and approach taken to engage the iNADO members.
- The RADO program continues to provide an effective mechanism for WADA to assist smaller and less developed countries. With the establishment of a new RADO in South America, there are now 16 RADOs involving 127 countries.
  - WADA continues to provide a Staffing Grant for the employment of full-time RADO staff persons in six of the RADOs. WADA is also providing a Supplementary Grant to two RADOs to assist with their staffing needs. This has resulted in significant progress in the implementation of anti-doping programs in these regions.

- WADA is also providing a Testing Grant to all RADOs. In 2015, the RADOs conducted 1167 tests under the Testing Grant, resulting in 21 Adverse Analytical Findings. The Testing Grant is continuing in 2016 with the RADOs focusing on conducting effective and smart testing, as well as implementing the Technical Document for Sport Specific Analysis (TDSSA).
- The Japan Government (MEXT) continues to help support RADOs in Asia. In 2015, MEXT contributed over \$173,085 USD, specifically to RADOs in this region. A similar agreement is currently in place for 2016.
- As mentioned in the NADO update, Anti-Doping Norway, through the support of the Norwegian Government, and in partnership with the Chinese Anti-Doping Agency (CHINADA) and WADA are providing support for the development of anti-doping activities in Kenya. The Africa Zone V RADO is playing an integral role in this partnership and will benefit as a result of its involvement.
- The Australian Government continues to support the Oceania RADO, providing an additional \$60,000 USD for education programs to be implemented in 2015-2016. Discussions are on-going for the possible extension of this support.
- NADOs / Public Authorities that provide or have provided support to RADOs include: Anti-Doping Switzerland, Conference des Ministres de la Jeunesse et des Sports de la Francophonie (CONFEJES), Government of Morocco, Government of Niger, Government of Cameroon, Government of Kenya, Anti-Doping Authority of Portugal (ADoP), Agence française de lutte contre le dopage (AFLD), Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES), South African Institute for Drug Free Sport (SAIDS), Government of Botswana, Government of Seychelles, African Union Sports Council Region 5, Government of Canada, United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA), Spanish NADO (AEPSAD), Government of Panama, Government of Paraguay, Colombia NADO, Chile NADO, Anti-Doping Norway (ADN), UK Anti-Doping (UKAD), Government of Kazakhstan, Government of Maldives, Finnish Anti-Doping Agency (FINADA), Japan Anti-Doping Agency (JADA), Government of Singapore, Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority (ASADA), Government of Georgia, National Anti-Doping Agency of Germany (NADA), Government of Australian, Drug Free Sport New Zealand (DFSNZ).

### **Communications Report (Agenda Item 17)**

- A variety of media issues have dominated the headlines since the last meeting which have generated a great number of enquiries to WADA from media around the globe:
  - The IOC's Independent Testing Proposal
  - The Independent Commission Report Parts 1 and 2
  - The Maria Sharapova Case
  - Meldonium and why it was added to the Prohibited List
  - Allegations of widespread doping in Russian Swimming
  - Allegations of widespread doping and positive test cover-ups in Chinese Swimming
  - Sunday Times investigative report into Doctor Mark Bonar, who allegedly provided PEDs to over 150 athletes
  - Non-Compliance of Mexico and Spain
  - Brazil Compliance and Rio 2016 Anti-Doping Program
  - Ethiopian athletes under investigation for alleged doping

- Allegations of widespread doping in Kenya
- Status of Kenya's Compliance and participation at Rio 2016
- Status of Russia's participation at Rio 2016
- Call from stakeholders for further investigations in Russia and other sports

### **Standards and Harmonisation (Agenda Item 18)**

- Code Implementation and Compliance: The development of a programme to monitor and assess signatories' compliance with the 2015 Code and International Standards continues. The programme is in the process of being certified against the ISO9001:2015 standard. An ISO consultant has been working closely with WADA to ensure the requirements of the ISO9001:2015 standard are met. The final ISO audit was conducted on 8 April 2016 by an ISO approved auditing body and if all is in order WADA will receive its ISO9001:2015 certification by the end of April 2016.
- In addition, WADA is developing an on line 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 pre-released to signatories in December 2016, for completion early in 2017.
- A pilot group consisting of 20 signatories (a mix of varying sized IFs and NADOs) were selected to assist WADA in the review of the initial draft questionnaire and the testing of the IT system. The pilot group met during the recent ADO Symposium in March.
- 2015 Testing Figures and the Technical Document for Sport Specific Analysis (TDSSA): The formal 2015 Testing Figures Report is still in development, however according to an interim report from ADAMS and data entered by the WADA accredited laboratories (as at mid-February 2016), the number of samples in 2015 increased by 9,311 (4%) compared to 2014.
  - There was an increase of 4,798 (47%) blood samples collected.
  - There was an increase of 179 (8%) in Adverse Analytical Findings (AAFs).
  - There was an increase of 2,154 (9%) in Athlete Biological Passport (ABP) blood samples.
- Following the TDSSA's first year of implementation in 2015, the data from ADAMS was reviewed and compared to 2014 figures for the following three groups of prohibited substances:
  - ☐ Growth Hormone (GH);
  - ☐ Erythropoiesis Stimulating Agents (ESAs); and
  - ☐ Growth Hormone Releasing Factors (GHRFs).
  - The data shows a significant increase in the number of Testing Authorities (TAs) conducting and sports receiving such testing. These were two of the main objectives of the TDSSA.
  - As a result, the number of samples increased for these three substances as did the number of AAFs for GH and GHRFs. There were however a lower number of AAFs for ESAs compared to 2014.
- Two new Guidelines were published in February 2016:



- i) Guidelines for Major Events are aimed at Major Event Organizations (MEOs), Organizing Committees, IFs and NADOs with the responsibility of implementing anti-doping programs at major and multi-sport events. These Guidelines are the outcome of WADA's event advisory and observer programs conducted during major events in 2014 and 2015 and following consultation with key stakeholders with expertise in this area.
  - ii) Guidelines for Optimizing Collaboration between IFs and NADOs are focused on improving the collaboration of IFs and NADOs to optimize resources, through the sharing of information and strategies so more effective and efficient programs can be implemented.
- WADA's annual Testing Figures Report is scheduled to be published in June/July 2016. The Department, in conjunction with the Legal Department, also published in April 2016 the second WADA global report on the number of ADRVs in the year 2014. This report presents the outcomes of the AAFs reported in the 2014 Testing Figures Report that led to ADRVs, and those that did not and the reasons why, such as the existence of a valid TUE. The report also highlights the number of non-analytical ADRVs and provides a more accurate reflection of the incidence of doping in a particular year by sport, testing authority and nationality.
- There remain a number of limitations to the compiling of statistics and testing information one of which is that 1) not all ADOs currently use ADAMS or utilize it to its full potential, and 2) the number of cases that remain pending. These two issues will be addressed through WADA's compliance and monitoring program.
- Pre Rio Intelligence Gathering Task Force: To emphasize the importance of anti-doping efforts prior to the Summer Olympic Games in Rio, the IOC has undertaken to support an anti-doping 'taskforce' to ensure a coordinated effort amongst all relevant ADOs in the months leading up to the Games. WADA will provide oversight of this taskforce on behalf of the IOC in order to see that all relevant ADOs are actively engaged and coordinate their efforts at the National and International level to ensure that prospective athletes are subject to robust testing programs prior to their arrival in Rio.
  - The primary objective of the taskforce is to identify potential testing gaps of athletes qualified for the Games and to recommend that the relevant organizations with jurisdiction take the necessary action to conduct testing on those athletes. The taskforce is not replacing an ADO's pre-Games testing program but complementing it. The Taskforce will hand over all relevant information to the IOC so targeted testing can continue from the opening of the Athletes Village.

Joseph de Pencier, J.D.  
Chief Executive Officer  
[jdep@inado.org](mailto:jdep@inado.org)  
[www.inado.org](http://www.inado.org)  
+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.**