

Report of the Independent Observers

The 8th World Games

Kaohsiung

July 2009

INTRODUCTION

A team of three Independent Observers (IOs) attended the 8th World Games in Kaohsiung from the 14th to the 20th July 2009 though we were only in attendance for four days of competition. The IO team had a mandate to conduct an 'audit' type of mission, however, in reality we would describe it as more of an advisory role. Our goal was to reinforce quality doping control operations. We wish to thank the IWGA president Ron Froehlich for his very strong support of this programme.

From the outset of the mission it was clarified by the team that our role was not only to observe but to provide feedback and recommendations, where appropriate, throughout our time in Kaohsiung. Our approach was to co-operate and work with the IWGA Medical Commission as a team wherever possible. We are grateful for the recognition and full acceptance by the Medical Commission of this approach. We are also grateful to Tom Dielen (IWGA Executive Committee member) for all his assistance throughout our time in Kaohsiung. We would like to acknowledge, also, the full co-operation of the KOC/CTADA team throughout our time in Chinese Taipei. In particular we wish to thank Arnold Chen (Director, Chinese Taipei Anti-Doping Agency, CTADA) and Gisele Huang (Executive Director, CTADA). They managed a team of 91 sample collection personnel in an efficient and organised anti-doping programme and were at all times gracious and willing to accept our feedback and suggestions.

Our intention in this mission was firstly to review/consider compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code during the World Games. We also considered it appropriate to evaluate the extent to which the IO report of the 2005 Games in Duisburg had been taken on board and whether or not the recommendations made in that report had been implemented in the 2009 Games. While it should be expected that the doping control programme at the World Games would be of a very high quality standard the IO team felt that it would be important to take into consideration the context in which the programme is being carried out. The structure and level of event management at a major event such as the World Games creates its own challenges. A more flexible approach to venue and competition management results in unique demands on the notification process in particular but also in the management of the test distribution plan. Re-scheduling of the competition programme had a knock on effect of the AD program and required close monitoring. Late qualification of teams and athletes and access to this data also created planning challenges. It is also clear that many of the athletes who take part in the World Games are not ordinarily subject to doping control and this, combined with considerable language difficulties, created further challenges.

Whilst the IWGA were more than happy for the IO team to be involved in all stages of the process the time frame and location of this event dictated that the IO team would not have a role in observing the operations of the laboratory, which was located in Tokyo, Japan. The team also did not have the opportunity to review the sample analysis results while in Kaohsiung as the first results were not received until after our departure. We did, however, monitor these after our departure through the normal channels of the WADA Results Manager Kerwin Clarke.

The team was small (three members) and many of the events at which testing was taking place occurred simultaneously in a variety of locations. With this in mind the team endeavoured to get a sense of the common issues and a general impression of the unique demands of as many sports as possible. Of the 17 sports in which doping control took place during our time at the Games, we observed testing at 13. Some sports were visited on more than one occasion, sometimes due the risk profile of the sport and sometimes due to previous difficulties.

While the overall standard of the programme was undoubtedly of a high quality it was frustrating to find that a number of the recommendations made in the IO report of the 7th World Games in Duisburg were not addressed. There were three major aspects of the programme where a weakness was observed despite the same concerns being raised, not only in the previous IO report from Duisburg but also in both other IO/audit style missions carried out to date (Doha Asian Games and Paralympics 2008). These were the issues of (1)Therapeutic Use Exemptions (2) Planning and Preparation of Test Distribution Plan and (3) Notification and Chaperoning of athletes

IWGA

IWGA Anti-Doping Rules

We were provided with evidence of WADA's confirmation that the IWGA Anti-Doping Rules were in compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code. However, on closer inspection we were confused to find that the references to the International Standard for Testing (IST) in Appendix 2 of the IWGA Rules were not consistent with the current version of the IST (January 2009). This confusion pervaded the observations of the IO team as it was noted that pH readings were still being measured and the procedures relating to samples with low Specific Gravity were also not being followed. We were provided with a DCO manual which was in Chinese and therefore we were not in position to review this in great depth.

Therapeutic Use Exemptions

At our first meeting with the IWGA medical commission it became clear that there was a problem with the TUE process. Only 3 TUEs had been received by the MC and it was agreed that this was not likely to be a true reflection of the situation in reality. This was despite the posting of information in advance on the World Games website as well as a reminder in the final event information regarding TUEs. The IWGA consequently decided to send out a reminder to all IFs seeking confirmation that all TUEs had been sent to the MC. The variety of responses received presented a clear message that there was a gap in the education of IFs with regards to TUEs – (a selection of the responses is outlined in Appendix 3). The MC did not provide the IO team with any copies of TUE documentation so their content or quality was not reviewed. The IO team feels that it is important to report on this issue as there is a very strong need to fill this gap. Athletes' reputations are being put at considerable risk where genuine medical conditions are not being documented appropriately. It is recommended that not only the IWGA but also WADA review their education programmes in this area. The IWGA expressed frustration that despite various IF workshops/seminars and having sent out numerous information letters the situation appeared not to have improved at all since the previous Games in 2005.

Beyond the main concern of a serious lack of understanding about TUEs the team also observed a situation during sample collection where the doping control staff did not follow best practice in the case of an athlete who declared a TUE. The team were not in a position to establish whether this TUE had previously been received by the MC and if not what the course of action was likely to be. Of more concern was the fact that the doping control staff retained all documentation presented by the athlete and made no comment whatsoever on the doping control form (not even to declare the use of the medication). It was recommended by the team subsequently that the papers be returned to the athlete.

Planning and Preparation of TDP

It was a concern for the IO team that on arrival in Kaohsiung there was seemingly no test distribution planning carried out. This, along with a number of other concerns which emerged during the Games, originated from communications issues. There was an

apparent lack of communication between IFs and the IWGA regarding the nature and competition format of sports. This made it more difficult for the IWGA MC to ensure that the selections made were the most appropriate. It would be helpful if each IF were to prepare a TDP guidance note in advance of the Games. This also had an effect out on the field where chaperones had to communicate extensively in some sports with event officials to gain an understanding of the sport – this reduced the confidentiality of the selections at times. There were also occasions when the notification form was shown to persons other than the athlete, seriously compromising the confidentiality of the process. During the Games themselves the MC did not seem to have access to up to date start lists from which to make selections. This resulted in very late test planning. The IWGA requested that chaperones make contact with the technical delegate of each sport on arrival at the venue to ensure that the notifications were made appropriately. This may not have occurred at all sites and consequently some issues arose whereby athletes were notified of their selection for testing prior to the completion of all of their events. While this would not always be an issue it was certainly an issue where athletes could not practically provide a sample prior to their final event due to the distance to the doping control station. This may have been avoided if there was a main contact person allocated by the IF for the doping control team (e.g. the competition manager) whose responsibility it would be to provide access to the technical delegate if and when required.

There was a lack of clarity with regards to which sports required validation of world records and this presented some difficulties for the doping control team. This was potentially an issue in the sport of rock climbing.

Pre-competition testing

It was confirmed in the advance of the Games that there would be no pre-Games testing carried out by the IWGA. There was, however, some Pre games or Pre comp testing carried out by a number of IFs and by WADA in the days prior to the commencement of the Games. There appeared to be a lack of communication regarding these tests and there was a question about the definition of the competition period. This was clarified and it was agreed that all testing carried out was appropriately timed. However, it may have been more productive if this testing had been better co-ordinated with the IWGA facilitating a more comprehensive and effective pre-Games testing programme.

During the week preceding the Games a decision was made to carry out a number of pre-competition tests in both bodybuilding and powerlifting as the two highest risk sports of the Games. The initial plan had been to carry out testing on the teams shortly after their arrival in Kaohsiung but without detailed whereabouts this was not really practical. Instead it was agreed that testing would take place during the weigh-in for bodybuilding. Problems with communications almost jeopardised this plan as the location of the weigh-in was altered at a very late stage. Not all teams arrived for the weigh-in. But of those that did a significant proportion were selected for testing. This proved to be a highly successful strategy resulting in a number of adverse analytical findings.

The pre-competition testing in Powerlifting was also successfully carried out, with notification taking place this time at the competitors' hotel accommodation. This approach went well and the use of accommodation details was successful even in the absence of full whereabouts details.

The lack of specific whereabouts information however, was something of a limitation and contributed to a lack of further pre-competition tests being carried out in any other sports. This is an area where further work is required for future games. It is recommended that a manageable and realistic whereabouts policy be developed which would facilitate a greater number of out of competition tests to be carried out across a broader range of sports.

Event management guide

The IO team noted a small number of issues which arose out of inexperience of the doping control management staff with such a large multi-sport event. It was felt that there would be merit in having a standard event management guide which would highlight key actions required etc. in establishing a programme of this kind for the organisers of future events. It is suggested that WADA and/or SPORTACCORD should consider preparing a document of this kind.

The IO team saw a number of issues arise which have previously been raised in other IO reports. These are clearly areas which require attention and could be remedied by pulling together a best practice guideline for event management.

Education

A small pocket sized Doping Control Guide was produced for the Games which was helpful and convenient for athletes to carry around for reference. This was a particularly important resource as it may have been the only anti-doping education some athletes will have received.

PROGRAMME OBSERVATIONS

Doping Control Facilities

General

The doping controls were based out of two centralised doping control stations during the Games. While many of the venues were reasonably close to one or other of the two there were a few locations which were a 30-40 minute drive from the either of the DCSs. This left athletes with a long drive after already on occasions having had to wait some time for medal ceremonies. It might be an idea to do a cost analysis to have more DCS and less transport?

In general the two DCSs were large and functional, with plenty of sample processing cubicles set up. At no time during our observations was there a queue of athletes waiting to be dealt with. The stations were bright and air conditioned, with posters on the wall and a TV to watch. The ADO are to be commended in particular for their very clear and well presented posters on the sample processing procedures – both for a complete sample and for a partial sample. They had an innovative use of these posters as disposable spill mats during each sample processing procedure.

The toilets were not ideal but were adapted to provide a reasonable space to accommodate witnessing of the sample collection. The IO team and the MC made a number of suggestions, not all of which were taken on board. In an area which had both shower and toilet cubicle it was decided to use the shower cubicle as it was larger. However, it did not have a toilet. The intention was to simply wash the floor after each sample was provided. This was not considered acceptable on two grounds – firstly it would create a health and safety hazard resulting from the wet floor and secondly, it wasn't deemed acceptable to have athletes provide a sample without any type of toilet. The problem of the wet and potentially slippery surface was resolved with the use of mats and eventually after a second request from the IO team a receptacle was provided as a toilet. The toilet area could also have been improved with the use of mirrors to improve the view of the athlete, as recommended in the previous IO report. It was also felt that better use could have been made of the space outside of the cubicles. This space would have been more appropriate for the sample collection.

While the ADO are to be applauded for having such a large and enthusiastic workforce available each day, this created a problem in itself as the doping control station became very crowded at times on the first days. However, following a recommendation of the IO team this was controlled much more stringently during the coming days and only those personnel involved with the testing procedure were allowed into the waiting room. This overcrowding issue was even more of a concern within the sample processing area, but again it was resolved to some degree after the first couple of days, though there did still seem to be a large number of individuals who were being authorised to enter the sample processing cubicle.

There were a couple of instances of poor judgement by the Sample Collection Personnel (SCP) team at the DCS, in particular one DCO disclosed the planned testing programme in a sport to one of the coaches accompanying an athlete from that sport.

Security

The security arrangements, and indeed the requirements, differed slightly in each of the two doping control stations. The main command centre was located at the Fistball venue and consequently there was other Games related business in the same venue. This meant that security was more of an issue here than in the university doping control station. At the commencement of the Games there was security provided on the 4th Floor where the doping control station was located but it was clear that a further level of security was required to ensure that persons not permitted in the doping control station did not arrive in the lift and find themselves already in the DCS before they could be stopped. Over the course of the first couple of days this was rectified with a desk set up in the foyer of the building.

The different layout of the university DCS was somewhat different in that there were a number of rooms being used for testing purposes, all of which were accessed from one corridor. There was a security guard present in this corridor who predominantly controlled access to the sample collection processing room, where samples were stored in a refrigerator.

Although the main office of the doping control station was locked overnight, neither of the two DCSs had lockable fridges despite the requests of the MC. Documentation was stored in lockable cabinets in both of the stations.

Notification and Chaperoning

This particular aspect of the doping control process has been raised time and again in IO reports as an area of weakness requiring special attention. In Kaohsiung it was an issue once again. As is often the case the unique requirements of notification at a major competition created challenges. Language was an issue as many of the chaperones were not proficient in English and many athletes were not proficient in either English or Chinese. With no interpreters available the chaperones had to improvise and generally succeeded in finding someone who could act as an interpreter. Though this resolved some problems it was clear that not all athletes were fully aware of their rights and responsibilities and some were clearly not at all sure of what was required of them. Others did not understand that the doping control station was not at the venue of their competition and therefore came unprepared without even bringing with them a change of clothes.

As many of the chaperones were also quite young they were not always very assertive. As a result they had difficulty notifying the athletes fully and appropriately and on more than one occasion athletes arrived at the doping control station without ever having signed the notification form. The full supervision and observation of the athletes after notification was also compromised by the chaperones lack of assertiveness. Some

chaperones were also clearly distracted from their role at times and were not observing their athletes as diligently as required.

The challenges of having a centralised doping control station opened up some further issues e.g. one athlete was inappropriately permitted to divert on the way to the doping control station to his hotel to retrieve a medical prescription.

Having said the above, the comments of the IO team were noted and the arrangements for chaperoning were adapted during the course of our time at the event. Chaperones went in pairs and a further improvement was the presence of a more senior DCO to accompany them to venues.

Consumption of food and fluids

There was one issue which resulted in considerable debate and concluded in the decision by the IWGA MC not to accept the recommendation of the IO team. The IO team were at variance with the IWGA MC over whether or not athletes should be permitted to consume food or drink not provided at the doping control station. The pros and cons were debated and it was agreed that the IST was sufficiently ambiguous on this point to allow for the preferred interpretation of the IWGA to be accepted. However, it was agreed that the IO team would report back this confusion to WADA. WADA has subsequently provided further guidance and clarification on the situation to the IWGA regarding the consumption of food and fluids by athletes after notification and prior to sample collection (see Appendix 4).

Transport of athletes to the Doping Control Station

The logistics of getting all athletes from their competition venue to the appropriate doping control station was successfully addressed by the use of a contracted taxi company. This system was efficient in most cases and athletes did not generally have to wait long for taxis to arrive. Two minor problems arose. One was the distraction for chaperones while they made the call for the taxi. They should not have been allowed to be distracted from the job of observing the athlete. The second problem was that for one or two venues the taxi pick up had to be made outside of the gate of the venue as drivers could not gain access – this meant a bit of a walk for some of the athletes.

Sample Collection procedures

The sample collection and processing was generally carried out in a friendly yet professional manner. However, there were some instances where the process was extremely slow. The level of experience of the DCOs varied quite significantly and while some had a substantial amount of Major Games experience, there were others who appeared to be novices. On one occasion the DCO was unable to provide an athlete with a clear explanation of the reason for the measurement of specific gravity (SG). In contrast some of the DCOs were particularly meticulous in their explanations to the athletes even in cases where athletes were confident and familiar with the process. There

was also more than one occasion where an issue arose and the problem solving process became enormous and lengthy resulting in one athlete taking 45 minutes from the time his sample was provided to the time he left the doping control station.

It was noted at an early stage that the pH of samples was to be measured. This was contrary to the current IST and it was recommended by the IO team that unless the lab had a specific requirement for this information that it should not be measured. However, following some discussion it was agreed that it would be collected but that a second sample should not be requested even if the pH were to fall outside the normal range.

The IO team queried the necessity to collect athlete's addresses as (in accordance with the IWGA Rules) this information should have been available to the organisers. However, it was clarified later that the information held already was deemed somewhat unreliable. This information should, in future, be confirmed accurate at the time of accreditation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation:

The IO team recommends that WADA and/or SPORTACCORD develop an Event Manual for use by major event organisers.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that not only the IWGA but also WADA review their education programmes in the area of Therapeutic Use Exemptions.

Recommendation:

Information regarding competition structure and anti-doping selection policies should be provided in a comprehensive format by all IFs in advance of the Games (this should include requirements for validation of world records).

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the competition manager be the main contact for the doping control team and that this person should be responsible for providing access to the technical delegate if and when required.

Recommendation:

A comprehensive pre-competition programme should be put in place for future Games taking into consideration the demands of putting in place an adequate whereabouts system.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that a manageable and realistic whereabouts policy be developed which would facilitate a greater number of out of competition tests to be carried out across a broader range of sports.

Recommendation:

A cost/benefit analysis should be carried out by the IWGA to ascertain the value of having only one or two doping control stations, while taking into consideration the costs of transport, impact on operations and athletes etc.

Recommendation

At no time should any person be permitted to enter the doping control area unless they have a specific role to play at the time.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that toilets should have mirrors in them to assist in the observation of sample provision, particularly if the toilet area is not large.

Recommendation:

Where there is not a doping control station at a sport venue there should, as an alternative, be a clear doping control base at each venue and clarity on the competition structure for the benefit of the chaperones.

Recommendation:

Athlete's personal details should be verified at the time of accreditation and not in the Doping Control Station in order to expedite the sample collection process.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of IO Team Members and IWGA Medical Commission Members

Appendix 2: Statistics of Doping Control Tests Conducted at the 8th World Games

Appendix 3: Samples of TUE Communications

Appendix 4: Extracts on Consumption of Food and Fluid from the International Standard for Testing and Guidelines for Urine Sample Collection

Appendix 1: List of IO Team Members and IWGA Medical Commission Members

The members of the IO team at the 8th World Games in Kaohsiung were:

- **Dr. Una May (Ireland) – Chair**
Director of Anti-Doping, Irish Sports Council
- **Kelly Fairweather (South Africa)**
Director of European Office and International Federations Relations, WADA
- **Cui Ying (China)**
Project Coordinator, Standards and Harmonization, WADA

The members of the IWGA Medical Commission at the 8th World Games in Kaohsiung were*:

- **Dr. Pierre Dernier (Belgium) – Chair**
- **Dr. Michel Leglise (France)**
- **Dr. Karl-Heinz Kerll (Germany)**

* Tom Dielen representing the IWGA Executive Committee attended the daily meetings of the IO team and IWGA Medical Commission. His presence and contributions were appreciated.

Appendix 2: Statistics of Doping Control Tests Conducted at the 8th World Games

Sport	Total	Positive	Negative	%
Air Sports	5	0	5	0.00%
Archery	7	0	7	0.00%
Beach Handball	5	0	5	0.00%
Billiard	5	0	5	0.00%
Bodybuilding	19	5	14	26.32%
Boules Sports	4	0	4	0.00%
Bowling	6	0	6	0.00%
Canoe-Polo	6	0	6	0.00%
Dance		0	9	0.00%
Dragon Boat	6	0	6	0.00%
Finswimming	9	0	9	0.00%
Fistball	6	0	6	0.00%
Flying Disc	9	0	9	0.00%
Gymn. Acrobatic	8	0	8	0.00%
Gymn. Aerobic	12	0	12	0.00%
Gymn. Rhythmic.	7	0	7	0.00%
Gymn Trampoline	5	0	5	0.00%
Gymn. Tumbling	4	0	4	0.00%
Ju-Jitsu	6	0	6	0.00%
Karate	8	0	8	0.00%
Korfball	13	0	13	0.00%
Lifesaving	10	0	10	0.00%
Orienteering	8	0	8	0.00%
Powerlifting	24	0	24	0.00%
Racquetball	6	0	6	0.00%
Roller Hockey	8	0	8	0.00%
Roller Sports	5	0	5	0.00%
Roller; 1000 m	2	0	2	0.00%
Roller; Speed	2	0	2	0.00%
Rugby	14	0	14	0.00%
Softball	4	0	4	0.00%
Sport Climbing	10	0	10	0.00%
Squash	8	0	8	0.00%
Sumo	8	1	7	14.29%
Tchoukball	4	0	4	0.00%
Tug of War	12	0	12	0.00%
Waterski	12	0	12	0.00%
Wushu	4	0	4	0.00%
	291	6	285	2.06%

The IO team thanks the IWGA Medical Commission for providing the data.

Appendix 3: Samples of TUE Communications

E-mail sent to all IWGA member federations

Sent: Tuesday, 14 July 2009 3:09:34

Subject: Urgent!

Dear Colleagues from All Member-Federations, going to participate in the WG09,
The IWGA Medical Commission has asked me to notify you they have not received many TUEs or declaration of use letters(attached here on to). Please forward this information directly to Dr. Michel Leglise as soon as possible. His email address is: michel.leglise@ffgym.fr

Thank you for your immediate attention.
With kind regards,
Rossitsa Stateva

Sample correspondence arising out of e-mail

Envoyé : vendredi 17 juillet 2009 09:50

À : Michel Leglise

Objet : Re: Urgent!

Hi Dr. Michel

Please certify what TUE is. Our athlete have just completed the university and have no medical problem.

Thank You

From: Michel Leglise <michel.leglise@ffgym.fr>

Sent: Thursday, 16 July 2009 2:57:00

Subject: RE: Urgent!

Sorry ; our request concerns the TUE

Have you any athletes who got a TUE or request for a TUE ? if yes please send me the forms if not confirm too

A lot of thanks DR M leglise

Envoyé : jeudi 16 juillet 2009 08:47

A : Rossitsa Stateva; Michel Leglise

Objet : Re: Urgent!

Hi Dr. Michel Leglise

A attached Copy of the Declaration form for the Athlete of

Thanks

Envoyé : mercredi 15 juillet 2009 01:36

À : Michel Leglise

Objet : TUE

Hello

I am and my daughter is an athlete at the World Games representing in

Attached is a copy of the active ingredients in "Elevit" which is currently taking for theraputic reasons.

I have sent the attachment to ma729172@worldgames2009.tw on the 10 July (NZ time) thinking that this was all we needed to do.

Judging by an email received this has not been received in Taiwan and it has been suggested that we send it direct to you.

Many thanks

Subject: RE: IMPORTANT - TUE for World Games

TUE is the abbreviation for" therapeutic use exemption" .This has nothing to do with the declaration for custom to import medication in Taiwan Please consult WADA code and WADA rules on WADA Website We IWGA need a prompt answer of course if some of your athletes need this Tue Be kind to control urgently DR M Leglise

-----Message d'origine-----

De : Mariya Bulgakova [mailto:office@uwsf.org.ua] Envoyé : mardi 14 juillet 2009 23:54 À : Michel Leglise Objet : Re: IMPORTANT - TUE for World Games

Dear Dr.Leglise!

Could you please explain what "TUEs or declaration of use letters" is so we do it if needed? Is it form for medications that the athlete is carrying with to Taiwan?

Sincerely,

...

Secretary General

Appendix 4: Extracts on Consumption of Food and Fluid from the International Standard for Testing and Guidelines for Urine Sample Collection

International Standard for Testing 2009

5.4 Requirements for notification of *Athletes*

5.4.1 When initial contact is made, the *ADO*, *DCO* or *Chaperone*, as applicable, shall ensure that the *Athlete* and/or a third party (if required in accordance with Clause 5.3.8) is informed:

...

- g) That should the *Athlete* choose to consume food or fluids prior to providing a *Sample*, he/she does so at his/her own risk, and should in any event avoid excessive rehydration, having in mind the requirement to produce a *Sample* with a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.

Guidelines for Urine Sample Collection (Version 4.)

5.6 *Escorting the Athlete to the Doping Control Station.*

5.6.3 The DCO/Chaperone cannot prevent the *Athlete* eating or drinking products of their choice, but shall recommend that the *Athlete* chooses from a selection of individually sealed, non-caffeinated and non-alcoholic beverages in order to hydrate. The DCO/Chaperone shall not handle food or drink items for the *Athlete*.