

WADA CODE & INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS 2021: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

Lausanne, 20 April 2020

Dear National Federations,

This document explains what will change in the World Anti-Doping Code and its related International Standards starting 1 January 2021. These changes mandate the modifications which will be proposed for the FEI Anti-Doping Rules for Human Athletes (ADRHA) on 13 July as part of the 2020 rule revision process.

The changes are presented along with an explanation of the rationale and, where relevant, positions expressed by WADA's stakeholders during the 2021 revision consultation process (you can learn more about the review process [here](#)). As it includes a number of acronyms and defined terms, please read it in conjunction with the [Anti-Doping Glossary](#).

We draw your attention to the now mandatory requirements on education, which are an important consequence of the 2021 Code for the daily work of National Federations. For many of you, partnering with your National or Regional Anti-Doping Organisation (NADO/RADO) will enable the conception and delivery of effective education programs. Where partnerships cannot be developed, please let us know and we will determine how the FEI can help you.

The document ends with a few words on Code Compliance. Code compliance is mandatory for the entire Olympic Movement and is now closely monitored by WADA in accordance with the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS). It is crucial for the FEI's compliance that National Federations comply with their obligations under the ADRHA. If after reading the first draft revised ADRHA you find that you need help in order to achieve this goal, please [contact us](#).

Thank you for your commitment to Clean Sport.

FEI Legal Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Summary of the significant changes between the current 2015 Code and the 2021 Code	5
1. Purpose, Scope and Organization of the Code	5
2. Emphasis on Health as a Rationale for the Code	5
3. Fundamental Rationale: Athlete's Rights	5
4. Delegation of Doping Control Functions by Anti-Doping Organizations	5
5. Procedures Related to Split Samples (Article 2.1.2 and Article 6.7)	6
6. Expansion of Laboratory Reports for Atypical Findings Beyond Endogenous Substances (Article 2.1.4 and 2015 Code Article 7.4)	6
7. Tampering (Article 2.5) and Definition of Tampering	6
8. Article 2.9: Attempted Complicity	6
9. Modification of Article 2.10 - Prohibited Association	7
10. Addition of a New Article Providing Protection for Individuals Reporting Violations (Article 2.11)	7
11. Burden Shifting (Article 3.2)	7
12. The Problem of Substances which are not Prohibited Out-of-Competition Appearing, in Trace Amounts, in In-Competition Samples (Article 4.2)	7
13. Specified Methods (Article 4.2.2.)	8
14. Expanded use of the Monitoring Program. (Article 4.5)	8
15. Retired Athletes Returning to Competition (Article 5.6)	8
16. Use of Information from Sample Analysis (Article 6)	8
17. Use of Other Laboratories to Establish Forensic Facts Other than the Presence of a Prohibited Substance under Article 2.1 (Article 6.1).	9
18. Further Analysis of Samples (Articles 6.5 and 6.6)	9
19. WADA's Right to Take Possession of Samples and Data (Article 6.8)	9
20. General Changes to Results Management (Article 7)	9
21. WADA's Right to Require an Anti-Doping Organization to Conduct Results Management – (Article 7.1.5)	10
22. More Rigorous Standards for Fair Hearings under Article 8	10
23. Comment to Article 10.2.3: Definition of Intentional	10
24. Substances of Abuse – Article 10.2.4	10
25. Added Flexibility in Sanctioning for Refusal to Submit to Sample Collection (Article 2.3) or Tampering (Article 2.5) (Article 10.3.1)	11

26. Fraudulent Conduct During Results Management and Hearing Process (Article 10.3.1)	12
27. Increasing the Upper End of the Sanction for Complicity (Article 2.9) (Article 10.3.4)	12
28. Re-Introduction of the Concept of "Aggravating Circumstances" (Article 10.4)	12
29. Addressing the Problem of Common Contaminants in Supplements and Other Products (Article 10.6.1.2)	12
30. Expansion of the Types of Cooperation which Justify a Reduced Sanction for Substantial Assistance – (Article 10.7.1.1)	13
31. New Article Entitled Results Management Agreements (Article 10.8)	13
32. Improvements to the Multiple Violations Rules - (Article 10.9)	14
33. Forfeited Prize Money Goes to Other Athletes (Article 10.11)	15
34. Delays not Attributable to the Athlete or Other Person (Article 10.13.1)	15
35. Clarifications Relating to Sanctions for Violation of a Provisional Suspension (Article 10.14.3)	15
36. Express Authority of a Signatory to Exclude Athletes and Other Persons from its Events as a Sanction Against a Member Federation (Article 12)	15
37. Scope of Review on Appeal (Article 13.1.1).	16
38. Appeals Involving National Level Athletes (Article 13.2.2.)	16
39. Public Disclosure (Article 14.3)	16
40. Implementation of Decisions (Formerly Mutual Recognition) – (Article 15)	16
41. Article 18 Education	17
42. Obligation of Individual Signatory Participants to Agree to be Bound by the Code and for Signatories to not Knowingly Employ any Person Whose Actions Would Have Violated the Code had the Code Been Applicable to That Person (Articles 20.1.7 and 20.1.8 and comparable Articles for other Signatories)	17
43. Article 20.5: National Anti-Doping Organizations Conflict of Interest Policies	17
44. Signatories' Expectations of Governments – (Article 22)	18
45. How Does a Sport Organization Become a Signatory? (Article 23.1)	18
46. Code of Conduct, Medical and Safety Rules Permitted Under Article 23.2	18
47. Article 24 Code Compliance and Monitoring	19
48. Non-Retroactive Effect of Changes to the Prohibited List (Article 27.6)	19
49. Definition of In-Competition.	19
50. "Protected Persons" and "Minors"	19

51. New Category of Athletes – "Recreational Athletes" Permitted More Flexibility in the Imposition of Consequences	20
II. Significant changes between the current International Standards and the revised Standards	20
1. International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS)	20
2. International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI)	23
3. International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUE)	27
4. International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information (ISPPPI)	30
5. International Standard for Laboratories (ISL)	33
III. Summary of key topics being addressed in the new Standards	33
1. International Standard for Education (ISE)	33
2. International Standard for Results Management (ISRM)	35
IV. General Considerations on Code Compliance	37

I. Summary of the significant changes between the current 2015 Code and the 2021 Code

1. Purpose, Scope and Organization of the Code

Technical Documents have been enumerated as one of the main elements of the World Anti-Doping Program. Technical Documents are mandatory and become effective immediately upon publication by WADA unless a later date is specified. Where implementation of a new Technical Document is not time sensitive, the ExCo will allow for reasonable consultation with Code Signatories, governments and other relevant stakeholders.

2. Emphasis on Health as a Rationale for the Code

A recent decision of the European Court of Human Rights relied on public health as a primary basis for upholding the whereabouts requirements of the Code. As suggested by a number of stakeholders, health has been moved to the top of the list of rationales for the Code and is specifically mentioned in a sentence preceding that list. Additional changes were made at the request of WADA's Ethics Working Group to provide a better statement of the ethical foundation of the Code.

3. Fundamental Rationale: Athlete's Rights

WADA's Athlete Committee proposed that a document entitled Anti-Doping Charter of Athlete Rights be specifically referenced in the 2021 Code. Both the Olympic Movement and Public Authorities expressed concern over including a reference to this document in the Code. First, there is the general problem referencing a document where there is not yet an agreement on either the document name or its content. Second, there is specific concern that the Code and not a separate document, remain the controlling document for anti-doping-related athlete rights. In the 2021 Code, the identification of athletes' rights in the Code has been specifically included as part of the Fundamental Rationale for the Code. The 2021 Code also continues to provide in Article 20.7.7 that one of WADA's responsibilities will be, in coordination with WADA's Athlete Committee, to approve a document that compiles in one place those athletes' rights that are specifically identified in the Code and also identifies any other agreed upon principles of best practice with respect to the overall protection of athletes' rights in the context of anti-doping.

4. Delegation of Doping Control Functions by Anti-Doping Organizations

There has been some confusion under the current Code whether an Anti-Doping Organization (ADO) may delegate aspects of the doping control process and the extent to which it remains responsible following such delegation. The Introduction to Part One of the Code and Article 20 which sets forth stakeholders' responsibilities, make clear that ADOs are responsible for all aspects of doping control that they may delegate any of those aspects, but they remain fully responsible for the performance of those aspects

in compliance with the Code. A broad definition of the term “Delegated Third Party” has been added to the Code. A comment has been added to Article 20 which provides that “Anti-Doping Organizations should contractually require Delegated Third Party to whom they have delegated anti-doping responsibilities to report to the Anti-Doping Organization any finding of non-compliance by the Delegated Third Party.”

5. Procedures Related to Split Samples (Article 2.1.2 and Article 6.7)

These Articles, together with the revised International Standard for Laboratories (ISL), permit a single A Sample or B Sample to be split and used for both initial analysis and both parts of the confirmation analysis. Where only a single bottle is to be used for analysis, the laboratory and ADO with results management responsibility must attempt to notify the athlete of the opportunity to observe the bottle opening. Much of the detail applicable to split samples has been moved to the ISL.

6. Expansion of Laboratory Reports for Atypical Findings Beyond Endogenous Substances (Article 2.1.4 and 2015 Code Article 7.4)

When a laboratory reports a sample as an Atypical Finding (ATF) that sends a message to the ADO that the Sample may or may not contain a prohibited substance. It is then the ADO’s responsibility to conduct an investigation to determine whether the sample should be treated as an Adverse Analytical Finding (AAF) or not. Under the original 2015 Code, a laboratory could only report test results involving endogenous substances as ATF. The 2021 Code permits WADA to develop a list of other prohibited substances which may be reported as ATF and thereby trigger investigations. This approach is particularly helpful when trace levels of clenbuterol are detected in a sample. It is well known that meat contamination in Mexico and China can cause trace levels of clenbuterol to appear in an athlete’s urine. Historically, there was significant disparity in how different ADOs treat these potential meat contamination cases. The 2015 Code was amended by WADA’s Foundation Board on 16 May 2019 to expand the category of ATFs beyond endogenous substance. The provisions of the 2021 Code and International Standards are consistent with that amendment.

7. Tampering (Article 2.5) and Definition of Tampering

In the 2015 Code, the act of tampering was described in Article 2.5, in a comment to Article 2.5 and in a separate definition of “Tampering.” In the 2021 Code, all of that has been consolidated into the definition of “Tampering. At the request of a number of stakeholders, the acts of falsifying documents submitted to an ADO and procuring false testimony from witnesses have been moved up from the comment and specifically included in the definition of “Tampering.”

8. Article 2.9: Attempted Complicity

“Attempted Complicity” has been added to “Complicity” as an Anti-Doping Rule Violation (ADRV) under Article 2.9.

9. Modification of Article 2.10 - Prohibited Association

This Article prohibits association in a sport related capacity with an athlete support person who is serving a period of ineligibility. Since this Article was incorporated into the 2015 Code, there have been very few, if any, ADRV cases brought under this Article. A number of ADOs have expressed concern that one reason for this is because the current requirement that an athlete must be notified before an ADRV for prohibited association can be asserted, simply drives that prohibited association underground. In response to that concern, this Article has been changed to eliminate the advance notice requirement and instead, places the burden on the ADO to demonstrate that the athlete knew that the athlete support person was ineligible.

10. Addition of a New Article Providing Protection for Individuals Reporting Violations (Article 2.11)

This Article makes it an ADRV to threaten another person to discourage that person from the good faith reporting to authorities of information relating to an ADRV, non-compliance with the Code or other doping activity, or to retaliate against another person for doing so. The range of sanction for these violations is two years to lifetime ineligibility depending on the seriousness of the violation. (Article 10.3.6)

11. Burden Shifting (Article 3.2)

Modifications to Article 3.2.3 make clear that departures from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI) involving sample collection or sample handling, or the International Standard for Results Management (ISRM) involving Adverse Passport Findings (APF) or whereabouts failures or notice to the athlete of the opening of the B Sample, which could reasonably have caused an ADRV, shift the burden to the ADO to establish that the departure did not cause the ADRV. A comment to Article 3.2.3 makes clear that an ADO can satisfy its burden of establishing that the failure to give notice of the B Sample opening did not cause the AAF, by having an independent observer witness the B Sample opening. Other violations of anti-doping rules or policies (such as a violation of the International Standard for Education) may raise compliance issues for an ADO but may not be used as a defense to an ADRV.

12. The Problem of Substances which are not Prohibited Out-of-Competition Appearing, in Trace Amounts, in In-Competition Samples (Article 4.2)

It has always been the case under the Code that some substances are prohibited at all times, and other substances are only prohibited in-competition. The general rule has been that if a substance appears in an athlete's sample in an in-competition test, it is an (AAF); it does not matter when the substance was taken. The consequences of this approach have become increasingly problematic as WADA-accredited laboratories have developed the ability to detect ever more minute quantities of prohibited substances in an athlete's urine in in-competition samples. In some cases, these substances were obviously used out-of-competition and could not possibly have had an in-competition effect. To address this problem, a special working group appointed by WADA is

considering reporting thresholds for certain substances which are not prohibited out-of-competition but which may appear in trace amounts in in-competition tests. Recommendations from the working group would have to be approved by WADA's List Expert Group and ExCo.

13. Specified Methods (Article 4.2.2.)

The Code provides potentially different sanction schemes for non-specified substances and specified substances. Currently, all methods are non-specified. This change allows the List Expert Group, with subsequent approval from the ExCo, the flexibility to identify certain new or existing prohibited methods as "Specified."

14. Expanded use of the Monitoring Program. (Article 4.5)

In addition to monitoring substances already in the Monitoring Program, the modification to Article 4.5 provides that WADA may monitor data pertaining to other substances in order to see if they should be included on either the Monitoring Program or Prohibited List.

15. Retired Athletes Returning to Competition (Article 5.6)

Article 5.6 provides that when an international-level athlete or national-level athlete in a Registered Testing Pool (RTP) retires and then wishes to return to active participation in sport, the athlete must not compete in an international event or a national event until the athlete has made himself or herself available for testing by giving six months prior written notice to the athlete's International Federation (IF) and National Anti-Doping Organization (NADO). WADA is given the opportunity to make exceptions to the six-month rule in exceptional circumstances. Several stakeholders pointed out the problems which occur when an athlete wishes to compete in another unrelated sport, and also when an athlete cannot tell whether an event is or is not a national event (for example, where under national rules the event becomes a national event when a national level athlete is entered). New Article 5.6.1.1 makes clear that an athlete's competitive results are not disqualified if the athlete can establish that he or she could not have reasonably know that the event was an international or national level event. The requirement that exceptional circumstances must exist for WADA to grant an exemption has been removed. If the demand warrants, WADA will set up an expedited procedure to grant exemptions to the six-month rule for athletes who are clearly not international or national level competitors in the sport in which they are seeking to compete.

16. Use of Information from Sample Analysis (Article 6)

Changes have been made to this Article to make clear that analytical data from sample analysis and other Anti-Doping information, in addition to use for research purposes, may also be used for non-research purposes such as method development or to establish reference populations, provided that the information must be processed in a manner as to prevent it from being traced back to a particular athlete.

17. Use of Other Laboratories to Establish Forensic Facts Other than the Presence of a Prohibited Substance under Article 2.1 (Article 6.1).

This new Article makes clear that for purposes of an AAF under Article 2.1 only the results of WADA-accredited or -approved laboratories may be used. However other forensic analysis, (e.g., fingerprinting or DNA analysis) may be conducted by laboratories that are not WADA- accredited or -approved so long as their evidence is reliable because, under Article 3.2, an ADO may establish facts by any reliable means.

18. Further Analysis of Samples (Articles 6.5 and 6.6)

The Article addressing further analysis of samples has been broken into two parts: Article 6.5 - AAF, there is no limitation on repeated analysis of the sample. After the athlete has been notified of an AAF, additional analysis may take place only with the consent of the athlete or the hearing body in the case. The rationale for this is that once an athlete has been notified of an AAF, he or she should not be forced to react to a moving target in terms of the sample analysis during the course of the hearing process. If further analysis is appropriate, then that may be directed by the hearing body.

Article 6.6 - When a sample has been declared negative, there is no limitation imposed on either the ADO that initiated and directed sample collection or WADA conducting further analysis (retesting) on the sample. Other ADOs with authority over the athlete wishing to conduct further analysis on a sample must get permission to do so from either the ADO that initiated and directed the collection of the sample or WADA.

19. WADA's Right to Take Possession of Samples and Data (Article 6.8)

This Article reaffirms WADA's right to take immediate physical possession of samples and anti-doping data.

20. General Changes to Results Management (Article 7)

A number of stakeholders suggested detailed improvements to the results management process described in Article 7. Those improvements and much of the detail currently found in Article 7 has been moved into the new International Standard for Results Management (ISRM). Important principles of results management have been retained in Article 7, particularly those principles dealing with relationships between stakeholders. Those parts of Article 7 addressing how to process different types of ADRVs have been deleted from the Code and expanded upon in the ISRM.

Article 7.5.1 has been added to make clear that ADOs (other than Major Event Organizations (MEOs)) must not limit their decisions to a particular geographic area or sport. Currently, some ADOs limit their decisions so that other organizations must initiate their own proceedings to declare a person ineligible to participate in their events. This Article, together with new Article 15, gives the imposition of consequences by a Signatory worldwide effect in all sports without further action. An exception is made for results management decisions by MEOs where the athletes' only opportunity to appeal

the decision by the MEO is through an in-games expedited process. Those decisions are not given effect beyond the major event and are turned over to the applicable IF for follow up results management. (Article 7.1.4 and 7.5.2)

21. WADA's Right to Require an Anti-Doping Organization to Conduct Results Management – (Article 7.1.5)

It has occasionally been the case that the ADO with Results Management Authority (RMA) has refused to conduct results management. It therefore becomes necessary that some ADO conduct results management in the individual case to determine whether or not an ADRV was committed. Article 7.1.5 makes clear that in this unique circumstance, WADA may demand that the ADO with RMA conduct results management and, if the organization refuses, WADA may designate another ADO with authority over the athlete to conduct the results management with its costs and attorney's fees reimbursed by the refusing ADO. An ADO's refusal to conduct results management shall also be considered an act of non-compliance.

22. More Rigorous Standards for Fair Hearings under Article 8

A number of stakeholders suggested that the fair hearing requirement in Article 8 be expanded. A significant concern expressed by many is that the "impartial hearing panel" requirement in Article 8.1 is not being followed by all Signatories where, for example in some cases, the same individual is involved in the investigation, the decision to charge an ADRV and the hearing on whether a violation has been committed. Article 8 now requires that the hearing panel be "Operationally Independent" from the investigation, the decision to charge and the prosecution of the case. "Operational Independence" has been made a defined term.

23. Comment to Article 10.2.3: Definition of Intentional

A new comment to Article 10.2.3 which is consistent with existing Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) decisions, provides that, unless otherwise specified in the Code, "Intentional" means that the person intended to commit the act which forms the basis of an ADRV regardless of whether the person knew that such act constituted a violation of the Code.

24. Substances of Abuse – Article 10.2.4

We received considerable stakeholder feedback that sanctions for street drugs remain a significant problem under the Code. Cocaine is a particular problem.

Concerned stakeholders made the following points:

- Use of these drugs is a problem for society in general unrelated to sport performance.
- The Code only prohibits use/presence of these drugs in-competition. While stimulants like cocaine can clearly have a performance enhancing effect when

used in-competition, often the quantity detected in-competition strongly suggests that the use occurred out-of- competition in a social context with no effect on sport performance.

- In cases where an athlete has a drug problem, and not a performance enhancement problem that effects the level playing field, Signatories should prioritize the athlete's health.
- Substantial resources are being spent arguing in hearings over the appropriate length of sanction in substances of abuse cases. These resources could be better spent on anti- doping investigations or ADRVs which really do affect the level playing field of sport.

Based on this stakeholder input, new Article 10.2.4.1 provides as follows:

1. WADA's List Expert Group will identify those substances on the Prohibited List which are often abused in society outside of sport as "Substances of Abuse." The List Expert Group has the expertise to do this.
2. In order for Article 10.2.4.1 to apply, the athlete must establish that the use occurred out- of-competition and was unrelated to sport performance.
3. The period of ineligibility is a flat three months with no argument over No Significant Fault, etc. (This eliminates the need for expensive hearings on the appropriate length of sanction.)
4. The athlete can reduce the period of ineligibility down to one month by completing a rehabilitation program satisfactory to the RMA. (This addresses the athlete health concern.)

Article 10.2.4.2, provides that where the athlete can establish that in-competition use of a substance of abuse was unrelated to sport performance, then the use shall not be considered "intentional" for purposes of the 4-year period of ineligibility for intentional use provided in Article 10.2.1.

25. Added Flexibility in Sanctioning for Refusal to Submit to Sample Collection (Article 2.3) or Tampering (Article 2.5) (Article 10.3.1)

The sanction provided in the 2015 Code for Refusal and Tampering Violations was four years ineligibility, however, there may be exceptional circumstances where a lesser sanction is justified. Article 10.3.1 has been amended to provide that in exceptional circumstances, the period of ineligibility shall be in a range of 2 to 4 years.

26. Fraudulent Conduct During Results Management and Hearing Process (Article 10.3.1)

A number of ADOs have experienced problems with athletes engaging in fraudulent conduct during the results management and hearing process, including for example, submitting fraudulent documents or procuring false witness testimony. Under the current Code, there is no downside in terms of sanctions to an athlete who chooses to engage in this type of behavior. At the suggestion of a number of stakeholders, the definition of "Tampering" has been expanded to specifically include fraudulent conduct during results management. Tampering during results management would be treated as a separate first violation with the period of ineligibility, 2 years (in exceptional circumstances) to 4 years, to be served consecutively with any period of ineligibility imposed for the underlying violation.

27. Increasing the Upper End of the Sanction for Complicity (Article 2.9) (Article 10.3.4)

The current sanction for an ADRV involving complicity is 2-4 years ineligibility. However, in some circumstances, violations involving complicity can be very similar to violations involving "administration" (Article 2.8) where the current sanction is 4 years to life ineligibility. To retain some greater flexibility in the sanctioning of certain types of complicity, but to avoid any argument that the most serious types of complicity, which could also be viewed as administration, are subject to a sanction cap of 4 years, the range of ineligibility for complicity has been changed in Article 10.3.4 to 2 years – lifetime ineligibility.

28. Re-Introduction of the Concept of "Aggravating Circumstances" (Article 10.4)

The 2009 Code provided for the increase of the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility when aggravating circumstances were present. When the 2015 Code increased the period of ineligibility for intentional doping from 2 years to 4 years, the Aggravating Circumstances Article was deleted. The Aggravating Circumstances Article has been reinserted to deal with special or exceptional circumstances where an additional period of ineligibility from 0-2 years is appropriate.

29. Addressing the Problem of Common Contaminants in Supplements and Other Products (Article 10.6.1.2)

The ability of WADA-accredited laboratories to detect miniscule quantities of prohibited substances in athlete samples has, in some cases, improved one hundred to one thousand fold over the last decade. This increased analytical sensitivity has made it easier to detect the tail end of the excretion curve from the intentional use of a prohibited substance. However, it has also increased the likelihood that an AAF may result from contamination of a supplement or other product. The current Code provides that in order for an athlete to receive a reduced sanction on account of product contamination, the athlete must be able to identify the contaminated product which he or she consumed which caused the AAF (2015 Code Article 10.5.1.2 in combination with

the definition of “No Significant Fault or Negligence”). Generally, this is a good rule to protect the rights of clean athletes. However, there are cases where the AAF involves a very low level of a prohibited substance which is known to occur in contaminated products, but the athlete is not able to specifically identify the product which caused the AAF. In some of these cases, the AAF is much more likely the result of product contamination than the tail end of an excretion curve, but under the current rule no reduction of sanction is permitted. Rather than modify the rule in the current Code related to contaminated products, a better approach is to consider raising the reporting limits for those prohibited substances which are known contaminants. A special WADA working group is working on an approach to do this.

30. Expansion of the Types of Cooperation which Justify a Reduced Sanction for Substantial Assistance – (Article 10.7.1.1)

Under the 2015 Code, an athlete or other person who provides Substantial Assistance to an ADO, criminal authority, or a professional disciplinary body, in relation to ADRVs may receive a suspension of part of the otherwise applicable sanction. In the 2021 Code, Substantial Assistance credit may also be given for assistance provided in relation to establishing non-compliance with the Code and International Standards and other types of sport integrity violations.

Article 10.7 has been modified to provide that avoiding mandatory public disclosure in exchange for Substantial Assistance may be done with WADA’s agreement.

31. New Article Entitled Results Management Agreements (Article 10.8)

Articles 10.6.3 (Prompt Admission) and Article 10.11.2 (Timely Admission) have been eliminated and replaced with a new Article 10.8. Both of the prior Articles have been a repeated source of questions and misinterpretations.

The new Article 10.8 has two parts. Article 10.8.1 provides that where an athlete or other person who is facing an asserted period of ineligibility of 4 or more years admits the violation and accepts the asserted period of ineligibility within twenty days of notice of the ADRV charge, then there will be a reduction of one year from the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility. This provides some incentive for the individual to admit the Anti- Doping Rule Violation and saves the ADO the cost of a hearing without being too lenient.

The second part of Article 10.8 (Article 10.8.2) provides an opportunity for the ADO, the athlete or other person and WADA to enter into a Case Resolution Agreement in which the applicable period of ineligibility can be agreed upon based on the facts of the case. The reduction possibilities permitted in a Case Resolution Agreement are not something that a hearing body is permitted to impose or review. Case Resolution Agreements are not appealable by anyone. As in the case of “Substantial Assistance,” an athlete who is negotiating a Case Resolution Agreement is entitled to tell his or her story under a “Without Prejudice Agreement.”

32. Improvements to the Multiple Violations Rules - (Article 10.9)

Two proposed changes to the Multiple Violations Rules are noteworthy. The rule in the 2015 Code is that an athlete cannot be charged with a second ADRV until he or she has been previously notified of a first violation. This makes sense in the circumstance where an athlete tests positive twice in the same one week doping cycle. In that case the athlete should not be subject to the increased sanction for a first and second violation. When an ADO discovers an earlier ADRV which occurred before notice of a first violation, the approach under the current Code has been to go back and consider the two violations together as a first violation for purposes of imposing the longer of the two sanctions. For example, under the current Code, if an athlete commits two 4-year ADRVs several years apart, but the first occurring violation is not discovered until after notice has been given of the second occurring violation, then the combined period of Ineligibility would still only be 4 years. This is a particular problem when further analysis of old samples produces an AAF.

The 2021 Code addresses this problem in two ways. First, if the ADO can establish that a prior undiscovered violation occurred more than 12 months before the first sanctioned violation, then the later-discovered violation shall be punished as a first violation and run separately following the period of ineligibility for the previously discovered violation. This preserves the principle that a person does not get a "second strike" until he or she has been notified of the first strike, but yet maintains additional consequences for separate violations. For example, if it is discovered that an athlete who is serving or has already served a ban for a more recent ADRV also committed an ADRV more than 12 months earlier (for example when a sample from an earlier competition was retested), the athlete can be sanctioned for the later-discovered violation as a stand-alone violation but it would not count as a second violation going forward. (Article 10.9.3.2) Second, if a person commits a second anti-doping rule violation during a period of ineligibility, the period of ineligibility for the second violation is served consecutively after the period of the first violation (Article 10.9.3.4).

Finally, in Article 10.9.1, the formula for calculating the period of ineligibility for a second ADRV has been modified to make the result more proportionate and not so dependent on the order in which the two violations occurred. Under the 2015 Code, as a first example, an athlete with a 3-month period of ineligibility for a first violation and what would otherwise be a 4-year period of ineligibility for a second violation would receive a second violation sanction of

8 years (twice the normal sanction for the second violation). By contrast, as a second example, if the violations occurred in the opposite order and the athlete had received a 4-year period of ineligibility for the first violation and the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility for the second violation would be 3 months, under the 2015 formula, the athlete would only receive a sanction of 2 years (the greater of twice the second violation or half the first violation). The new Article 10.9.1.1 provides for a period of ineligibility for a second violation in a range between (1) the sum of the period of ineligibility for the first violation plus the otherwise applicable period for the second violation (in the above example, 4 years and 3 months) and (2) twice the period of ineligibility applicable to the second violation treated as if it were a first violation. In the first example described above, the ineligibility of the range would be 4 years and 3

months to 8 years. In the second example, the ineligibility range would be 4 years and 3 months to 6 months. The opportunity to impose ineligibility for a second violation within a range permits a more proportionated response for a second violation.

33. Forfeited Prize Money Goes to Other Athletes (Article 10.11)

Athlete stakeholders have argued that forfeited prize money which has been ADO wants to recoup some of its costs in bringing the case, it is permitted to do so in Article 10.11. As modified, Article 10.11 now provides that when an athlete is required to forfeit prize money as a result of an ADRV and the forfeited prize money is collected by the ADO, ADO shall take reasonable measures to distribute the forfeited prize money to the athletes who would have been entitled to the prize money, had the forfeiting athlete not competed. It is left up to the rules of the sporting body whether any rankings which are based on prize money will be reconsidered.

34. Delays not Attributable to the Athlete or Other Person (Article 10.13.1)

Article 10.11.1 found in the 2015 Code allows hearing panels to start a period of ineligibility running from the date of the ADRV where there has been a delay in the process not attributable to the athlete or other person. A number of stakeholders expressed concern that hearing panels have gone too far in applying this Article. As a result, the Article now makes clear that the burden of establishing that delays are not attributable to the athlete or other person is on the athlete or other person, and a comment has been added noting that in cases involving lengthy investigations, particularly where the athlete or other person has taken affirmative action to avoid detection, the flexibility provided in this article should not be used.

35. Clarifications Relating to Sanctions for Violation of a Provisional Suspension (Article 10.14.3)

Failure to respect a Provisional Suspension is not a separate ADRV. A new provision has been added as Article 10.14.3 making clear that if an athlete violates the prohibition against participation during a Provisional Suspension, not only does the athlete receive no credit for any period of Provisional Suspension served, but also the results of such participation will be disqualified.

36. Express Authority of a Signatory to Exclude Athletes and Other Persons from its Events as a Sanction Against a Member Federation (Article 12)

The language added to Article 12 makes clear that discipline by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) or International Paralympic Committee (IPC) against a member National Olympic Committee (NOC)/National Paralympic Committee (NPC) or by an International Federation (IF) against a member National Federation (NF) may include exclusion of athletes from that country from its events. This is already the current practice under the 2015 Code.

While the IOC, IPC, IF or NOC/NPC have authority to take action against their members for failing to implement Code-compliant anti-doping rules, and to take action when they become aware of such non-compliance by a member in the implementation of those rules, they are not affirmatively obligated to monitor their members' compliance as a requirement of their own Code Compliance.

37. Scope of Review on Appeal (Article 13.1.1).

This Article makes clear that any party to an appeal may submit evidence, legal arguments and claims which were not raised in the first hearing so long as they arose from the same cause of action or same general facts or circumstances raised in the first instance hearing. An example has been added in the comment to this Article to further clarify the point that a different ADRV charge may be asserted on appeal based on the same underlying facts.

38. Appeals Involving National Level Athletes (Article 13.2.2.)

Under the current Code, it is often the case that appeals by national level athletes are heard by national level appellate bodies, not by CAS. The amendment to this Article makes clear that where the structure of the national level appellate body is not fair, impartial, and operationally and institutionally independent, the athlete or other person shall have the right of appeal to CAS. Both "Operational Independence" and "Institutional Independence" have been made defined terms.

39. Public Disclosure (Article 14.3)

A number of stakeholders have commented that public disclosure as required by Article 14.3.2 may violate national law. A comment to Article 14.3.2 has been added to make clear that failure to make a public disclosure under 14.3.2 will not be considered a Code Compliance Violation where it is prohibited by national law.

A new provision, Article 14.3.3, has been added, which provides that after the initial hearing has been completed or waived, the ADO conducting results management may make public its determination or the hearing panel decision and may comment publicly on the matter. This has always been the case, but the right to do so has not been clearly spelled out in the Code.

40. Implementation of Decisions (Formerly Mutual Recognition) – (Article 15)

Two concerns with the current Code are addressed in the revisions to this Article. First, there has been some contention that when a Signatory recognizes the decision of another Signatory, that recognition decision is itself subject to appeal by the athlete or other person (as opposed to an appeal of the underlying decision). That was never the intent of the Code. As revised, Article 15 provides that with the exception of decisions by MEOs, where there is no opportunity for appeal outside of the fast track of the event structure, all the results management decisions of Signatory ADOs are automatically recognized worldwide in all sports. Because the implementation of the original RMA's

decision is automatic, and therefore other ADOs make no separate implementation decision, only the original RMA has liability if its decision was wrongly taken.

The second issue with current Article 15 is the fact that mutual recognition of provisional suspension decisions is not discussed. As revised, the Article provides that all provisional suspensions are automatically binding on other Signatories.

41. Article 18 Education

Education is clearly a very important part of each Signatory's anti-doping program. Now that there is an International Standard for Education (ISE) which provides detail on the mandatory education requirements to be included in a Signatory's anti-doping program, the education Article of the Code has been shortened to include only the basic principles underlying the anti-doping education requirement. "Education" has been included as a defined term.

42. Obligation of Individual Signatory Participants to Agree to be Bound by the Code and for Signatories to not Knowingly Employ any Person Whose Actions Would Have Violated the Code had the Code Been Applicable to That Person (Articles 20.1.7 and 20.1.8 and comparable Articles for other Signatories)

Two new Articles have been added to the roles and responsibilities of each Signatory. For example, for the IOC:

20.1.7: Subject to applicable law, as a condition of such position or involvement, to require all of its board members, directors, officers, and those employees (and those of appointed Delegated Third Parties), who are involved in any aspect of Doping Control, to agree to be bound by anti-doping rules as Persons in conformity with the Code for direct and intentional misconduct and intentional misconduct, or to be bound by comparable rules and regulations put in place by the Signatory.

20.1.8: Subject to applicable law, to not knowingly employ a Person in any position involving Doping Control (other than authorized anti-doping education or rehabilitation programs) who has been Provisionally Suspended or is serving a period of Ineligibility under the Code or, if a Person was not subject to the Code, who has directly and intentionally engaged in conduct within the previous six years which would have constituted a violation of anti-doping rules if Code- compliant rules had been applicable to such Person.

43. Article 20.5: National Anti-Doping Organizations Conflict of Interest Policies

The 2015 Code requires National Anti-Doping Organizations (NADOs) to be independent in their operational decisions and activities. The 2021 Code expands on that by prohibiting any involvement in their operational decisions or activities by any person who is at the same time involved in the management or operations of any IF, NF, MEO, NOC, NPC, or government department with responsibility for sport or anti-doping.

44. Signatories' Expectations of Governments – (Article 22)

Concern was expressed by some of the public authorities and UNESCO over Article 22 which sets forth the Signatories' expectations involving anti-doping actions by governments. Two significant changes were made. First, the introduction to the Article makes clear that governments are only bound by the requirements of the UNESCO International Convention against Doping in Sport (UNESCO Convention), not by the expectations of the Signatories. Second, the word "should" instead of the word "shall" was used to describe each of the eleven separate subsections of Article 22 which set forth the Signatories' expectations. Additional expectations of the Signatories have been added including:

22.2: Access for doping control officials and unrestricted transport of urine and blood samples;

22.3: The expectation that governments should adopt rules to discipline officials and employees for engaging in conduct which would have violated the Code had the Code been applicable to those Persons.

22.4: The expectation that governments not allow anyone to be involved in their doping control, sport performance or medical care in a sport setting who in the previous 6 years has engaged in conduct which would have been a Code violation.

22.9: The expectation that governments should not limit or restrict WADA's access to any doping samples or anti-doping records or information held or controlled by any Signatory, member of a Signatory or WADA-accredited laboratory.

45. How Does a Sport Organization Become a Signatory? (Article 23.1)

Article 23.1 has been modified to provide that organizations recognized by the Olympic Movement may become Signatories by signing a declaration of acceptance or other form of acceptance approved by WADA. Other entities having significant relevance in sport may submit an application to WADA to become a Signatory under a new policy which will be adopted by WADA. That policy will set forth the conditions which must be met for these types of organizations to be accepted as Signatories by WADA, including for example, a financial contribution to cover WADA's administrative, monitoring and compliance costs related to that entity.

46. Code of Conduct, Medical and Safety Rules Permitted Under Article 23.2

Article 23.2 identifies those Articles of the Code where the sanctions for doping set forth in the Code are exclusive and no additional doping sanctions may be imposed by Signatories beyond those set forth in the Code. However, a new provision has been added to the end of Article 23.2.2 which makes clear that nothing in the Code precludes a Signatory from having safety, medical or Code of Conduct rules which are applicable for purposes other than anti-doping. Thus, for example, excessive use of alcohol could not be called an ADRV because it is not prohibited in the Code. It could, however, be disciplined as a Code of Conduct Violation for bringing the sport into disrepute. The comment to Article 23.2.2 already makes clear that samples collected for doping control may also be used for other purposes such as enforcement of an ADO's Code of Conduct

rules. That comment has been expanded to include as an example an IF's use of data from doping control tests to monitor its transgender eligibility rules.

47. Article 24 Code Compliance and Monitoring

The former Article 23 has been broken into separate Articles addressing Acceptance and Implementation (Article 23), Monitoring and Enforcing Compliance (Article 24), and Modification and Withdrawal (Article 25). The detailed rules addressing Code Compliance and monitoring are found in the International Standard for Code Compliance (ISCC) by Signatories. The most important substantive provisions are also set forth in Article 24.

48. Non-Retroactive Effect of Changes to the Prohibited List (Article 27.6)

This new provision in Article 27, Transitional Provisions, makes clear that changes to the Prohibited List and Technical Documents relating to substances on the Prohibited List shall not, unless they specifically provide otherwise, be applied retroactively. As an exception, however, when a prohibited substance has been removed from the Prohibited List, an athlete currently serving a period of ineligibility on account of that removed prohibited substance, may apply to the RMA which imposed the sanction to consider a reduction in the period of ineligibility in light of the removal of the substance from the Prohibited List.

49. Definition of In-Competition.

The 2021 Code provides a standard definition for "in-competition" which is the period commencing at 11:59 pm on the day before a competition in which the athlete is scheduled to compete through the end of such competition and the sample collection process related to such competition. However, as an accommodation to those sports where there are unique reasons for a different definition of in-competition, for example sports which have a pre-competition weigh-in, WADA may approve a special definition for that sport which will in turn be followed by MEOs conducting those sports.

50. "Protected Persons" and "Minors"

Under the 2015 Code, more flexible sanctioning rules were applied to minors (persons under 18) including:

- a. No requirement to establish how a prohibited substance entered the athlete's system to benefit from the No Significant Fault or Negligence rule. (Definition of No Significant Fault or Negligence)
- b. Article 10.5.1.3: Minimum sanction is a reprimand when No Significant Fault is established.
- c. Article 14.3.6: Public Disclosure not mandatory.

The 2021 Code makes two important changes. First, these more flexible sanctioning rules are applied to an expanded class of athletes described as "Protected Persons"

which also includes individuals who, for reasons other than age, have been determined to lack legal capacity under applicable national legislation.

Second, at the request of athlete representatives, elite 16- and 17-year old athletes are not included in the definition of "Protected Persons" because, considering their sport experience necessary to achieve that level of performance, they should receive the same treatment as the other elite athletes against whom they are competing. These elite 16- and 17-year old athletes would not benefit from the special flexible sanctioning rules set forth in (a) and (b) above. They would, as "Minors" however, be excused from the mandatory Public Disclosure rule in Article 14.3.2 as provide in Article 14.3.7.

51. New Category of Athletes – "Recreational Athletes" Permitted More Flexibility in the Imposition of Consequences

Under the current Code, ADOs are not required to test lower-level athletes, but if they do and an ADRV results, then all of the consequences imposed by the Code apply. A number of the stakeholders who regularly test these lower-level athletes have pointed out that: they do so as a matter of public health and imposing full Code consequences (as opposed to rehabilitation) is counter-productive to that objective; these lower-level athletes have not had the same anti-doping educational opportunities as higher-level athletes; and the consequence of mandatory Public Disclosure on the employment status of someone who participates in sport only at the recreational level is unduly harsh. A new Code definition describes these lower-level athletes as "Recreational Athletes." The determination of who is a recreational athlete is left to the NADO of the athlete's country, but must not include any athlete who in the prior 5 years has been: an international-level or national-level athlete; representing a country in an international event in an open category; or been in a Registered Testing Pool or other whereabouts pool of an IF or NADO. "Recreational Athletes" benefit from the same flexibility in sanctioning as protected persons.

II. Significant changes between the current International Standards and the revised Standards

1. International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS)

The purpose of the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS) is to set out the relevant framework and procedures for ensuring World Anti-Doping Code (Code) Compliance by Signatories.

It sets out: the roles, responsibilities, and procedures of the different bodies involved in WADA's compliance monitoring function; the support and assistance that WADA offers to Signatories in their efforts to comply with the Code and the International Standards; the means by which WADA monitors compliance by Signatories with their obligations under the Code and the Standards; the opportunities and support that WADA offers to Signatories to correct non-conformities before any formal action is taken; the process to be followed to get the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) to hear and determine an

allegation of non-compliance and to determine the Signatory consequences of such non-compliance; the principles to be applied by CAS to determine the Signatory consequences to be imposed in a particular case, depending on the facts and circumstances of that case; and the procedures that WADA follows to ensure that a Signatory that has been determined to be non-compliant, is reinstated as quickly as possible once it has corrected that non-compliance.

The following captures the key changes from the version of the ISCCS that is currently in force:

- A number of changes have been made to emphasize the fact that it is CAS alone that has the power to impose sanctions on a Signatory for non-compliance with the Code and the Standards. This includes stating throughout that WADA does not “assert” but rather “alleges” non-compliance, and “proposes” consequences, whereas it is CAS that determines non-compliance and consequences if the Signatory does not accept WADA’s allegation and proposal.
- A new Article 5.4 and a new Article 9.4.3 have been added to give further emphasis to the “principle of last resort” (i.e., the principle that the aim is to get Signatories to conform, and that seeking sanctions against them for non-compliance should be the last resort). These articles confirm expressly that if a Signatory corrects a non-conformity after the matter has been referred by WADA’s Compliance Taskforce to the Compliance Review Committee (CRC), or by the CRC to WADA’s Executive Committee (ExCo), or by the ExCo to CAS, then that correction will be sufficient to end the proceedings against the Signatory, and no consequences will be imposed on the Signatory for confirming after the deadline, save to the extent that (a) costs have been incurred in pursuing the case before CAS (in which case the Signatory must cover those costs); and/or (b) the failure to correct the non-conformity within the required timeframe has resulted in irreparable prejudice to the fight against doping in sport (in which case CAS can decide if it sees fit to impose consequences to reflect that prejudice).
- A new Article 7.8 has been added to reflect the concept of “continuous compliance monitoring.” This is a concept that WADA enhanced in January 2019 to fill a potential gap in oversight in the period after a Signatory has corrected non-conformities identified by a Code Compliance Questionnaire (CCQ) response or in a Compliance Audit and before it has to respond to another CCQ or audit. The program allows WADA to use various means to conduct continuous monitoring of certain Critical requirements in that period, both generally in respect of all Signatories, but also specifically to check that a Signatory is implementing the corrections it made of Critical requirements following a CCQ response and/or the corrections it made of Critical and High Priority requirements following an audit. Examples include checking in the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS) that Signatories are uploading Doping Control Forms (DCFs) and Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) decisions on a timely basis.

- The various provisions relating to Major Event Organizations (MEOs) have been moved to a new stand-alone subsection (Article 7.9), and more detail has been added to this subsection setting out the means that WADA will use to monitor and ensure Code Compliance by MEOs (namely, a tailored CCQ, shortened timelines for the completion of corrective actions identified based on the completed CCQ, and the addition of WADA Auditors to the Independent Observer Team at some events to confirm that the corrective actions have been implemented and are working, and to ensure that any non-conformities identified in the Independent Observer Report issued following the event are included in a further corrective action report for correction by the MEO prior to its next event).
- New Articles 8.2.7 and 8.3.2 have been added to deal with the situation where a new non-conformity is identified after compliance proceedings have been commenced in respect of other non-conformities, with specified timeframes for correction. It enables WADA Management to add the new non-conformity to the proceedings and to adapt the timeframe for correction accordingly.
- The list of potential consequences has been moved from the ISCCS to the Code. However, remaining in the ISCCS are the provisions relating to (a) whether a particular Code requirement of a Signatory is to be considered "Critical," "High Priority," or "General" (which is important in determining gravity of breach and therefore range of potential consequences); and (b) the consequences that should prima facie apply, at least as a starting-point for analysis, in the different cases.
- A number of changes have been made in Appendix A:
 - The lowest category has been renamed "General" rather than "Other."
 - A few requirements have been added or re-classified within the three categories (Critical, High Priority and General).
 - To add further certainty for Signatories, it is now specified that the list of Critical requirements is an exhaustive list in respect of all requirements specified in the Code and Standards (although to ensure the ExCo retains the sort of flexibility that proved very useful in the Russian Anti-Doping Agency's (RUSADA's) case, the list of Critical requirements now includes "any requirement that is not already set out in the Code or the International Standards that WADA's Executive Committee exceptionally sees fit to impose as a Critical requirement").
- A number of changes have also been made in Appendix B:
 - A potential consequence has been added that is specific to Signatories that are organizations outside of the Olympic Movement and that maintain their status as Signatories by paying an annual fee under the current WADA policy. In the case of non-compliance by such Signatories, a potential consequence will be termination of their status as a Signatory, without any entitlement to reimbursement of any annual fees paid for such status.

- Other new potential consequences have been added (including the ability to suspend funding until the non-conformity is fixed, but then pay that funding out following correction of the non-conformity), and the consequences have been staggered so that the option to deny a country the right to host or to participate in events applies first to regional or continental championships or World Championships and only to the Olympic Games and/or Paralympic Games in the most serious cases. In addition, first it will be representatives of the Signatory who are excluded, with athletes only being excluded in the most serious cases, where necessary to ensure the consequences imposed have the desired effect on the non-compliant Signatory and on all other Signatories. These changes will provide the CRC with a greater choice of options when it alleges a Signatory's non-compliance and proposes related consequences to the ExCo, and they will address the concern of the Sport Movement that the current regime defaults too quickly to exclusion from the Olympic Games when that should really be the last resort.
- Fines are now available as sanctions in cases of non-compliance with High Priority requirements (not just in cases involving non-compliance with Critical requirements, as it is now). In addition, the maximum amount allowed for fines as a potential consequence has been removed in cases of Signatories' non-compliance with Critical requirements.

2. International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI)

The International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI) establishes mandatory standards for test distribution planning (including the collection and use of athlete whereabouts information), notification of athletes, preparing for and conducting sample collection, security/post-test administration of samples and documentation, and transport of samples to laboratories for analysis. In addition, it also establishes mandatory standards for the efficient and effective gathering, assessment and use of anti-doping intelligence, and for the efficient and effective conduct of investigations into possible Anti-Doping Rule Violations (ADRVs).

A. Reduction in Size of ISTI

Due to the new International Standard for Result Management (ISRM), several areas contained in the current ISTI that have a results management process have been relocated to the ISRM. These include:

- Annex A: Failure to Comply
- Annex I (partial relocation): Whereabouts Results Management
- Annex L: Athlete Biological Passport Result Management

The transfer of these Articles along with other text reductions have resulted in the ISTI being reduced in size by approximately 30 pages.

B. Definitions

Two new definitions have been added to the ISTI.

- Doping Control Coordinator (DCC)
 - This has been introduced to address those organizations that are coordinating any aspect of doping control on behalf of a Signatory but who are not the Testing Authority (TA) or the Sample Collection Authority. This may include delegated third parties such as service providers or a Signatory, i.e. a National Anti-Doping Organization (NADO) who coordinates certain parts of an International Federation's (IF) anti-doping program.
 - A reference will be built into the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS) to record the DCC as having been involved in coordinating such program.
- Testing Authority (TA)
 - A Signatory may delegate its authority to test to other organizations (i.e. DCC's) but the TA shall always remain the TA and responsible for ensuring that the organization conducting such testing does so in compliance with the ISTI. Any such authorization of testing shall be documented and may be captured in an agreement between the two parties.

C. Risk Assessment and Test Distribution Plans

- Greater clarity has been added to the framework to develop a risk assessment and produce an effective test distribution plan.
- Technical Document for Sports Specific Analysis (TDSSA):
- Initial feedback identified concerns around a lack of flexibility;
- In response, WADA launched a stakeholder consultation process in March 2019;
- Initial proposals from TDSSA Expert Group – to promote greater flexibility, were circulated as part of consultation process for comment;
- The TDSSA Expert Group considered 47 comments received from 14 stakeholders at its meeting in May 2019; and
- A revised TDSSA was submitted and approved at WADA's Executive Committee (ExCo) September meeting, effective 1 January 2020.

D. Athlete Whereabouts

- Clarification around use of other whereabouts pools based on "pyramid model"
 - Registered Testing Pool (RTP)
 - Testing pool
 - Other pool

- Consequences for Testing Pools outside of Code Article 2.4.
- Minimum of one out-of-competition test for athletes in a testing pool and specific whereabouts to be provided including overnight address, training schedule and competition schedule.
- Athletes should only be in one whereabouts pool and only file one set of whereabouts information.
- Greater collaboration between IFs and NADOs and Major Event Organizations (MEO).
- Team whereabouts – discussion with several NADOs and IFs regarding possible enhancements to functionality within ADAMS.
- Signatories may request that athletes file their whereabouts on the 15th of the month prior to each quarter.
 - This allows a two-week period to allow athletes to file in advance of the deadline that will allow Anti-Doping Organizations (ADOs) to plan testing and start in the first week of the following quarter.
 - Filing Failure deadline remains as the first day of the quarter.
 - A Filing Failure that occurs during the quarter will be deemed to have occurred on the date when such failure is discovered. Reference to this situation has moved to the ISRM.
- Athletes no longer meeting criteria for RTP shall be removed from the RTP. ADOs must consider whether the athlete should be included in a testing pool.

E. Sample Collection

- Clarification around athlete consumption of alcohol.
- Recommendation that no alcohol to be provided or consumed within the doping control station for:
 - Health and safety;
 - Consent and conduct; and
 - Analytical reasons.

F. Sample Collection Equipment

- After the sample collection equipment issues faced in early 2018, a working group was established to develop new criteria for sample collection equipment in the ISTI.

- Revised and new criteria were circulated as part of the first consultation of the ISTI in 2018.
- Criteria were amended and approved November 2018, in force 1 March 2019.
- ADOs are responsible for ensuring that the equipment they use meets the requirements of the ISTI.

G. Intelligence and Investigations

- Addition of new reference that ADOs should develop and implement policies to facilitate and encourage whistleblowers as outlined in WADA's Whistleblower Policy.
- Addition of investigating circumstances around an Adverse Analytical Finding (AAF) to gain further intelligence (e.g. interviewing athlete).

H. Specific Gravity (SG)

- Clarification sought around:
 - How many additional samples are required to be collected when dilute?
- WADA's Laboratory Expert Group recommended that if 150mls or more of urine is collected, then a SG of 1:003 or higher would be considered acceptable while maintaining the SG of 1:005 for samples of 90ml and less than 150ml. Otherwise, the recommendation to continue to collect until a sample has a suitable SG for analysis is achieved.
- Concerns were raised regarding the impact this may have on calculations used for the steroidal module of the Athlete Biological Passport (ABP) and the ability to detect all prohibited substances; however WADA's Laboratory Expert Group confirmed that this reduction is scientifically sound.
- Based on previous testing figures in 2018, this could save the time and cost associated with the collection of 8,000 dilute samples globally.

I. Sample Collection Personnel (SCP)

- Request for greater requirements around training, accreditation, re-accreditation and performance of Sample Collection Personnel (SCP) including Chaperones.
- Enhanced conflict of interest criteria added.
- Requirement for an agreement with SCP that covers confidentiality, code of conduct and conflicts.
- Requirement to have a performance monitoring system for SCP.

3. International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUE)

The purpose of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUE) is to ensure that the process of granting Therapeutic Use Exemptions (TUEs) is harmonized across sports and countries.

The following changes were made to the current ISTUE:

A. Article 4 - Obtaining a TUE

- A restructuring of Articles 4.1-4.3 was undertaken to provide a more logical order and extra clarity in the different sections.
- An athlete may only apply for a retroactive TUE if one of the Articles 4.1a-e is satisfied. If accepted as a retroactive application, the submitted file would next be evaluated by the Anti-Doping Organization's (ADO's) TUE Committee (TUEC) to ascertain whether it fulfills all of the 4.2 criteria.
- If an athlete is applying prospectively, Article 4.1 is not relevant, and the process automatically begins at Article 4.2.
- 4.1a: "treatment of an acute medical condition" was replaced with "urgent treatment".
- 4.1b: A minor restructuring of the wording was made around the term "exceptional circumstances".
- 4.1c: National Anti-Doping Organizations (NADOs), due to national-level prioritization of certain sports, may allow athletes competing in certain sports to apply retroactively for a TUE if submitted to sample collection.
- 4.1d: Allows athletes who are not international- nor national-level athletes using a prohibited substance for therapeutic reasons to apply for a retroactive TUE if submitted to sample collection.
- 4.1e: New inclusion addressing situations where, for therapeutic reasons, an athlete uses a substance out-of-competition that is only prohibited in-competition, but there is a risk that the substance will remain in their system in-competition.
- Article 4.2: Further clarification was added to the requirements to obtain a TUE.
- 4.2a: The concept of a diagnosis being an essential component of the application has been strengthened, and comments/examples have been added to provide additional clarification.
- Removal of the reference to acute or chronic condition.

- Clarified that the use of a prohibited substance may be as part of a diagnostic investigation and not only a treatment.
- 4.2b: “highly unlikely” has been replaced with “on the balance of probabilities”. An improved explanation regarding the assessment of an athlete’s normal state of health was also included.
- 4.2c: The use of permitted alternative medications was clarified in the comment, in particular the need to take into account, within reason, different practices in various geographical regions.
- It was made clear that the grant of a TUE is based solely on consideration of the conditions set out in Article 4.2 and not whether the prohibited substance or prohibited method is the most appropriate or safe, or legal in all jurisdictions.
- Comment to 4.2: WADA’s TUE Physician Guidelines are now referenced.
- 4.3 is now a new stand-alone 4.3: It is a specific exemption where it would be manifestly unfair not to grant a retroactive TUE, even if all the criteria in Article 4.2 may not be fulfilled.
- This exemption will continue to be reserved to truly exceptional and rare circumstances and the granting of such TUEs for international- and national-level athletes will require the prior approval of WADA. WADA will also have oversight of all non-international-level athletes/non-national-level athletes TUEs granted under this Article and may, at its own discretion, choose to review these decisions. All decisions must be reported in the Anti- Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS). WADA’s decision is final.

B. Article 5.0 - TUE Responsibilities of ADOs

- 5.1: Clarification for NADOs about which athletes’ TUEs they need to assess prospectively.
- 5.2: Clarification that if an athlete already has a valid NADO TUE and is not an international-level athlete, the TUE remains valid globally and does not require to be formally recognized by another NADO.
- 5.3: Clarification that the fulfilment of the conditions set out in Articles 4.1 and 4.3 may be determined by the relevant ADO in consultation with (a) member(s) of the TUEC. Further expansion on who constitutes a TUEC.
- 5.3a: It is specified that one physician member should act as chair of the TUEC.
- 5.5: Clarification that ADOs must report in ADAMS within 21 days all decisions of its TUEC granting or denying TUEs and all decisions to recognize or refusing to recognize other ADO decisions. A decision to deny shall include an explanation of the reason(s) for the denial.

- 5.5a: It is required to report the reason(s) why an athlete was permitted to apply for a retroactive TUE under Article 4.1 or why they were granted a retroactive TUE under Article 4.3.
- Comment to 5.5: Clarification on what needs to be translated into English or French: diagnosis, dosage, as well as a clear summary of the medical condition and diagnostic tests.
- 5.7 It is emphasized that an ADO must publish a regularly updated notice on their website describing which athletes fall under their jurisdiction and describe their recognition process.

C. Article 6.0 - TUE Application Process

- 6.2: A comment to 6.2 was added to give guidance on which NADO the athlete may apply to for a TUE:
- Comment to 6.2 Athletes who are not International-Level Athletes, should first contact the National Anti-Doping Organization of the country where the sport organization for which they compete (or with which they are a member or license holder) is based or, if different, the country in which they reside. If that National Anti-Doping Organization considers that the Athlete does not fall within its TUE jurisdiction, the Athlete should contact the National Anti-Doping Organization of their country of citizenship (if different). In the event that none of the above-mentioned National Anti-Doping Organizations have TUE jurisdiction, where there is an Adverse Analytical Finding the Athlete should ordinarily be permitted to apply for a retroactive TUE from the Anti-Doping Organization that has results management authority. New flow charts created to help the Athlete understand this are to be posted on the WADA website
- 6.3: A new Article explaining clearly that an athlete may only apply to one ADO at a time for a TUE for the same medical condition. Nor may an athlete have more than one TUE for the same medical condition at the same time.
- 6.4: Additional guidance for the athletes on their TUE application and referencing WADA's TUE Physician Guidelines.
- Comment to 6.14: Clarification on changing of dosages and when one should alert the ADO. The comment to 6.14 expands on these initial treatments dosage fluctuations and gives an example of insulin for diabetes.

D. Article 7.0 - TUE Recognition Process

- 7.6 Clarification that if an IF chooses to test an athlete who is not an international-level athlete, it must recognize a TUE granted by that athlete's NADO unless the athlete is required to apply for recognition of the TUE pursuant to Articles 5.8 and

7.0, i.e. because the athlete is competing in an international event (this provision has been moved from the Code into the ISTUE).

E. Article 8.0 - Review of TUE Decisions by WADA

- Inclusion of how WADA will assess the updated Article 4.1.
- Comment to 8.4: Additional clarification to 8.4. If an IF refuses to recognize a TUE granted by a NADO only because medical tests or other information required to demonstrate satisfaction of the Article 4.2 conditions are missing, the matter should not be referred to WADA. Instead, the file should be completed and re-submitted to the IF.

F. Article 9.0 - Confidentiality of Information

- Several edits were made to align this section with the revised International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information (ISPPPI).
- 9.2: Update on how ADOs shall communicate information regarding the application, health of the athlete, decision on the application to athletes as well as any other relevant information in accordance with Article 7.1 of the ISPPPI.

G. Annex 1

The flow charts have been reordered and updated to follow the order in the Code.

4. International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information (ISPPPI)

The main purpose of the International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information (ISPPPI) is to ensure that organizations and persons involved in anti-doping in sport apply appropriate, sufficient and effective privacy protection measures to the personal information they process.

The following captures the key changes from the version of the ISPPPI that is currently in force:

A. General

Part One of the ISPPPI was updated to harmonize formatting with other International Standards, including consolidating the preamble and introduction. Terms and formatting were also verified and updated throughout to ensure consistency with the 2021 World Anti-Doping Code (Code) and other International Standards (e.g., results management and education are now italicized and capitalized). Minor wording changes were also made to Article 4.4 and 7.1 to clarify existing language.

Further to revisions to the definition of “Signatory” and “Anti-Doping Organization” (“ADO”) as part of the Code review process, references to WADA that had initially been added during the ISPPPI consultations rounds have now been removed to ensure alignment with the Code given that the Code definition of “ADO” includes WADA.

B. Definitions

Anti-Doping Activities: The ISPPPI definition has been replaced with a new Code definition of the same term.

Personal Information: In light of Code changes whereby certain data collected for anti-doping purposes may be used for other purposes, a minor change was made to clarify that the scope of the ISPPPI is limited to personal information processed for the purpose of anti-doping activities.

Third-Party Agent: An update was made to include reference to the new Code term, “Delegated Third Party.”

C. Specific Provisions

Relevant and Proportionate Processing (Article 5)

- More explicit references to “proportionate” processing were added;
- Minor language changes were made at the request of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUE) drafting team for better alignment with this standard; and
- Examples of additional anti-doping purposes that may require the processing of personal information were added to the comment to Article 5.3(d). These examples reflect anti-doping purposes which, while not specifically discussed in Article 5.3, do not require a specific assessment to confirm their relevance to the fight against doping since they are already permitted or required by the Code or other International Standards.

Processing in Accordance with Law (Article 6)

- A minor title change aims to clarify the distinction between the subject-matter of Article 6 (which is focused more narrowly on legal grounds for processing anti-doping data) and Article 4 (which is focused on general compliance with privacy and data protection laws in the course of anti-doping activities);
- Reference was added to public health as a purpose served by anti-doping; and
- Modifications were made to further clarify that consent is one possible legal ground to process personal information for anti-doping purposes; that articles

6.2 and 6.3 relate to situations where consent is the legal ground being relied upon; and that, where consent is sought, consent must be specific and unambiguous. These changes are necessary to reflect the changing legal framework for the processing of anti-doping data in many jurisdictions (in particular, in Europe).

Disclosures of Personal Information (Article 8)

- Provisions related to the disclosure of information to law enforcement and other authorities were the subject of limited edits to account for stakeholder experiences related to disclosures to professional regulatory bodies in connection with anti-doping rule violations.

Security of Personal Information (Article 9)

- Greater use of the definition of “Security Breach” was made to improve readability;
- Minor wording changes to Article 9.3 were made to clarify that individual experts/consultants may also qualify as “Third-Party Agents” which must be subjected to appropriate contractual and technical controls; and
- The three-year periodicity requirement associated with the need to conduct an assessment of certain processing activities under Article 9.6 has been removed to provide anti-doping organizations with the flexibility to conduct such assessments at an appropriate frequency. A comment has been added for additional clarity.

Retention (Article 10 and Annex A)

- Article 10 was reorganized to clarify that, while ADOs must use Annex A to the ISPPPI as the primary reference to establish retention periods, the general retention criteria in this Article remain relevant to address the retention of any records or circumstances not specifically provided for in the Annex;
- A comment to Article 10.1 confirms the existing practice pursuant to which WADA implements the retention times set out in Annex A within the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS); and
- Several updates were made to Annex A to align with updates under the Code, reflect evolutions of the Athlete Biological Passport program (ABP), and stakeholder operational needs, namely:
 - Reduction of the “short” retention period for whereabouts and Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) information from 18 months to 12 months;

- Modifications to clarify the limited amount of whereabouts data that must be kept for ten years for the purpose of the ABP and the tracking of whereabouts failures over time;
- Simplification of retention periods for testing-related documentation;
- Addition of a brief explanation in the notes preceding the retention chart to indicate why the 10-year and 12-month retention periods were selected; and
- Modifications in Section 5 of the Annex to indicate that reference should be made to the Code (in particular, Articles 6.2 and 6.3) to determine whether a sample may be retained for scientific purposes.

Rights of Participants (Article 11)

- Reference was added to possible additional rights of athletes and exceptions thereto under national laws as well as to certain common or necessary exceptions related to legal claims and the protection of the integrity of the anti-doping system; and
- A clarification was made in the comment to Article 11.1 regarding which ADO would normally have primary responsibility for responding to participant requests under this Article.

5. International Standard for Laboratories (ISL)

For the International Standard for Laboratories (ISL), the situation is slightly different:

- The new version approved in May 2019 will be reviewed as soon as the World Anti-Doping Code (Code) and other International Standards are approved at the World Conference on Doping in Sport in Katowice, in order to reflect and incorporate any relevant changes into the ISL and to ensure consistency with the other documents.
- The amended draft will be circulated for stakeholder consultation from 10 December 2019 to 4 March 2020. It will then be tabled at WADA's Executive Committee (ExCo) September 2020 meeting for approval and will subsequently enter into force on 1 January 2021, together with the revised Code and all other International Standards.

III. Summary of key topics being addressed in the new Standards

1. International Standard for Education (ISE)

The International Standard for Education (ISE) is a new standard and it complements Article 18 of the World Anti-Doping Code (Code). The objectives of this Standard are

to establish mandatory standards to support Signatories with planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of effective education programs.

The overall approach taken vis-à-vis development of the ISE is principles based. It was recognized that a technical approach, as is the case with other International Standards, would not be prudent given cultural and diverse education methods around the world and within the sport community. The underpinning principles of the ISE are:

- An athlete's first experience with anti-doping should be with education rather than a sample collection.
- Any international-level athlete should receive education before leaving their country.
- All athletes begin sport competing clean and the majority wish to remain clean throughout their careers, programs should be supportive of this goal.
- Education programs need to be tailored for the local cultural and sporting contexts in which they are situated. This should be reflected in the requirements of the ISE.
- Education is a collaborative activity, cooperation between Signatories should be encouraged through the ISE.
- Meeting the requirements of the ISE should be achievable for every Signatory, regardless of resources and capacity.

Rather than prescribing content, it was decided to focus on a number of key processes that will facilitate a harmonized approach to education. This keeps the focus of the ISE on what a Signatory is required to do to develop and deliver an education program.

A. The main requirements of the ISE are:

- Signatories are required to develop an education plan and demonstrate its implementation through monitoring and evaluation procedures.
- Signatories need to establish an education pool based on various criteria and encouraged to cooperate with others to coordinate their education activities. At a minimum, Signatories must include their Registered Testing Pools (RTPs) in the education pool.
- Signatories need to provide a rationale for athletes and athlete support personnel who will not be included in the education pool.
- ADA will provide support to the Signatories to meet the requirements of the ISE through the provision of tools.

B. Roles and Responsibilities:

National Anti-Doping Organizations (NADOs)

- Each NADO shall be the authority on education within their respective countries
- Encouragement of education through the school system is maintained and supplemented with the sport system for those countries who do not have sport participation in school
- Additional emphasis is added on the key role of National Federations (NFs).

International Federations (IFs)

- The language now reflects the Code whereby education of international-level athletes is the priority of the IF.
- Consider delivering education at all events under their jurisdiction
- Require NFs to cooperate with NADOs as it relates to education in line with the Code.
- Major Event Organizations (MEOs)
- Aligned to the requirements of IFs in relation to event-based education, MEOs must consider education at their events.
- MEOs are encouraged to cooperate with the Local Organizing Committee (LOC), NADO and NFs.

Recognition

- Signatories must acknowledge other education programs and following due diligence, they may recognize another program in order to minimize duplication.
- The solutions necessary to meet these requirements are already available through WADA, thus requiring minimal extra resources from stakeholders to implement if they do not have their own resources or capacity.

2. International Standard for Results Management (ISRM)

Further to Stakeholders' comments during the first round of consultation for the 2021 World Anti-Doping Code (Code), the Code Drafting Team made the proposal to establish an International Standard for Results Management (ISRM), which was one of the last key areas of the Code without an International Standard.

The ISRM establishes mandatory standards for minimal requirements that all ADOs must follow in respect to the results management and hearing processes of potential Anti-Doping Rule Violations (ADRVs). The ISRM also holds Code Signatories accountable from a compliance perspective in case of a violation of the basic rules of law and an athlete's or other person's rights to defense.

The ISRM sets up general principles related to jurisdiction, confidentiality and public disclosure, as well as timeliness of the disciplinary and adjudication processes.

It also establishes the minimum but mandatory requirements all Results Management Authorities (RMAs) shall respect during the initial review of potential ADRVs, including the two - stage notification process (initial notification, notification of charge), the imposition of a provisional suspension, and the decision-making process (minimum requirements for setting up a fair and impartial hearing, ensuring the operational independence of first instance hearing panels, the independence of appeal bodies, and the content of decisions).

A number of provisions of the first draft ISRM were replicas of provisions of the Code. Certain of these provisions were therefore removed from the ISRM. This concerned in particular the responsibility for conducting results management (expressed at Article 7.1 of the Code) and Public Disclosures (Article 14.3 of the Code).

An attempt was also made to draw a clear line between the areas covered by the International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI), including investigations, and the remit of the ISRM. The definition of "results management" was amended to reflect it. As a result, certain areas previously covered by the ISTI were transferred to the ISRM. This concerned Whereabouts Failures, Failures to Comply and Athlete Biological Passports (ABPs). For all these fields, a separate annex (either taken over (in full or part) from the ISTI (or newly drafted) was added to the ISRM. The ISRM specifically provided (and still does) that the pre-adjudication phases for these three subjects are governed by these annexes.

A new regime was provided for with respect to setting a date for the opening and analysis of the B Sample. According to this new regime, if an athlete requests the analysis of the B Sample and is not available on the initial date proposed by the Results Management Authority (RMA), the RMA shall propose two alternative dates, which take into account inter alia the reasons for the athlete's unavailability. If the athlete claims not to be available on any of the alternative dates, then the RMA will instruct the laboratory to proceed regardless as per the ISRM and International Standard for Laboratories (ISL). This regime should make the process for setting a date for the B Sample analysis simpler and swifter.

Different aspects of Article 8 on hearings at first instance were amended.

- First, a minimum term of office of two years for hearing panel members was set out.

- Second, the selection process of the hearing panel members was improved. In this respect, it was made clear that hearing panel members had to be selected from a wider pool of hearing panel members, to ensure that other members are available in case of a conflict of interest of an appointed panel member. A specific process to decide on the size and composition of any given hearing panel was also provided for.
- Third, the scope of the persons who are not eligible to sit on specific hearing panels was broadened to include inter alia persons who were involved in the earlier pre-adjudication phase of results management of the matter, with a view to ensuring the operational independence of the hearing panel.
- A right to a public hearing is afforded to the athlete or other person, reflecting the regime adopted by the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in this respect.

The requirements in terms of independence of appellate instances under Article 9 were amended, in the sense that such instances were no longer required to constitute proper arbitral tribunals, but rather to be institutionally independent from the RMA. This requires that the appellant instance be in no way administered by, connected or subject to the RMA.

A new Article 11 was included to provide that the results management regime of the ISRM, including the two-step notification process of Articles 5 and 7, shall be applicable to violations of a period of ineligibility under Article 10.14 of the Code.

IV. General Considerations on Code Compliance

- To ensure efficiency in the harmonized fight against doping in sport and fairness for the athletes, compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code (Code) is mandatory for all Code Signatories.
- As the international independent agency tasked with coordinating, monitoring and promoting the fight against doping in sport, one of WADA's core activities is to monitor the compliance to the Code of its Signatories.
- While WADA is the governing body for the implementation of the Code, it is the Code Signatories who are responsible for the implementation of applicable Code provisions through policies, statutes, rules, regulations and programs according to their authority and jurisdiction. Signatories have a number of Code Compliance obligations under WADA's Code Compliance Monitoring Program.
- In 2015-2016, WADA shifted its focus to ensuring that Signatories have rules in place to having quality anti-doping programs in place; and, in keeping with strong demand from stakeholders, that their compliance be monitored rigorously. To do so, in 2016, WADA initiated development of an ISO9001:2015 certified Code Compliance Monitoring Program that was expanded in 2017. The Program, which represents the most thorough review

of anti-doping rules and programs that has ever taken place, aims to reinforce athlete and public confidence in the standard of Anti-Doping Organizations (ADOs) work worldwide. On 1 April 2018, the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS) entered into force, which further reinforced WADA's Code Compliance Monitoring Program by creating a clear framework for WADA's compliance activities and outlining the responsibilities and consequences applicable to Signatories.

- Please consult the [Compliance Monitoring Program section of WADA's website](#) for more information.