

THE WORLD ANTI-DOPING CODE

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD

TESTING

January 2009



International Standard for Testing

The International Standard for Testing was first adopted in 2003 and became effective in 2004. The enclosed incorporates revisions to the International Standard for Testing that were approved by the World Anti-Doping Agency Executive Committee on 10 May 2008. The revised International Standard for Testing is effective as of 1 January 2009

Published on 16 May 2008 by:

World Anti-Doping Agency
Stock Exchange Tower
800 Place Victoria (Suite 1700)
PO Box 120
Montreal, Quebec,
Canada H4Z 1B7

URL: www.wada-ama.org

Tel: +1 514 904 9232
Fax: +1 514 904 8650
E-mail: code@wada-ama.org

PREAMBLE

World Anti-Doping Code *International Standard for Testing* is a mandatory *International Standard* (Level 2) developed as part of the World Anti-Doping Program.

Version 3.0 of the 2003 *International Standard for Testing* was approved by the WADA Executive Committee on June 7th 2003. In concert with revisions to the 2003 *World Anti-Doping Code*, a consultation process was initiated with *Signatories* in order to revise the *International Standard for Testing*. Version 1.0 of the revised *International Standard for Testing* was circulated to *Signatories* and governments for review and comments in August 2006. Versions 2.0 (2007), 3.0 (2007) and 4.0 (2008) were also drafted based on the comments and proposals received from *Signatories* and governments during this consultation process. The *International Standard for Testing* (January 2009) was approved by the WADA Executive Committee in May 2008.

The official text of the *International Standard for Testing* shall be maintained by WADA and shall be published in English and French. In the event of any conflict between the English and French versions, the English version shall prevail.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION, <i>CODE</i> PROVISIONS AND DEFINITIONS.....	6
1.0 Introduction and scope.....	6
2.0 <i>Code</i> Provisions	7
3.0 Terms and definitions, and interpretation.....	17
3.1 Defined terms from the 2009 <i>Code</i>	17
3.2 Defined terms specific to the <i>International Standard for Testing</i>	21
3.3 Interpretation of the <i>International Standard for Testing</i>	23
PART TWO: STANDARDS FOR <i>TESTING</i>.....	24
4.0 Planning	24
4.1 Objective.....	24
4.2 General.....	24
4.3 Requirements for test distribution planning	25
4.4 Requirements for selection of <i>Athletes</i> for <i>Testing</i>	27
5.0 Notification of <i>Athletes</i>.....	30
5.1 Objective.....	30
5.2 General.....	30
5.3 Requirements prior to notification of <i>Athletes</i>	30
5.4 Requirements for notification of <i>Athletes</i>	32
6.0 Preparing for the <i>Sample</i> Collection Session.....	35
6.1 Objective.....	35
6.2 General.....	35
6.3 Requirements for preparing for the <i>Sample</i> Collection Session.....	35
7.0 Conducting the <i>Sample</i> Collection Session.....	37
7.1 Objective.....	37
7.2 General.....	37
7.3 Requirements prior to <i>Sample</i> collection	37
7.4 Requirements for <i>Sample</i> collection.....	38
8.0 Security/Post test administration.....	40
8.1 Objective.....	40
8.2 General.....	40
8.3 Requirements for security/post test administration	40
9.0 Transport of <i>Samples</i> and documentation.....	40
9.1 Objective.....	40
9.2 General.....	41
9.3 Requirements for transport and storage of <i>Samples</i> and documentation .	41
10.0 Ownership of <i>Samples</i>	42

11.0	<i>Athlete Whereabouts Requirements</i>	42
11.1	Objective/general principles	42
11.2	Requirements for establishing the <i>Registered Testing Pool</i>	46
11.3	Whereabouts Filing Requirements	48
11.4	Availability for <i>Testing</i>	53
11.6	Results Management	60
11.7	Whereabouts Responsibilities of <i>Anti-Doping Organizations</i>	67
PART THREE:	ANNEXES	73
	Annex A - Investigating a possible Failure to Comply	73
	Annex B - Modifications for <i>Athletes</i> with disabilities	75
	Annex C - Modifications for <i>Athletes</i> who are <i>Minors</i>	77
	Annex D - Collection of urine <i>Samples</i>	79
	Annex E - Collection of blood <i>Samples</i>	83
	Annex F - Urine <i>Samples</i> - Insufficient volume	86
	Annex G - Urine <i>Samples</i> that do not meet the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.....	88
	Annex H - <i>Sample</i> Collection Personnel Requirements	90

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION, CODE PROVISIONS AND DEFINITIONS

1.0 Introduction and scope

The main purpose of the *International Standard for Testing* is to plan for effective *Testing*, both *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition*, and to maintain the integrity and identity of the *Samples* collected, from the point the *Athlete* is notified of the test to the point the *Samples* are transported to the laboratory for analysis.

The *International Standard for Testing* includes standards for test distribution planning, notification of *Athletes*, preparing for and conducting *Sample* collection, security/post test administration and transport of *Samples*.

In addition, Section 11.0 of the *International Standard for Testing* sets out mandatory standards to be implemented by IFs and *NADOs* (as well as recognised and applied by other *Anti-Doping Organizations*) as the whereabouts requirements applicable to *Athletes* in their respective *Registered Testing Pools*. Failure to comply with such requirements three times in an 18-month period shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.4 of the *Code*.

The *International Standard for Testing*, including all annexes, is mandatory for all *Signatories* to the *Code*.

The World Anti-Doping Program encompasses all of the elements needed in order to ensure optimal harmonization and best practice in international and national anti-doping programs. The main elements are: the *Code* (Level 1), *International Standards* (Level 2), and Models of Best Practice (Level 3).

In the introduction to the *Code*, the purpose and implementation of the *International Standards* are summarized as follows:

"International Standards for different technical and operational areas within the anti-doping program will be developed in consultation with the *Signatories* and governments and approved by *WADA*. The purpose of the *International Standards* is harmonization among *Anti-Doping Organizations* responsible for specific technical and operational parts of the anti-doping programs. Adherence to the *International Standards* is mandatory for compliance with the *Code*. The *International Standards* may be revised from time to time by the *WADA* Executive Committee after reasonable consultation with the *Signatories* and governments. Unless provided otherwise in the *Code*, *International Standards* and all revisions shall become effective on the date specified in the *International Standard* or revision."

Definitions specified in the *Code* are written in italics. Additional definitions specific to the *International Standard for Testing* are underlined.

2.0 *Code Provisions*

The following articles in the 2009 *Code* are directly relevant to the *International Standard for Testing*:

Code Article 2 Anti-Doping Rule Violations

2.3 Refusing or failing without compelling justification to submit to *Sample* collection after notification as authorized in applicable anti-doping rules or otherwise evading *Sample* collection.

[Comment to Article 2.3: Failure or refusal to submit to Sample collection after notification was prohibited in almost all pre-Code anti-doping rules. This Article expands the typical pre-Code rule to include "otherwise evading Sample collection" as prohibited conduct. Thus, for example, it would be an anti-doping rule violation if it were established that an Athlete was hiding from a Doping Control official to evade notification or Testing. A violation of "refusing or failing to submit to Sample collection" may be based on either intentional or negligent conduct of the Athlete, while "evading" Sample collection contemplates intentional conduct by the Athlete.]

2.4 ***Violation of applicable requirements regarding Athlete availability for Out-of-Competition Testing***, including failure to file required whereabouts information and missed tests which are declared based on rules which comply with the *International Standard for Testing*. Any combination of three missed tests and/or filing failures within an eighteen-month period as determined by *Anti-Doping Organizations* with jurisdiction over the *Athlete* shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 2.4: Separate whereabouts filing failures and missed tests declared under the rules of the Athlete's International Federation or any other Anti-Doping Organization with authority to declare whereabouts filing failures and missed tests in accordance with the International Standard for Testing shall be combined in applying this Article. In appropriate circumstances, missed tests or filing failures may also constitute an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.3 or Article 2.5.]

2.5 ***Tampering, or Attempted Tampering***, with any part of *Doping Control*.
[Comment to Article 2.5: This Article prohibits conduct which subverts the Doping Control process but which would not otherwise be included in the definition of Prohibited Methods. For example, altering identification numbers on a Doping Control form during Testing, breaking the B Bottle at the time of B Sample analysis or providing fraudulent information to an Anti-Doping Organization.]

2.8 Administration or *Attempted* administration to any *Athlete In-Competition* of any *Prohibited Method* or *Prohibited Substance*, or administration or *Attempted* administration to any *Athlete Out-of-Competition* of any *Prohibited Method* or any *Prohibited Substance* that is prohibited *Out-of-Competition*, or assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, covering up or any other type of complicity involving an anti-doping rule violation or any *Attempted* anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 2: The Code does not make it an anti-doping rule violation for an Athlete or other Person to work or associate with Athlete Support Personnel who are serving a period of Ineligibility. However, a sport organization may adopt its own rules which prohibit such conduct.]

Code Article 3 Proof of Doping

3.2.2 Departures from any other *International Standard* or other anti-doping rule or policy which did not cause an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or other anti-doping rule violation shall not invalidate such results. If the *Athlete* or other *Person* establishes that a departure from another *International Standard* or other anti-doping rule or policy which could reasonably have caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding* or other anti-doping rule violation occurred, then the *Anti-Doping Organization* shall have the burden to establish that such departure did not cause the *Adverse Analytical Finding* or the factual basis for the anti-doping rule violation.

Code Article 5 Testing

5.1 Test Distribution Planning. Subject to the jurisdictional limitations for *In-Competition Testing* in Article 15.1, each *National Anti-Doping Organization* shall have *Testing* jurisdiction over all *Athletes* who are present in that *National Anti-Doping Organization's* country or who are nationals, residents, license-holders or members of sport organizations of that country. Each International Federation shall have *Testing* jurisdiction over all *Athletes* who are members of their member National Federations or who participate in their *Events*. All *Athletes* must comply with any request for *Testing* by any *Anti-Doping Organization* with *Testing* jurisdiction. In coordination with other *Anti-Doping Organizations* conducting *Testing* on the same *Athletes*, and consistent with the *International Standard for Testing*, each *Anti-Doping Organization* shall:

5.1.1 Plan and conduct an effective number of *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition* tests on *Athletes* over whom they have jurisdiction, including but not limited to *Athletes* in their respective *Registered Testing Pools*. Each International Federation shall establish a *Registered Testing Pool* for *International-Level Athletes* in its sport, and each *National Anti-Doping Organization* shall establish a national *Registered Testing Pool* for *Athletes* who are present in that *National Anti-Doping Organization's* country or who are nationals, residents, license-holders or members of sports organizations of that country. In accordance with

Article 14.3, any *Athlete* included in a *Registered Testing Pool* shall be subject to the whereabouts requirements set out in the *International Standard for Testing*.

5.1.2 Except in exceptional circumstances all *Out-of-Competition Testing* shall be *No Advance Notice*.

5.1.3 Make *Target Testing* a priority.

5.1.4 Conduct *Testing* on *Athletes* serving a period of *Ineligibility* or a *Provisional Suspension*.

[Comment to Article 5.1.3: Target Testing is specified because random Testing, or even weighted random Testing, does not ensure that all of the appropriate Athletes will be tested (e.g., world-class Athletes, Athletes whose performances have dramatically improved over a short period of time, Athletes whose coaches have had other Athletes test positive, etc.).]

Obviously, Target Testing must not be used for any purpose other than legitimate Doping Control. The Code makes it clear that Athletes have no right to expect that they will be tested only on a random basis. Similarly, it does not impose any reasonable suspicion or probable cause requirement for Target Testing.]

5.2 Standards for Testing *Anti-Doping Organizations* with *Testing* jurisdiction shall conduct such *Testing* in conformity with the *International Standard for Testing*.

5.3 Retired Athletes Returning to Competition

Each *Anti-Doping Organization* shall establish a rule addressing eligibility requirements for *Athletes* who are not *Ineligible* and retire from sport while included in a *Registered Testing Pool* and then seek to return to active participation in sport.

Code Article 7 Results Management

7.1 Initial Review Regarding Adverse Analytical Findings Upon receipt of an *A Sample Adverse Analytical Finding*, the *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for results management shall conduct a review to determine whether: (a) an applicable therapeutic use exemption has been granted or will be granted as provided in the *International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions*, or (b) there is any apparent departure from the *International Standard for Testing* or *International Standard for Laboratories* that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

7.2 Notification After Initial Review Regarding Adverse Analytical Findings

If the initial review of an *Adverse Analytical Finding* under Article 7.1 does not reveal an applicable therapeutic use exemption or entitlement to a therapeutic use exemption as provided in the *International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions*, or departure that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*, the *Anti-Doping Organization* shall promptly notify the *Athlete*, in the manner set out in its rules, of: (a) the *Adverse Analytical Finding*; (b) the anti-doping rule violated; (c) the *Athlete's* right to promptly request the analysis of the B *Sample* or, failing such request, that the B *Sample* analysis may be deemed waived; (d) the scheduled date, time and place for the B *Sample* analysis if the *Athlete* or *Anti-Doping Organization* chooses to request an analysis of the B *Sample*; (e) the opportunity for the *Athlete* and/or the *Athlete's* representative to attend the B *Sample* opening and analysis within the time period specified in the *International Standard for Laboratories* if such analysis is requested; and (f) the *Athlete's* right to request copies of the A and B *Sample* laboratory documentation package which includes information as required by the *International Standard for Laboratories*. The *Anti-Doping Organization* shall also notify the other *Anti-Doping Organizations* described in Article 14.1.2. If the *Anti-Doping Organization* decides not to bring forward the *Adverse Analytical Finding* as an anti-doping rule violation, it shall so notify the *Athlete* and the *Anti-Doping Organizations* as described in Article 14.1.2.

7.3 Review of Atypical Findings

As provided in the *International Standards*, in some circumstances laboratories are directed to report the presence of *Prohibited Substances*, which may also be produced endogenously, as *Atypical Findings* subject to further investigation. Upon receipt of an A *Sample Atypical Finding*, the *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for results management shall conduct a review to determine whether: (a) an applicable therapeutic use exemption has been granted, or (b) there is any apparent departure from the *International Standard for Testing* or *International Standard for Laboratories* that caused the *Atypical Finding*. If that review does not reveal an applicable therapeutic use exemption or departure that caused the *Atypical Finding*, the *Anti-Doping Organization* shall conduct the required investigation. After the investigation is completed, the *Athlete* and other *Anti-Doping Organizations* identified in Article 14.1.2 shall be notified whether or not the *Atypical Finding* will be brought forward as an *Adverse Analytical Finding*. The *Athlete* shall be notified as provided in Article 7.2.

7.3.1 The *Anti-Doping Organization* will not provide notice of an *Atypical Finding* until it has completed its investigation and decided whether it will bring the *Atypical Finding* forward as an *Adverse Analytical Finding* unless one of the following circumstances exist:

- (a) If the *Anti-Doping Organization* determines the B *Sample* should be analyzed prior to the conclusion of its investigation under Article 7.3, the

Anti-Doping Organization may conduct the B Sample analysis after notifying the *Athlete*, with such notice to include a description of the *Atypical Finding* and the information described in Article 7.2(b)-(f).

- (b) If the *Anti-Doping Organization* receives a request, either from a *Major Event Organization* shortly before one of its *International Events* or a request from a sport organization responsible for meeting an imminent deadline for selecting team members for an *International Event*, to disclose whether any *Athlete* identified on a list provided by the *Major Event Organization* or sport organization has a pending *Atypical Finding*, the *Anti-Doping Organization* shall so identify any such *Athlete* after first providing notice of the *Atypical Finding* to the *Athlete*.

[Comment to Article 7.3.1(b): Under the circumstance described in Article 7.3.1(b), the option to take action would be left to the *Major Event Organization* or sport organization consistent with its rules.]

7.4 Review of Other Anti-Doping Rule Violations Not Covered by Articles 7.1–7.3

The *Anti-Doping Organization* or other reviewing body established by such organization shall conduct any follow-up investigation into a possible anti-doping rule violation as may be required under applicable anti-doping policies and rules adopted pursuant to the *Code* or which the *Anti-Doping Organization* otherwise considers appropriate. At such time as the *Anti-Doping Organization* is satisfied that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, it shall promptly give the *Athlete* or other *Person* subject to sanction notice, in the manner set out in its rules, of the anti-doping rule violated, and the basis of the violation. Other *Anti-Doping Organizations* shall be notified as provided in Article 14.1.2.

7.6 Retirement from Sport

If an *Athlete* or other *Person* retires while a results management process is underway, the *Anti-Doping Organization* conducting the results management process retains jurisdiction to complete its results management process. If an *Athlete* or other *Person* retires before any results management process has begun, the *Anti-Doping Organization* which would have had results management jurisdiction over the *Athlete* or other *Person* at the time the *Athlete* or other *Person* committed an anti-doping rule violation, has jurisdiction to conduct results management.

[Comment to Article 7.6: Conduct by an *Athlete* or other *Person* before the *Athlete* or other *Person* was subject to the jurisdiction of any *Anti-Doping Organization* would not constitute an anti-doping rule violation but could be a legitimate basis for denying the *Athlete* or other *Person* membership in a sports organization.]

Code Article 10 Sanctions on Individuals

10.3.3 For violations of Article 2.4 (Whereabouts Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests), the period of *Ineligibility* shall be at a minimum one (1) year and at a maximum two (2) years based on the *Athlete's* degree of fault.

[Comment to Article 10.3.3: The sanction under Article 10.3.3 shall be two years where all three filing failures or missed tests are inexcusable. Otherwise, the sanction shall be assessed in the range of two years to one year, based on the circumstances of the case.]

10.11 Reinstatement Testing

As a condition to regaining eligibility at the end of a specified period of *Ineligibility*, an *Athlete* must, during any period of *Provisional Suspension* or *Ineligibility*, make him or herself available for *Out-of-Competition Testing* by any *Anti-Doping Organization* having Testing jurisdiction, and must, if requested, provide current and accurate whereabouts information. If an *Athlete* subject to a period of *Ineligibility* retires from sport and is removed from *Out-of-Competition Testing* pools and later seeks reinstatement, the *Athlete* shall not be eligible for reinstatement until the *Athlete* has notified relevant *Anti-Doping Organizations* and has been subject to *Out-of-Competition Testing* for a period of time equal to the period of *Ineligibility* remaining as of the date the *Athlete* had retired.

Code Article 14 Confidentiality and Reporting:

14.3 Athlete Whereabouts Information

As further provided in the *International Standard for Testing*, *Athletes* who have been identified by their International Federation or *National Anti-Doping Organization* for inclusion in a *Registered Testing Pool* shall provide accurate, current location information. The International Federations and *National Anti-Doping Organizations* shall coordinate the identification of *Athletes* and the collecting of current location information and shall submit these to WADA. This information will be accessible, through ADAMS where reasonably feasible, to other *Anti-Doping Organizations* having jurisdiction to test the *Athlete* as provided in Article 15. This information shall be maintained in strict confidence at all times; shall be used exclusively for purposes of planning, coordinating or conducting *Testing*; and shall be destroyed after it is no longer relevant for these purposes.

14.5 Doping Control Information Clearinghouse

WADA shall act as a central clearinghouse for *Doping Control Testing* data and results for *International-Level Athletes* and national-level *Athletes* who have been included in their *National Anti-Doping Organization's Registered Testing Pool*. To facilitate coordinated test distribution planning and to avoid unnecessary duplication in *Testing* by the various *Anti-Doping Organizations*, each *Anti-Doping Organization* shall report all *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition* tests on such *Athletes* to the WADA clearinghouse as soon as possible after such tests have been conducted. This information will be made accessible to the *Athlete*, the

Athlete's National Federation, National Olympic Committee or National Paralympic Committee, National Anti-Doping Organization, International Federation, and the International Olympic Committee or International Paralympic Committee.

To enable it to serve as a clearinghouse for *Doping Control Testing* data, WADA has developed a database management tool, *ADAMS*, that reflects emerging data privacy principles. In particular, *WADA* has developed *ADAMS* to be consistent with data privacy statutes and norms applicable to *WADA* and other organizations using *ADAMS*. Private information regarding an *Athlete, Athlete Support Personnel*, or others involved in anti-doping activities shall be maintained by *WADA*, which is supervised by Canadian privacy authorities, in strict confidence and in accordance with the *International Standard* for the protection of privacy. *WADA* shall, at least annually, publish statistical reports summarizing the information that it receives, ensuring at all times that the privacy of *Athletes* is fully respected and make itself available for discussions with national and regional data privacy authorities.

14.6 Data Privacy

When performing obligations under the Code, *Anti-Doping Organizations* may collect, store, process or disclose personal information relating to *Athletes* and third parties. Each *Anti-Doping Organization* shall ensure that it complies with applicable data protection and privacy laws with respect to their handling of such information, as well as the *International Standard* for the protection of privacy that *WADA* shall adopt to ensure *Athletes* and non-athletes are fully informed of and, where necessary, agree to the handling of their personal information in connection with anti-doping activities arising under the Code.

Code Article 15 Clarification of *Doping Control* Responsibilities:

15.1 Event Testing

The collection of *Samples* for *Doping Control* does and should take place at both *International Events* and *National Events*. However, except as otherwise provided below, only a single organization should be responsible for initiating and directing *Testing* during the *Event Period*. At *International Events*, the collection of *Doping Control Samples* shall be initiated and directed by the international organization which is the ruling body for the *Event* (e.g., the International Olympic Committee for the Olympic Games, the International Federation for a World Championship, and Pan-American Sports Organization for the Pan American Games). At *National Events*, the collection of *Doping Control Samples* shall be initiated and directed by the designated *National Anti-Doping Organization* of that country.

15.1.1 If an *Anti-Doping Organization* which is not responsible for initiating and directing *Testing* at an *Event* nevertheless desires to conduct additional *Testing* of *Athletes* at the *Event* during the *Event Period*, the *Anti-Doping Organization* shall first confer with the ruling body of the *Event* to obtain permission to conduct, and

to coordinate, any additional *Testing*. If the *Anti-Doping Organization* is not satisfied with the response from the ruling body of the *Event*, the *Anti-Doping Organization* may ask *WADA* for permission to conduct additional *Testing* and to determine how to coordinate such additional *Testing*. *WADA* shall not grant approval for such additional *Testing* before consulting with and informing the ruling body for the *Event*.

[Comment to Article 15.1.1: Before giving approval to a National Anti-Doping Organization to initiate and conduct Testing at an International Event, WADA shall consult with the international organization which is the ruling body for the Event. Before giving approval to an International Federation to initiate and conduct Testing at a National Event, WADA shall consult with the National Anti-Doping Organization of the country where the Event takes place. The Anti-Doping Organization "initiating and directing Testing" may, if it chooses, enter into agreements with other organizations to which it delegates responsibility for Sample collection or other aspects of the Doping Control process.]

15.2 Out-of-Competition Testing

Out-of-Competition Testing shall be initiated and directed by both international and national organizations. *Out-of-Competition Testing* may be initiated and directed by: (a) *WADA*; (b) the International Olympic Committee or International Paralympic Committee in connection with the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games; (c) the *Athlete's International Federation*; or (d) any other *Anti-Doping Organization* that has *Testing* jurisdiction over the *Athlete* as provided in Article 5.1 (Test Distribution Planning). *Out-of-Competition Testing* shall be coordinated through *ADAMS* where reasonably feasible in order to maximize the effectiveness of the combined *Testing* effort and to avoid unnecessary repetitive *Testing* of individual *Athletes*.

[Comment to Article 15.2: Additional authority to conduct Testing may be authorized by means of bilateral or multilateral agreements among Signatories and governments.]

15.4.1 Mutual Recognition.

Subject to the right to appeal provided in Article 13, *Testing*, therapeutic use exemptions and hearing results or other final adjudications of any *Signatory* which are consistent with World Anti-Doping Code 2007 Version 1.0 46 the *Code* and are within that *Signatory's* authority, shall be recognized and respected by all other *Signatories*.

[Comment to Article 15.4.1: There has in the past been some confusion in the interpretation of this Article with regard to therapeutic use exemptions. Unless provided otherwise by the rules of an International Federation or an agreement with an International Federation, National Anti-Doping Organizations do not have "authority" to grant therapeutic use exemptions to International-Level Athletes.]

15.4.2 *Signatories* shall recognize the same actions of other bodies which have not accepted the *Code* if the rules of those bodies are otherwise consistent with the *Code*.

[Comment to Article 15.4.2: Where the decision of a body that has not accepted the Code is in some respects Code compliant and in other respects not Code compliant, Signatories should attempt to apply the decision in harmony with the principles of the Code. For example, if in a process consistent with the Code a non-Signatory has found an Athlete to have committed an anti-doping rule violation on account of the presence of a Prohibited Substance in his body but the period of Ineligibility applied is shorter than the period provided for in the Code, then all Signatories should recognize the finding of an anti-doping rule violation and the Athlete's National Anti-Doping Organization should conduct a hearing consistent with Article 8 to determine whether the longer period of Ineligibility provided in the Code should be imposed.]

3.0 Terms and definitions, and interpretation

3.1 Defined terms from the 2009 Code

ADAMS: The Anti-Doping Administration and Management System is a Web-based database management tool for data entry, storage, sharing, and reporting designed to assist stakeholders and WADA in their anti-doping operations in conjunction with data protection legislation.

Adverse Analytical Finding: A report from a laboratory or other WADA-approved *Testing* entity that, consistent with the *International Standard* for Laboratories and related Technical Documents, identifies in a *Sample* the presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* (including elevated quantities of endogenous substances) or evidence of the *Use* of a *Prohibited Method*.

Anti-Doping Organization (ADO): A *Signatory* that is responsible for adopting rules for initiating, implementing or enforcing any part of the *Doping Control* process. This includes, for example, the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, other *Major Event Organizations* that conduct *Testing* at their *Events*, WADA, International Federations, and *National Anti-Doping Organizations*.

Athlete: Any *Person* who participates in sport at the international level (as defined by each International Federation), the national level (as defined by each *National Anti-Doping Organization*, including but not limited to those *Persons* in its *Registered Testing Pool*), and any other competitor in sport who is otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of any *Signatory* or other sports organization accepting the *Code*. All provisions of the *Code*, including, for example, *Testing* and therapeutic use exemptions, must be applied to international- and national-level competitors. Some *National Anti-Doping Organizations* may elect to test and apply anti-doping rules to recreational-level or masters competitors who are not current or potential national caliber competitors. *National Anti-Doping Organizations* are not required, however, to apply all aspects of the *Code* to such *Persons*. Specific national rules may be established for Doping Control for non-international-level or non-national-level competitors without being in conflict with the *Code*. Thus, a country could elect to test recreational-level competitors but not require therapeutic use exemptions or whereabouts information. In the same manner, a *Major Event Organization* holding an *Event* only for masters-level competitors could elect to test the competitors but not require advance therapeutic use exemptions or whereabouts information. For purposes of Article 2.8 (Administration or *Attempted Administration*) and for purposes of anti-doping information and education, any *Person* who participates in sport under the

authority of any *Signatory*, government, or other sports organization accepting the *Code* is an *Athlete*.

[Comment: This definition makes it clear that all international- and national-caliber athletes are subject to the anti-doping rules of the Code, with the precise definitions of international- and national- level sport to be set forth in the anti-doping rules of the International Federations and National Anti-Doping Organizations, respectively. At the national level, anti-doping rules adopted pursuant to the Code shall apply, at a minimum, to all persons on national teams and all persons qualified to compete in any national championship in any sport. That does not mean, however, that all such Athletes must be included in a National Anti-Doping Organization's Registered Testing Pool. The definition also allows each National Anti-Doping Organization, if it chooses to do so, to expand its anti-doping program beyond national-caliber athletes to competitors at lower levels of competition. Competitors at all levels of competition should receive the benefit of anti-doping information and education.]

Atypical Finding: A report from a laboratory or other WADA-approved entity which requires further investigation as provided by the *International Standard* for Laboratories or related Technical Documents prior to the determination of an *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

Code: The World Anti-Doping Code.

Competition: A single race, match, game or singular athletic contest. For example, a basketball game or the finals of the Olympic 100-meter dash. For stage races and other athletic contests where prizes are awarded on a daily or other interim basis the distinction between a *Competition* and an *Event* will be as provided in the rules of the applicable International Federation.

Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations: An *Athlete's* or other *Person's* violation of an anti-doping rule may result in one or more of the following: (a) *Disqualification* means the *Athlete's* results in a particular *Competition* or *Event* are invalidated, with all resulting Consequences including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes; (b) *Ineligibility* means the *Athlete* or other *Person* is barred for a specified period of time from participating in any *Competition* or other activity or funding as provided in Article 10.9; and (c) *Provisional Suspension* means the *Athlete* or other *Person* is barred temporarily from participating in any *Competition* prior to the final decision at a hearing conducted under Article 8 (Right to a Fair Hearing).

Doping Control: All steps and processes from test distribution planning through to ultimate disposition of any appeal including all steps and processes in between such as provision of whereabouts information, *Sample* collection and handling, laboratory analysis, therapeutic use exemptions, results management and hearings.

Event: A series of individual *Competitions* conducted together under one ruling body (e.g., the Olympic Games of the Olympiad and the Winter Games, FINA World Championships, or Pan American Games).

In-Competition: Unless provided otherwise in the rules of an International Federation or other relevant *Anti-Doping Organization*, "*In-Competition*" means the period commencing twelve hours before a *Competition* in which the *Athlete* is scheduled to participate through the end of such *Competition* and the *Sample* collection process related to such *Competition*.

Independent Observer Program: A team of observers, under the supervision of *WADA*, who observe and may provide guidance on the *Doping Control* process at certain *Events* and report on their observations.

Ineligibility: See *Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations* above.

International Event: An *Event* where the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, an International Federation, a *Major Event Organization*, or another international sport organization is the ruling body for the *Event* or appoints the technical officials for the *Event*.

International-Level Athlete: *Athletes* designated by one or more International Federations as being within the *Registered Testing Pool* for an International Federation.

International Standard: A standard adopted by *WADA* in support of the *Code*. Compliance with an *International Standard* (as opposed to another alternative standard, practice or procedure) shall be sufficient to conclude that the procedures addressed by the *International Standard* were performed properly. *International Standards* shall include any Technical Documents issued pursuant to the *International Standard*.

Minor: A natural *Person* who has not reached the age of majority as established by the applicable laws of his or her country of residence.

National Anti-Doping Organization: The entity(ies) designated by each country as possessing the primary authority and responsibility to adopt and implement anti-doping rules, direct the collection of *Samples*, the management of test results, and the conduct of hearings, all at the national level. This includes an entity which may be designated by multiple countries to serve as regional *Anti-Doping Organization* for such countries. If this designation has not been made by the competent public authority(ies), the entity shall be the country's *National Olympic Committee* or its designee.

National Olympic Committee (NOC): The organization recognized by the International Olympic Committee. The term *National Olympic Committee* shall also include the National Sport Confederation in those countries where the National Sport Confederation assumes typical *National Olympic Committee* responsibilities in the anti-doping area.

No Advance Notice: A *Doping Control* which takes place with no advance warning to the *Athlete* and where the *Athlete* is continuously chaperoned from the moment of notification through *Sample* provision.

Out-of-Competition: Any *Doping Control* which is not *In-Competition*.

Prohibited List: The List identifying the *Prohibited Substances* and *Prohibited Methods*.

Provisional Suspension: See *Consequences* above.

Registered Testing Pool: The pool of top level *Athletes* established separately by each International Federation and *National Anti-Doping Organization* who are subject to both *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition Testing* as part of that International Federation's or Organization's Test Distribution Plan. Each International Federation shall publish a list which identifies those *Athletes* included in its *Registered Testing Pool* either by name or by clearly defined, specific criteria.

Sample or Specimen: Any biological material collected for the purposes of *Doping Control*.

[Comment: It has sometimes been claimed that the collection of blood Samples violates the tenets of certain religious or cultural groups. It has been determined that there is no basis for any such claim.]

Signatories: Those entities signing the *Code* and agreeing to comply with the *Code*, including the International Olympic Committee, International Federations, International Paralympic Committee, *National Olympic Committees*, National Paralympic Committees, *Major Event Organizations*, *National Anti-Doping Organizations*, and WADA.

Tampering: Altering for an improper purpose or in an improper way; bringing improper influence to bear; interfering improperly; obstructing, misleading or engaging in any fraudulent conduct to alter results or prevent normal procedures from occurring; or providing fraudulent information to an *Anti-Doping Organization*.

Target Testing: Selection of *Athletes* for *Testing* where specific *Athletes* or groups of *Athletes* are selected on a non-random basis for *Testing* at a specified time.

Team Sport: A sport in which the substitution of players is permitted during a *Competition*.

Testing: The parts of the *Doping Control* process involving test distribution planning, *Sample* collection, *Sample* handling, and *Sample* transport to the laboratory.

WADA: The World Anti-Doping Agency.

3.2 Defined terms specific to the *International Standard for Testing*

Blood Collection Officer (BCO): An official who is qualified to and has been authorized by the *ADO* to collect a blood *Sample* from an *Athlete*.

Chain of Custody: The sequence of individuals or organizations who have the responsibility for a *Sample* from the provision of the *Sample* until the *Sample* has been received for analysis.

Chaperone: An official who is trained and authorized by the *ADO* to carry out specific duties including one or more of the following: notification of the *Athlete* selected for *Sample* collection; accompanying and observing the *Athlete* until arrival at the Doping Control Station; and/or witnessing and verifying the provision of the *Sample* where the training qualifies him/her to do so.

Doping Control Officer (DCO): An official who has been trained and authorized by the *ADO* with delegated responsibility for the on-site management of a *Sample* Collection Session.

Doping Control Station: The location where the *Sample* Collection Session will be conducted.

Failure to Comply: A term used to describe anti-doping rule violations under *Code* Articles 2.3, 2.5 and 2.8.

Filing Failure: A failure by the *Athlete* (or by a third party to whom the *Athlete* has delegated this task, in accordance with Clause 11.3.6 or Clause 11.5.4) to make an accurate and complete Whereabouts Filing in accordance with Clause 11.3 or Clause 11.5.6.

International Federation (IF): An international non-governmental organization administering one or more sports at world level.

Missed Test: A failure by the *Athlete* to be available for *Testing* at the location and time specified in the 60-minute time slot identified in his/her Whereabouts Filing for the day in question, in accordance with Clause 11.4 or Clause 11.5.6.

National Federation: A national non-governmental organization administering one or more sports at a national level.

Random Selection: Selection of *Athletes* for *Testing* which is not *Target Testing*. Random Selection may be: completely random (where no pre-determined criteria are considered, and *Athletes* are chosen arbitrarily from a list or pool of *Athlete* names); or weighted (where *Athletes* are ranked using pre-determined criteria in order to increase or decrease the chances of selection).

Responsible ADO: The *Anti-Doping Organization* with responsibility for a particular whereabouts matter, as specified in Clause 11.5.

Sample Collection Equipment: Containers or apparatus used to directly collect or hold the *Sample* at any time during the *Sample* collection process. *Sample* Collection Equipment shall, as a minimum, consist of:

- For urine *Sample* collection:
 - Collection vessels for collecting the *Sample* as it leaves the *Athlete's* body;
 - Sealable and tamper-evident bottles and lids for securing the *Sample*;
 - Partial *Sample* kit;
- For blood *Sample* collection:
 - Needles for collecting the *Sample*;
 - Blood tubes with sealable and tamper-evident devices for holding the *Sample*.

Sample Collection Personnel: A collective term for qualified officials authorized by the *ADO* who may carry out or assist with duties during the Sample Collection Session.

Sample Collection Session: All of the sequential activities that directly involve the *Athlete* from notification until the *Athlete* leaves the Doping Control Station after having provided his/her *Sample/s*.

Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis: Specific gravity measured at 1.005 or higher with a refractometer, or 1.010 or higher with lab sticks.

Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis: A minimum of 90 mL for full or part menu analysis.

Team Activity: As defined in Clause 11.5.3.

Test Distribution Plan: As defined in Clause 4.2.1.

Unsuccessful Attempt Report: A detailed report of an unsuccessful *Testing* attempt, as more fully described in Clause 11.6.3(a).

Whereabouts Failure: A Filing Failure or a Missed Test.

Whereabouts Filing: Information provided by or on behalf of an *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* that sets out the *Athlete's* whereabouts during the following quarter, in accordance with Clause 11.3 (or optionally, in the case of a *Team Sport*, in accordance with Clause 11.5).

3.3 Interpretation of the *International Standard for Testing*

3.3.1 Unless otherwise specified, references in this document to Clauses are references to clauses of this *International Standard for Testing*.

3.3.2 The comments annotating various provisions of the *International Standard for Testing* are included to assist in the understanding and interpretation of the *International Standard*.

PART TWO: STANDARDS FOR TESTING

4.0 Planning

4.1 Objective

The objective is the development of Test Distribution Plans that are specific to the relevant sport (in the case of an IF) or the relevant nation (in the case of a *NADO*). The common objective in each case is to plan and implement an effective distribution of *Sample* collections both *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition* in each nation, sport, or discipline within the sport (as applicable), resulting in the effective detection, deterrence and prevention of doping practices in such sport/discipline/nation.

4.2 General

4.2.1 Each *ADO* with *Testing* jurisdiction must develop a plan for the efficient and effective allocation of its *Testing* resources across the different sports under its jurisdiction (in the case of a *NADO*), across the different countries within its jurisdiction (in the case of an IF) and across the different disciplines within a sport under its jurisdiction (in the case of an IF and a *NADO*). Such plan, which should be monitored, evaluated, modified and updated periodically as required, is referred to in this *International Standard* as the "Test Distribution Plan".

[4.2 Comment: Any other ADO that (like a NADO) has Testing jurisdiction over a significant number of different and otherwise unrelated sports (e.g., a Major Event Organizer) shall be treated under this International Standard in the same manner as a NADO in relation to test distribution planning and allocation of Testing resources across those different sports. (See Clauses 4.3.1, 4.3.6 and 4.4.4).]

4.2.2 Planning starts with the gathering of information (e.g., in relation to the number of relevant *Athletes* in a particular sport/discipline/nation, as well as the basic structure of the season for the sport/discipline in question, including standard competition schedules and training patterns for each sport/discipline); evaluating the potential risk of doping and possible doping pattern for each sport/discipline/nation; and then developing a Test Distribution Plan that deploys the available resources in the most efficient and effective way to address those risks.

4.2.3 The main activities are therefore information-gathering, monitoring and follow up; risk evaluation; and developing, monitoring, evaluating, modifying and updating the Test Distribution Plan.

4.2.4 The *ADO* shall ensure that *Athlete Support Personnel* and/or any other person with a conflict of interest shall not be involved in test distribution planning for their *Athletes* or in the process of selection of *Athletes* for *Testing*.

4.3 Requirements for test distribution planning

4.3.1 The basis of the Test Distribution Plan must be a considered evaluation of the risk of doping and possible doping pattern for the sport/discipline/nation in question. In the case of an IE, in addition to conducting a risk evaluation for each discipline within its sport, it should also take into account the strength of the national anti-doping programme within each nation under its jurisdiction, so as to ensure proper coordination and efficiency in the use of *Testing* resources. In the case of a *NADO*, in addition to conducting its own risk evaluations for each relevant sport/discipline under its jurisdiction, it may also take into account the relative risks of doping as between the different sports under its jurisdiction, as well as any national anti-doping policy requirements and priorities that it may follow as between those different sports.

[4.3.1 Comment: It is understood and expected that different NADOs will have different national policy requirements and priorities. For example, one NADO may have legitimate reasons to prioritize (some or all) Olympic sports while another may have legitimate reasons, because of different characteristics of that sporting nation, to prioritize (for example) certain professional sports. These national policy imperatives are a relevant consideration in the NADO's test distribution planning, alongside the NADO's assessment of the relative risks of doping in the various sports played within its national jurisdiction. They may lead, for example, to a NADO deciding, in its Test Distribution Plan for a particular period, (1) not to allocate any Testing to one or more sports within its jurisdiction; and/or (2) to allocate Testing to a particular sport in its Test Distribution Plan but not to include any Athletes from that sport in its national Registered Testing Pool for purposes of triggering the whereabouts requirements of Section 11 of this International Standard. (See further Clause 4.4.4(b)). Such decisions should be reviewed regularly: See Clause 4.3.11.]

4.3.2 The *ADO* shall, as a minimum, evaluate the potential risk of doping and possible doping pattern for each sport and/or discipline based on:

- a) The physical demands of the sport and/or discipline and possible performance-enhancing effect that doping may elicit;
- b) Available doping analysis statistics;
- c) Available research on doping trends;
- d) The history of doping in the sport and/or discipline;
- e) Training periods and the *Competition* calendar; and
- f) Information received on possible doping practices.

4.3.3 The *ADO* shall develop and document a Test Distribution Plan based on the information referred to in Clause 4.3.2; the number of *Athletes* involved in the

sport/discipline; the *Competition* calendar; the anti-doping activities of other *ADOs* with responsibility for *Testing* in respect of the sport/discipline; the evaluation outcomes of previous test distribution planning cycles; (in the case of IFs) the strength of the national anti-doping programme from nation to nation; and (in the case of *NADOs*) the national anti-doping policy imperatives referenced in Clause 4.3.1.

4.3.4 The *ADO* shall allocate the number of *Sample* collections that it has at its disposal for each sport/discipline/nation (as relevant), including between urine and blood *Testing* and between *Out-of-Competition Testing* and *In-Competition Testing*. The allocation of resources between urine and blood *Testing* and between *Out-of-Competition Testing* and *In-Competition Testing* shall take into account the relative risks of doping in such periods for each sport/discipline under evaluation.

4.3.5 Each IF shall evaluate the relative merits of *Out-of-Competition* and *In-Competition Testing* in its sport and in the various disciplines within that sport. In sports and/or disciplines with a high risk of doping *Out-of-Competition, Out-of-Competition Testing* shall be made a priority, and a substantial portion of *Testing* shall be conducted *Out-of-Competition*. However, some material amount of *In-Competition Testing* shall still take place. For those sports and/or disciplines where there is a low risk of doping *Out-of-Competition, In-Competition Testing* shall be made a priority, and a significant amount of *Testing* shall be conducted *In-Competition*. However, some material amount of *Out-of-Competition Testing* shall still take place.

4.3.6 Each *NADO* shall first determine how it will allocate the *Sample* collections at its disposal among the various sports under its jurisdiction, based on an analysis of the relative risks of doping between those sports as well as the national anti-doping policy imperatives referenced in Clause 4.3.1. Having identified in this way the "priority" sports to which its *Testing* resources are to be allocated, the *NADO* shall then make its own evaluation of the relative merits of *Out-of-Competition* and *In-Competition Testing* in those "priority" sports. In those sports and/or disciplines where it assesses that there is a high risk of doping in the *Out-of-Competition* period, the *NADO* shall ensure that *Out-of-Competition Testing* is made a priority, and that a substantial portion of annual *Testing* is conducted *Out-of-Competition*. However, some material amount of *In-Competition Testing* shall still take place. For those sports and/or disciplines where the *NADO* assesses that there is a low risk of doping *Out-of-Competition, In-Competition Testing* shall be made a priority, and a substantial amount of *Testing* shall be conducted *In-Competition*. However, some material amount of *Out-of-Competition Testing* shall still take place.

4.3.7 In order to develop a Test Distribution Plan that takes into account in a coordinated manner the *Testing* activities of other relevant *ADOs*:

- a) *ADOs* shall coordinate *Testing* activities to avoid duplication. Clear agreement on roles and responsibilities for *Event Testing* shall be agreed in advance in accordance with *Code* Article 15.1.
- b) *ADOs* shall, without any unnecessary delay, share information on its *Testing* with other relevant *ADOs*, ideally via ADAMS or another centralized database of similar functionality and security, in accordance with *Code* Article 14.5.

4.3.8 As part of the Test Distribution Plan, the *ADO* shall allocate the type of test for each sport/discipline/nation, as relevant, including as between urine and blood *Sample* collection, based on an analysis of the risks of doping for the particular sport/discipline in question, as explained in Clause 4.3.4.

4.3.9 The *ADO* shall ensure that the timing of *Testing* is planned to ensure optimum deterrence and detection of doping practices.

4.3.10 Save in exceptional and justifiable circumstances, all *Testing* shall be *No Advance Notice*:

- a) For *In-Competition Testing*, placeholder selection may be known in advance. However, random *Athlete*/placeholder selection shall not be revealed to the *Athlete* until notification.
- b) All *Out-of-Competition Testing* shall be *No Advance Notice* save in exceptional and justifiable circumstances.

4.3.11 The *ADO* shall document its Test Distribution Plan and shall establish a system whereby that Test Distribution Plan is reviewed and, if necessary, updated on a regular basis in order to incorporate new information and take into account *Sample* collection by other *ADOs*. Such data shall be used to assist with determining whether modifications to the plan are necessary.

4.4 Requirements for selection of *Athletes* for *Testing*

4.4.1 In implementing the Test Distribution Plan, the *ADO* shall select *Athletes* for *Sample* collection using *Target Testing* and Random Selection methods.

4.4.2 *ADOs* shall ensure that a significant amount of *Testing* undertaken pursuant to the Test Distribution Plan is *Target Testing*, based on the intelligent assessment of the risks of doping and the most effective use of resources to ensure optimum detection and deterrence. The factors that will be relevant to determining who should be made the subject of *Target Testing* will vary as

between different sports, but could include (without limitation) some or all of the following factors:

- a) Abnormal biological parameters (blood parameters, steroid profiles, etc);
- b) Injury;
- c) Withdrawal or absence from expected *Competition*;
- d) Going into or coming out of retirement;
- e) Behaviour indicating doping;
- f) Sudden major improvements in performance;
- g) Repeated failure to provide Whereabouts Filings;
- h) Whereabouts Filings that may indicate a potential increase in the risk of doping, including moving to a remote location;
- i) *Athlete* sport performance history;
- j) *Athlete* age, e.g. approaching retirement, move from junior to senior level;
- k) *Athlete* test history;
- l) *Athlete* reinstatement after a period of *Ineligibility*;
- m) Financial incentives for improved performance, such as prize money or sponsorship opportunities;
- n) *Athlete* association with a third party such as coach or doctor with a history of involvement in doping; and
- o) Reliable information from a third party.

4.4.3 *Testing* which is not *Target Testing* shall be determined by Random Selection, which shall be conducted using a documented system for such selection. Random Selection which is weighted shall be conducted according to clear criteria and may take into account the factors listed in Clause 4.4.2 (as applicable) in order to ensure that a greater percentage of 'at risk' *Athletes* is selected.

4.4.4 As set out in Clause 11.2:

- a. In addition to developing a Test Distribution Plan that is specific to its sport, an IF must define criteria for the inclusion of certain *Athletes* from its sport in an international *Registered Testing Pool*, to whom the whereabouts requirements of Section 11 of this *International Standard* will apply. For the avoidance of doubt, however, the IF's Test Distribution Plan must encompass all relevant *Athletes*, not just *Athletes* included in the international *Registered Testing Pool*, and accordingly the IF should select *Athletes* for *Testing* (including *Out-of-Competition Testing*) who are not included in its international *Registered Testing Pool*. However, an appropriate proportion of the *Out-of-Competition* tests specified in the Test Distribution Plan must be conducted on *Athletes* in the international *Registered Testing Pool*.

- b. In addition to developing a Test Distribution Plan that allocates its *Testing* resources among some or all of the sports within its jurisdiction, a *NADO* must identify criteria for the inclusion of certain *Athletes* from some or all of those sports in a national *Registered Testing Pool*, to whom the whereabouts requirements of Section 11 of this *International Standard* will apply. For the avoidance of doubt, however, the *NADO's* Test Distribution Plan must encompass all relevant *Athletes* from the sports in question, not just *Athletes* included in the national *Registered Testing Pool*, and accordingly the *NADO* should select *Athletes* for *Testing* (including *Out-of-Competition Testing*) who are not included in the national *Registered Testing Pool*. However, where *Athletes* from a particular sport have been included in the national *Registered Testing Pool*, an appropriate proportion of the *Out-of-Competition* tests allocated to that sport in the *NADO's* Test Distribution Plan must be conducted on those *Athletes*.

[4.4.4 Comment: As further explained in Section 11 of this International Standard, the main purpose of the Registered Testing Pool is to identify those Athletes from the relevant sport(s) who should be made subject to the whereabouts requirements of Section 11 of this International Standard. That decision will depend principally on an evaluation of the risk of Out-of-Competition doping in the sport(s) or discipline(s) in question: the greater that risk, the larger the Registered Testing Pool should be; the smaller that risk, the smaller the Registered Testing Pool can be. Accordingly, the number of Athletes in a Registered Testing Pool may vary considerably from sport to sport. In accordance with Clause 11.2, however, there are certain minimum requirements for populating Registered Testing Pools, and pursuant to Clause 4.4.4 an appropriate number of the Out-of-Competition tests specified in the Test Distribution Plan must be carried out on Athletes in the Registered Testing Pool.]

In the case of a NADO, the relevant sports for purposes of Clause 4.4.4(b) shall be those sports within its jurisdiction that it decides, based on the national policy requirements and priorities referenced in Clause 4.3.1, as well as the risk assessment and other factors referred to in Clause 4.3.3, to treat as "priority" sports for purposes of Out-of-Competition Testing. Based on those factors, a NADO may decide not to include any Athletes from a particular sport or sports in the national Registered Testing Pool. That decision should be reviewed regularly in accordance with Clause 4.3.11. However, where the NADO does decide to include Athletes from a particular sport in the national Registered Testing Pool, an appropriate number of the Out-of-Competition tests allocated to that sport in the Test Distribution Plan must be conducted on those Athletes.]

4.4.5 Where the *ADO* authorizes a DCO to select *Athletes* for *Sample* collection, the *ADO* shall provide selection criteria to the DCO in accordance with the Test Distribution Plan.

4.4.6 Following the selection of an *Athlete* for *Sample* collection and prior to notification of the *Athlete*, the *ADO* and/or DCO shall ensure *Athlete* selection

decisions are disclosed only to those who need to know, in order to ensure the *Athlete* can be notified and tested on a *No Advance Notice* basis.

5.0 Notification of *Athletes*

5.1 Objective

The objective is to ensure that reasonable attempts are made to locate the *Athlete*, the selected *Athlete* is notified as outlined in Clause 5.4.1, the rights of the *Athlete* are maintained, there are no opportunities to manipulate the *Sample* to be provided, and the notification is documented.

[5.1 Comment: WADA will produce guidelines to assist ADOs in determining what constitutes reasonable attempts to locate an Athlete in the specific context of Section 11 (Whereabouts).]

5.2 General

Notification of *Athletes* starts when the *ADO* initiates the notification of the selected *Athlete* and ends when the *Athlete* arrives at the Doping Control Station or when the *Athlete's* possible failure to comply is brought to the *ADO's* attention. The main activities are:

Appointment of DCOs, Chaperones and other Sample Collection Personnel;

Locating the *Athlete* and confirming his/her identity;

Informing the *Athlete* that he/she has been selected to provide a *Sample* and of his/her rights and responsibilities;

For *No Advance Notice Sample* collection, continuously chaperoning the *Athlete* from the time of notification to the arrival at the designated Doping Control Station; and

Documenting the notification, or notification attempt.

5.3 Requirements prior to notification of *Athletes*

5.3.1 Other than by exception, *No Advance Notice* shall be the notification method for *Sample* collection.

5.3.2 To conduct or assist with Sample Collection Sessions, the *ADO* shall appoint and authorise Sample Collection Personnel who have been trained for their assigned responsibilities, who do not have a conflict of interest in the outcome of the *Sample* collection, and who are not *Minors*.

5.3.3 Sample Collection Personnel shall have official authorisation documentation that is provided and controlled by the *ADO*. In the case of DCOs, such documentation shall identify them by name. DCOs shall also carry complementary identification which includes their name and photograph (i.e., *ADO* identification card, driver's licence, health card, passport or similar valid identification) and the expiry date of the identification.

*[5.3.3 Comment: Chaperones do not have to carry documentation that identifies them by name or photograph. They only have to produce official authorisation documentation that is provided by the *ADO*, such as a Mission Order or an Authorisation Letter.]*

5.3.4 The *ADO* shall establish criteria to validate the identity of an *Athlete* selected to provide a *Sample*. This ensures the selected *Athlete* is the *Athlete* who is notified. The method of identification of the *Athlete* shall be documented on the doping control documentation.

5.3.5 The *ADO*, DCO or Chaperone, as applicable, shall establish the location of the selected *Athlete* and plan the approach and timing of notification, taking into consideration the specific circumstances of the sport/*Competition*/training session/etc and the situation in question.

5.3.6 The *ADO* shall establish a system for the detailed recording of *Athlete* notification attempt/s and outcome/s.

5.3.7 The *Athlete* shall be the first one notified that he/she has been selected for *Sample* collection except where prior contact with a third party is required as specified in Clause 5.3.8.

5.3.8 The *ADO/DCO/Chaperone*, as applicable, shall consider whether a third party is required to be notified prior to notification of the *Athlete* when the *Athlete* is a *Minor* (as provided for in Annex C – Modifications for *Athletes* who are Minors), or where required by an *Athlete's* disability (as provided for in Annex B - Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities), or in situations where an interpreter is required and available for the notification.

*[5.3.8 Comment: In the case of In-Competition Testing, it is permissible to notify third parties that Testing will be conducted, where required to help the Sample Collection Personnel to identify the *Athlete(s)* to be tested and to notify such *Athlete(s)* that he/she is required to provide a *Sample*. However, there is no requirement to notify any third party (e.g. a team doctor) of the Doping Control mission where such assistance is not needed.]*

5.4 Requirements for notification of *Athletes*

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

- a) That the *Athlete* is required to undergo a *Sample* collection;
- b) Of the authority under which the *Sample* collection is to be conducted;
- c) Of the type of *Sample* collection and any conditions that need to be adhered to prior to the *Sample* collection;
- d) Of the *Athlete's* rights, including the right to:
 - i. Have a representative and if available, an interpreter;
 - ii. Ask for additional information about the *Sample* collection process;
 - iii. Request a delay in reporting to the Doping Control Station for valid reasons; and
 - iv. Request modifications as provided for in Annex B – Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities.
- e) Of the *Athlete's* responsibilities, including the requirement to:
 - i. Remain within direct observation of the DCO/Chaperone at all times from the point of notification by the DCO/Chaperone until the completion of the *Sample* collection procedure;
 - ii. Produce identification in accordance with Clause 5.3.4;
 - iii. Comply with *Sample* collection procedures (and the *Athlete* should be advised of the possible consequences of Failure to Comply); and
 - iv. Report immediately for a test, unless there are valid reasons for a delay, as determined in accordance with Clause 5.4.4.
- f) Of the location of the Doping Control Station.
- g) That should the *Athlete* choose to consume food or fluids prior to providing a *Sample*, he/she does so at his/her own risk, and should in any event avoid excessive rehydration, having in mind the requirement to produce a *Sample* with a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.
- h) That the *Sample* provided by the *Athlete* to the Sample Collection Personnel should be the first urine passed by the *Athlete* subsequent to notification, i.e., he/she should not pass urine in the shower or otherwise prior to providing a *Sample* to the Sample Collection Personnel.

5.4.2 When contact is made, the DCO/Chaperone shall:

- a) From this time until the *Athlete* leaves the Doping Control Station at the end of his/her Sample Collection Session, keep the *Athlete* under observation at all times.
- b) Identify themselves to the *Athlete* using the documentation referred to in Clause 5.3.3.
- c) Confirm the *Athlete's* identity as per the criteria established in Clause 5.3.4. Confirmation of the *Athlete's* identity by any other method, or failure to confirm the identity of the *Athlete*, shall be documented and reported to the *ADO*.
- d) In cases where the *Athlete's* identity cannot be confirmed as per the criteria established in Clause 5.3.4, the *ADO* shall decide whether it is appropriate to follow up in accordance with Annex A – Investigating a possible failure to comply.

5.4.3 The Chaperone/DCO shall then have the *Athlete* sign an appropriate form to acknowledge and accept the notification. If the *Athlete* refuses to sign that he/she has been notified, or evades the notification, the Chaperone/DCO shall if possible inform the *Athlete* of the consequences of refusing or failing to comply, and the Chaperone (if not the DCO) shall immediately report all relevant facts to the DCO. When possible the DCO shall continue to collect a *Sample*. The DCO shall document the facts in a detailed report and report the circumstances to the *ADO*. The *ADO* shall follow the steps prescribed in Annex A – Investigating a Possible Failure to Comply.

5.4.4 The DCO/Chaperone may at their discretion consider any reasonable third party requirement or any request by the *Athlete* for permission to delay reporting to the Doping Control Station following acknowledgement and acceptance of notification, and/or to leave the Doping Control Station temporarily after arrival, and may grant such permission if the *Athlete* can be continuously chaperoned and kept under direct observation during the delay and if the request relates to the following activities:

For *In-Competition Testing*:

- a) Participation in a victory ceremony;
- b) Fulfilment of media commitments;
- c) Competing in further *Competitions*;
- d) Performing a warm down;
- e) Obtaining necessary medical treatment;
- f) Locating a representative and/or interpreter;
- g) Obtaining photo identification; or

- h) Any other exceptional circumstances which may be justified, and which shall be documented.

For *Out-of-Competition Testing*:

- a) Locating a representative;
- b) Completing a training session;
- c) Receiving necessary medical treatment;
- d) Obtaining photo identification;
- e) Any other exceptional circumstances which can be justified, and which shall be documented.

5.4.5 The DCO or other authorised Sample Collection Personnel shall document any reasons for delay in reporting to the Doping Control Station and/or reasons for leaving the Doping Control Station that may require further investigation by the *ADO*. Any failure of the *Athlete* to remain under constant observation should also be recorded.

5.4.6 A DCO/Chaperone shall reject a request for delay from an *Athlete* if it will not be possible for the *Athlete* to be continuously chaperoned.

5.4.7 If the *Athlete* delays reporting to the Doping Control Station other than in accordance with Clause 5.4.4 but arrives prior to the DCO's departure, the DCO shall decide whether to process a possible Failure to Comply. If at all possible the DCO shall proceed with collecting a *Sample*, and shall document the details of the delay in the *Athlete* reporting to the Doping Control Station.

5.4.8 If, while keeping the *Athlete* under observation, Sample Collection Personnel observe any matter with potential to compromise the test, the circumstances shall be reported to and documented by the DCO. If deemed appropriate by the DCO, the DCO shall follow the requirements of Annex A – Investigating a Possible Failure to Comply, and/or consider if it is appropriate to collect an additional *Sample* from the *Athlete*.

6.0 Preparing for the Sample Collection Session

6.1 Objective

To prepare for the Sample Collection Session in a manner that ensures that the session can be conducted efficiently and effectively.

6.2 General

Preparing for the Sample Collection Session starts with the establishment of a system for obtaining relevant information for effective conduct of the session and ends when it is confirmed that the Sample Collection Equipment conforms to the specified criteria.

The main activities are:

- a) Establishing a system for collecting details regarding the Sample Collection Session;
- b) Establishing criteria for who may be present during a Sample Collection Session;
- c) Ensuring that the Doping Control Station meets the minimum criteria prescribed in Clause 6.3.2;
- d) Ensuring that the Sample Collection Equipment used by the *ADO* meets the minimum criteria prescribed in Clause 6.3.4.

6.3 Requirements for preparing for the Sample Collection Session

6.3.1 The *ADO* shall establish a system for obtaining all the information necessary to ensure that the Sample Collection Session can be conducted effectively, including special requirements to meet the needs of *Athletes* with disabilities (as provided in Annex B – Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities) as well as the needs of *Athletes* who are *Minors* (as provided in Annex C – Modifications for *Athletes* who are *Minors*).

6.3.2 The DCO shall use a Doping Control Station which, at a minimum, ensures the *Athlete's* privacy and where possible is used solely as a Doping Control Station for the duration of the Sample Collection Session. The DCO shall record any significant deviations from these criteria.

6.3.3 The *ADO* shall establish criteria for who may be authorized to be present during the Sample Collection Session in addition to the Sample Collection Personnel. At a minimum the criteria shall include:

- a) An *Athlete's* entitlement to be accompanied by a representative and/or interpreter during the Sample Collection Session except when the *Athlete* is passing a urine *Sample*;
- b) A *Minor Athlete's* entitlement (as provided for in Annex C – Modifications for Athletes who are Minors), and the witnessing DCO/Chaperone's entitlement to have a representative observe the witnessing DCO/Chaperone when the *Minor Athlete* is passing a urine *Sample*, but without the representative directly observing the passing of the *Sample* unless requested to do so by the *Minor Athlete*;
- c) The entitlement of an *Athlete* with a disability to be accompanied by a representative as provided for in Annex B - Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities;
- d) A *WADA Independent Observer* where applicable under the *Independent Observer Program*. The *WADA Independent Observer* shall not directly observe the passing of a urine *Sample*.

6.3.4 The ADO shall only use Sample Collection Equipment systems which, at a minimum, meet the following criteria. They shall:

- a) Have a unique numbering system incorporated into all bottles, containers, tubes or other item used to seal the *Sample*;
- b) Have a sealing system that is tamper evident;
- c) Ensure the identity of the *Athlete* is not evident from the equipment itself; and
- d) Ensure that all equipment is clean and sealed prior to use by the *Athlete*.

6.3.5 The ADO shall develop a system for recording the Chain of Custody of the *Samples* and *Sample* collection documentation which includes confirming that both the *Samples* and *Sample* collection documentation have arrived at their intended destinations.

[6.3.5 Comment: Information as to how a Sample is stored prior to departure from the Doping Control Station may be recorded on (for example) a post-mission report. When the Sample is taken from the Doping Control Station, each transfer of custody of the Sample from one person to another, e.g. from the DCO to the courier, or from the DCO to the laboratory, should be documented, up until the Sample arrives at its intended destination.]

7.0 Conducting the Sample Collection Session

7.1 Objective

To conduct the Sample Collection Session in a manner that ensures the integrity, security and identity of the *Sample* and respects the privacy of the *Athlete*.

7.2 General

The Sample Collection Session starts with defining overall responsibility for the conduct of the Sample Collection Session and ends once the *Sample* collection documentation is complete.

The main activities are:

- a) Preparing for collecting the *Sample*;
- b) Collecting and securing the *Sample*; and
- c) Documenting the *Sample* collection.

7.3 Requirements prior to *Sample* collection

7.3.1 The *ADO* shall be responsible for the overall conduct of the Sample Collection Session, with specific responsibilities delegated to the DCO.

7.3.2 The DCO shall ensure that the *Athlete* has been informed of his/her rights and responsibilities as specified in Clause 5.4.1.

7.3.3 The DCO shall provide the *Athlete* with the opportunity to hydrate. The *Athlete* should avoid excessive rehydration, having in mind the requirement to provide a *Sample* with a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.

7.3.4 The *Athlete* shall only leave the Doping Control Station under continuous observation by the DCO/Chaperone and with the approval of the DCO. The DCO shall consider any reasonable request by the *Athlete* to leave the Doping Control Station, as specified in Clauses 5.4.5 and 5.4.6, until the *Athlete* is able to provide a *Sample*.

7.3.5 If the DCO gives approval for the *Athlete* to leave the Doping Control Station, the DCO shall agree with the *Athlete* on the following conditions of leave:

- a) The purpose of the *Athlete* leaving the Doping Control Station; and
- b) The time of return (or return upon completion of an agreed activity); and

- c) That the *Athlete* must remain under observation at all times; and
- d) That the *Athlete* shall not pass urine until he/she gets back to the Doping Control Station; and

the DCO shall document the actual time of the *Athlete's* departure and return.

7.4 Requirements for *Sample* collection

7.4.1 The DCO shall collect the *Sample* from the *Athlete* according to the following protocol/s for the specific type of *Sample* collection:

- a) Annex D: Collection of urine *Samples*;
- b) Annex E: Collection of blood *Samples*.

7.4.2 Any behaviour by the *Athlete* and/or persons associated with the *Athlete* or anomalies with potential to compromise the *Sample* collection shall be recorded in detail by the DCO. If appropriate, the *ADO* shall institute Annex A – Investigating a possible Failure to Comply.

7.4.3 If there are doubts as to the origin or authenticity of the *Sample*, the *Athlete* shall be asked to provide an additional *Sample*. If the *Athlete* refuses to provide an additional *Sample*, the DCO shall document in detail the circumstances around the refusal, and the *ADO* shall institute Annex A – Investigating a possible Failure to Comply.

7.4.4 The DCO shall provide the *Athlete* with the opportunity to document any concerns he/she may have about how the Sample Collection Session was conducted.

7.4.5 In conducting the Sample Collection Session the following information shall be recorded as a minimum:

- a) Date, time and type of notification (*No Advance Notice*, advance notice, *In-Competition* or *Out-of-Competition*);
- b) Arrival time at Doping Control Station;
- c) Date and time of *Sample* provision;
- d) The name of the *Athlete*;
- e) The date of birth of the *Athlete*;
- f) The gender of the *Athlete*;
- g) The *Athlete's* home address and telephone number;
- h) The *Athlete's* sport and discipline;

- i) The name of the *Athlete's* coach and doctor;
- j) The *Sample* code number;
- k) The name and signature of the witnessing DCO/Chaperone;
- l) The name and signature of the Blood Collection Officer (where applicable);
- m) Required laboratory information on the *Sample*;
- n) Medications and supplements taken and recent blood transfusion details (if applicable) within the timeframe specified by the laboratory, as declared by the *Athlete*;
- o) Any irregularities in procedures;
- p) *Athlete* comments or concerns regarding the conduct of the Sample Collection Session, if provided;
- q) *Athlete* consent for the processing of test data in ADAMS;
- r) *Athlete* consent or otherwise for the use of the *Sample(s)* for research purposes;
- s) The name and signature of the *Athlete's* representative (if applicable), as per Clause 7.4.6;
- t) The name and signature of the *Athlete*; and
- u) The name and signature of the DCO.

7.4.6 At the conclusion of the Sample Collection Session the *Athlete* and DCO shall sign appropriate documentation to indicate their satisfaction that the documentation accurately reflects the details of the *Athlete's Sample Collection Session*, including any concerns recorded by the *Athlete*. The *Athlete's* representative (if any) and the *Athlete* shall both sign the documentation if the *Athlete* is a *Minor*. Other persons present who had a formal role during the *Athlete's Sample Collection Session* may sign the documentation as a witness of the proceedings.

7.4.7 The DCO shall provide the *Athlete* with a copy of the records of the Sample Collection Session that have been signed by the *Athlete*.

8.0 Security/Post test administration

8.1 Objective

To ensure that all *Samples* collected at the Doping Control Station and *Sample* collection documentation are securely stored prior to their departure from the Doping Control Station.

8.2 General

Post test administration begins when the *Athlete* has left the Doping Control Station after providing his/her *Sample/s*, and ends with preparation of all of the collected *Samples* and *Sample* collection documentation for transport.

8.3 Requirements for security/post test administration

8.3.1 The *ADO* shall define criteria ensuring that any *Sample* will be stored in a manner that protects its integrity, identity and security prior to transport from the Doping Control Station. The DCO shall ensure that any *Sample* is stored in accordance with these criteria.

8.3.2 The *ADO/DCO* shall develop a system to ensure that the documentation for each *Sample* is completed and securely handled.

8.3.3 The *ADO* shall develop a system to ensure that, where required, instructions for the type of analysis to be conducted are provided to the *WADA*-accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by *WADA*.

9.0 Transport of *Samples* and documentation

9.1 Objective

- a) To ensure that *Samples* and related documentation arrive at the *WADA*-accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by *WADA* in proper condition to do the necessary analysis, and
- b) To ensure the Sample Collection Session documentation is sent by the DCO to the *ADO* in a secure and timely manner.

9.2 General

Transport starts when the *Samples* and related documentation leave the Doping Control Station and ends with the confirmed receipt of the *Samples* and Sample Collection Session documentation at their intended destinations.

The main activities are arranging for the secure transport of *Samples* and related documentation to the WADA-accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by WADA, and arranging for the secure transport of Sample Collection Session documentation to the ADO.

9.3 Requirements for transport and storage of *Samples* and documentation

9.3.1 The ADO shall authorise a transport system that ensures *Samples* and documentation will be transported in a manner that protects their integrity, identity and security.

9.3.2 *Samples* shall always be transported to the WADA-accredited laboratory (or as otherwise approved by WADA), using the ADO's authorised transport method, as soon as practicable after the completion of the Sample Collection Session. *Samples* shall be transported in a manner which minimizes the potential for *Sample* degradation due to factors such as time delays and extreme temperature variations.

[9.3.2 Comment: ADOs should discuss transportation requirements for particular missions with the laboratory they are using for analysis of the Samples, to establish what is necessary (e.g., whether refrigeration or freezing of Samples is necessary) in the particular circumstances of such mission(s).]

9.3.3 Documentation identifying the *Athlete* shall not be included with the *Samples* or documentation sent to the WADA-accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by WADA.

9.3.4 The DCO shall send all relevant Sample Collection Session documentation to the ADO using the ADO's authorised transport method as soon as practicable after the completion of the Sample Collection Session.

9.3.5 Chain of Custody shall be checked by the ADO if receipt of either the *Samples* with accompanying documentation or Sample Collection Session documentation is not confirmed at their intended destination or a *Sample's* integrity or identity may have been compromised during transport. In this instance, the ADO shall consider whether the *Sample* should be voided.

9.3.6 Documentation related to a Sample Collection Session and/or an anti-doping rule violation shall be stored by the ADO for a minimum of 8 years as per Code Article 17.

10.0 Ownership of Samples

10.1 The *ADO* which initiates *Testing* on the *Athlete* owns the *Samples* collected from the *Athlete*.

10.2 The *ADO* which initiates *Testing* on the *Athlete* may transfer ownership of the *Samples* to the *ADO* exercising results management authority in relation to such *Testing*.

11.0 Athlete Whereabouts Requirements

11.1 Objective/general principles

11.1.1 It is recognised and accepted that (a) *No Advance Notice Out-of-Competition Testing* is at the core of effective *Doping Control*; and (b) without accurate information as to an *Athlete's* whereabouts, such *Testing* can be inefficient and often impossible.

[11.1.1 Comment: Such recognition is the fundamental rationale underlying Code Article 2.4 and this Section 11 of the International Standard for Testing.]

11.1.2 Therefore, in addition to developing a Test Distribution Plan in accordance with Section 4 of this *International Standard*, each IF and *NADO* shall create a *Registered Testing Pool* of *Athletes* meeting criteria specified by the IF/NADO (as applicable): see Clause 11.2 and, in relation to *Team Sports*, Clause 11.5. *Athletes* in a *Registered Testing Pool* shall be subject to and required to comply with the *Athlete* whereabouts requirements set out in this Section 11: see *Code* Article 14.3.

11.1.3 An *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* is required to make a quarterly Whereabouts Filing that provides accurate and complete information about the *Athlete's* whereabouts during the forthcoming quarter, including identifying where he/she will be living, training and competing during that quarter, so that he/she can be located for *Testing* at any time during that quarter: see Clause 11.3. A failure to do so amounts to a Filing Failure and therefore a Whereabouts Failure for purposes of *Code* Article 2.4.

11.1.4 An *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* is also required to specify in his/her Whereabouts Filing, for each day in the forthcoming quarter, one specific 60-minute time slot where he/she will be available at a specified location for *Testing*: see Clause 11.4. This does not limit in any way the *Athlete's* obligation to be available for *Testing* at any time and place. Nor does it limit his/her

obligation to provide the information specified in Clause 11.3 as to his/her whereabouts outside of that 60-minute time slot. However, if the *Athlete* is not available for *Testing* at such location during the 60-minute time slot specified for that day in his/her Whereabouts Filing, and has not updated his/her Whereabouts Filing prior to that 60-minute time slot to provide an alternative time slot/location for that day, that failure shall amount to a Missed Test and shall therefore constitute a Whereabouts Failure for purposes of *Code Article 2.4*.

[11.1.4 Comment: The purpose of the 60-minute time slot is to strike a balance between the need to locate the Athlete for Testing and the impracticality and unfairness of making Athletes potentially accountable for a Missed Test every time they depart from their previously-declared routine. ADOs that implemented whereabouts systems in the period up to 2008 reflected that tension in different ways. Some demanded "24/7" whereabouts information, but did not declare a Missed Test if an Athlete was not where he/she had said he/she would be unless (a) he/she could still not report for Testing despite being given notice in the form of a phone call; or (b) the following day he/she was still not where he/she had said he/she would be. Others asked for details of the Athlete's whereabouts for only one hour per day, but held the Athlete fully accountable during that period, which gave each side certainty but limited the ADO's ability to test the Athlete outside that hour. After extensive consultation with stakeholders with substantial whereabouts experience, the view was taken that the best way to maximize the chances of finding the Athlete at any time, while providing a reasonable and appropriate mitigation of "24/7" Missed Test liability, was to combine the best elements of each system, i.e. requiring disclosure of whereabouts information on a "24/7" basis, while limiting exposure to a Missed Test to a 60-minute time slot. (For discussion of how this will work in practice, see the comment to Clause 11.4.1).]

11.1.5 More than one *ADO* may have jurisdiction to test an *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* (see *Code Article 15*) and therefore (where an attempt to test the *Athlete* is unsuccessful and the requirements of *Clause 11.5.3* are satisfied) to record a Missed Test against that *Athlete*. That Missed Test shall be recognized by other *ADOs* in accordance with *Code Article 15.4*.

11.1.6 An *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* shall be deemed to have committed an anti-doping rule violation under *Code Article 2.4* if he/she commits a total of three Whereabouts Failures (which may be any combination of Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests adding up to three in total) within any 18 (eighteen) month period, irrespective of which *ADO(s)* has/have declared the Whereabouts Failures in question.

[11.1.6 Comment: While a single Whereabouts Failure will not amount to an anti-doping rule violation under Code Article 2.4, it may, if the circumstances are particularly flagrant, amount to an anti-doping rule violation under Code Article 2.3 (evading Sample collection) and/or Code Article 2.5 (Tampering or Attempted Tampering with Doping Control). Nothing in this International Standard is intended to prevent an ADO from treating a Whereabouts Failure as an anti-doping rule violation]

under one or both such Articles where the circumstances warrant (without prejudice to the ability subsequently to rely on it as a Whereabouts Failure under Code Article 2.4).

Only Athletes who have been designated for inclusion in a Registered Testing Pool, in accordance with Code Article 14.3, are subject to the whereabouts requirements set out in this Section 11. Other Athletes are not subject to those whereabouts requirements. However, nothing in this International Standard prevents an ADO developing different whereabouts requirements for Athletes outside the Registered Testing Pool. For example:

- a. where the circumstances warrant, an ADO may identify certain “high risk” Athletes under its jurisdiction who should be subject to stricter whereabouts requirements (such as an expansion of the time slots during which an Athlete may be held liable for a missed test if he/she is not available for Testing, e.g. to incorporate regular training periods); and/or*
- b. an ADO may identify a pool of Athletes (e.g. those Athletes who were in a larger Registered Testing Pool that it maintained prior to the introduction of IST v.4.0) who may be made subject to lesser whereabouts requirements (e.g. filing of place of residence and regular training, competing and other regular activities, but no specific 60-minute time slot requirement).*

In this manner, a range (or pyramid) of different testing pools may be established by an ADO, with different whereabouts requirements applying to each pool. And any failure to comply with such requirements may be deemed a Whereabouts Failure for purposes of Code Article 2.4.

The difference arises when it comes to combining Whereabouts Failures declared under different rules. Where an Athlete is in a Registered Testing Pool, only Whereabouts Failures declared against him/her based on rules consistent with this Section 11 are to be combined for purposes of Code Article 2.4. Where the Athlete is in a different testing pool, to which other whereabouts requirements apply, then the rules of the ADO that put him/her in that pool shall determine to what extent Whereabouts Failures declared against the Athlete under other rules shall be combined with Whereabouts Failures declared under that ADO's rules for purposes of Code Article 2.4.]

11.1.7 The 18-month period referred to in Clause 11.1.6 starts to run on the date that an *Athlete* commits a Whereabouts Failure. It is not affected by any successful *Sample* collection conducted with respect to that *Athlete* during the 18-month period, i.e., if three Whereabouts Failures occur during the 18-month period then a Code Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation is committed, irrespective of any *Samples* successfully collected from the *Athlete* during that 18-month period. However, if an *Athlete* who has committed one Whereabouts Failure does not go on to commit a further two Whereabouts Failures within 18 months of the first, at the end of that 18-month period the first Whereabouts Failure “expires” for purposes of Clause 11.1.6.

[11.1.7 Comment: If an Athlete commits two Whereabouts Failures, but then does not commit a third within 18 months of the first, then the first Whereabouts Failure “expires” and a new 18-month period begins to run from the date of the second Whereabouts Failure.

For purposes of determining whether a Whereabouts Failure has occurred within the 18-month period referred to in Clause 11.1.6:

- a. a Filing Failure will be deemed to have occurred on the first day of the quarter for which the Athlete fails to make the required filing, or (in the case of any subsequent Filing Failure in the same quarter) on the day that the deadline specified in accordance with Clause 11.3.8 expires; and*
- b. a Missed Test will be deemed to have occurred on the date that the Sample collection was unsuccessfully attempted.]*

11.1.8 Transitional arrangements:

- a. This January 2009 version of the *International Standard for Testing*, including (without limitation) the provisions relating to the combination of Whereabouts Failures declared by different ADOs for the purposes of Code Article 2.4, shall apply in full to all Whereabouts Failures occurring after 1 January 2009.*

[11.1.8(a) Comment: Nothing in this Standard precludes an ADO prior to 1 January 2009 establishing its Registered Testing Pool for purposes of this Section 11, notifying Athletes that they have been included in that pool, and collecting Whereabouts Filings from them for the quarter beginning 1 January 2009.]

- b. Where an Athlete has failed to comply with any whereabouts requirements declared in accordance with the then-applicable rules of the ADO in question in the 18-month period up to 1 January 2009, questions about whether such failures may be combined with each other and/or with post-1 January 2009 Whereabouts Failures for purposes of Code Article 2.4 shall be determined by reference to Code Article 25.2.*

[11.1.8(b) Comment: Nothing in this Standard precludes an ADO providing in its rules that it will recognise whereabouts violations declared by other ADOs, even prior to 1 January 2009, where such whereabouts violations are made public by the ADO(s) in question. Furthermore, an ADO may put an Athlete on notice that whereabouts failures committed subsequent to the notice but prior to 1 January 2009 will be combined with Whereabouts Failures committed after 1 January 2009 for purposes of Code Article 2.4.]

11.2 Requirements for establishing the *Registered Testing Pool*

11.2.1 Each IF shall define the criteria for *Athletes* to be included in the international *Registered Testing Pool* for its sport, and shall publish those criteria as well as a list of the *Athletes* meeting those criteria (and so included in the international *Registered Testing Pool*) for the period in question. The criteria used should reflect the IF's evaluation of the risks of *Out-of-Competition* doping in that sport: see Clause 4.2. While such criteria (and therefore the number of *Athletes* in the *Registered Testing Pool*) may vary from sport to sport, an IF must be able to demonstrate it has made a proper assessment of the relevant risks and has adopted appropriate criteria based on the results of that assessment.

[11.2.1 Comment: As a general principle, it is expected that an international Registered Testing Pool will include Athletes who compete regularly at the highest level of international competition (e.g. candidates for Olympic, Paralympic or World Championship medals), determined by rankings or other suitable criteria. In accordance with Clause 4.4.4, an appropriate proportion of the Out-of-Competition tests specified in the IF's Test Distribution Plan must be carried out on Athletes in the international Registered Testing Pool.]

In relation to options for the fixing of the Registered Testing Pool in a Team Sport, see Clause 11.5.1.]

11.2.2 Each *NADO* shall define the criteria for *Athletes* to be included in its national *Registered Testing Pool* from the sports that it has included in its Test Distribution Plan, and shall publish those criteria as well as a list of the *Athletes* meeting those criteria (and so included in the national *Registered Testing Pool*) for the period in question. The criteria used should reflect the *NADO's* evaluation of the risks of *Out-of-Competition* doping in such sports (see Clause 4.3), as well as the national anti-doping policy imperatives referenced in Clause 4.3.1. While such criteria may vary from nation to nation, a *NADO* must be able to demonstrate it has made a proper assessment of the relevant risks and has adopted appropriate criteria based on the results of that assessment.

[11.2.2 Comment: As a general principle, unless good reason exists otherwise, it is expected that the national Registered Testing Pool will include (i) Athletes over which the NADO has jurisdiction that have been included in an international Registered Testing Pool; (ii) Athletes who are part of national teams in Olympic, Paralympic or other sports of high national priority (or who may be selected for such teams); and (iii) Athletes who train independently but perform at Olympic/Paralympic or World Championship level and may be selected for such events.]

An example of a reason why a particular Athlete in one of these categories might not be included in the national Registered Testing Pool would be if such inclusion was inconsistent with the NADO's national anti-doping policy imperatives, as referenced in Clause 4.3.1.

In accordance with Clause 4.4.4, where Athletes from a particular sport are included in a national Registered Testing Pool, an appropriate proportion of the Out-of-Competition tests allocated to that sport in the NADO's Test Distribution Plan must be carried out on such Athletes.]

11.2.3 The ADO should include in its *Registered Testing Pool* (a) those *Athletes* under its jurisdiction who are serving periods of *Ineligibility* (see *Code Article 10.11*); and (b) those *Athletes* under its jurisdiction who retired at a time when they were in its *Registered Testing Pool* and who wish to return from that period of retirement to active participation in the sport (see *Code Article 5.4*). The ADO may also include in its *Registered Testing Pool* those *Athletes* under its jurisdiction whom it wishes to target for *Testing*.

11.2.4 The ADO shall periodically review and update as necessary its criteria for including *Athletes* in its *Registered Testing Pool*. In addition, the ADO shall periodically review its published list of *Athletes* in its *Registered Testing Pool* to ensure that each listed *Athlete* continues to meet such criteria. *Athletes* who no longer meet the criteria should be removed from the *Registered Testing Pool* and *Athletes* who meet the criteria should be added to the *Registered Testing Pool*. The ADO must advise such *Athletes* of the change in their status, and publish a new list of *Athletes* in the *Registered Testing Pool*, without delay.

[11.2.4 Comment: see Clause 11.5.2 for a discussion of the application of this Clause 11.2.4 in the context of Registered Testing Pools defined by reference to teams.]

11.2.5 An *Athlete* who has been included in a *Registered Testing Pool* shall continue to be subject to the whereabouts requirements set out in this Section 11 unless and until:

- a. he/she has been given written notice by the Responsible ADO that he/she is no longer designated for inclusion in its *Registered Testing Pool*; or
- b. he/she retires from competition in the sport in question in accordance with the applicable rules and gives written notice to his/her IE or NADO or both (as applicable) to that effect.

[11.2.5(a) Comment: The applicable rules may also require that notice of retirement be sent to the Athlete's National Federation.

Where an Athlete retires from but then returns to sport, his/her period of retirement/non-availability for Out-of-Competition Testing shall be disregarded for purposes of calculating the 18-month period referred to in Code Article 2.4 and Clause 11.1.5. As a result, Whereabouts Failures committed by the Athlete prior to retirement may be combined, for purposes of Code Article 2.4, with Whereabouts Failures committed by the Athlete after his/her return from retirement/non-availability for Out-of-Competition Testing. For example, if an Athlete committed two Whereabouts Failures in the 12 months prior to his/her

retirement, then if he/she commits another Whereabouts Failure in the first six months after his/her return from retirement/non-availability for Out-of-Competition Testing, this amounts to a Code Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation.]

11.2.6 For co-ordination purposes, the ADO shall make available to other relevant ADOs and WADA the criteria that the ADO has established for inclusion of Athletes in its Registered Testing Pool, the current list of Athletes in its Registered Testing Pool, and updates as necessary: see Code Article 14.3.

11.3 Whereabouts Filing Requirements

[11.3 Comment: ADOs are encouraged to use the ADAMS system to facilitate the information-sharing required under this Section 11.

See Clause 11.5.5 for a discussion of the application of this Clause 11.3 in the context of Team Sports.]

11.3.1 On a date specified by the Responsible ADO that is prior to the first day of each quarter (i.e. 1 January, 1 April, 1 July and 1 October, respectively), an Athlete in a Registered Testing Pool must file a Whereabouts Filing with his/her IF (if the Athlete has been included in its international Registered Testing Pool) or his/her NADO (if the Athlete has been included in its national Registered Testing Pool) that contains at least the following information:

[11.3.1 Comment: If an Athlete is included in both an international Registered Testing Pool and a national Registered Testing Pool, then his/her IF and NADO should seek to agree on who will be responsible for receiving his/her Whereabouts Filings and advise the Athlete accordingly. In the absence of any such agreement, WADA shall determine whether the IF or the NADO shall be responsible. The Athlete should file his/her Whereabouts Filing only with the Responsible ADO, who will then share that information with the Athlete's IF/NADO (as applicable) and other ADOs with jurisdiction to test the Athlete, in accordance with Clause 11.7.3(c). In such cases, it will still be necessary for the IF/NADO (as applicable) that is not the Responsible ADO to notify the Athlete that he/she is also in its Registered Testing Pool, in accordance with Clause 11.7.1(b).]

- a. a complete mailing address where correspondence may be sent to the Athlete for formal notice purposes. Any notice or other item mailed to that address will be deemed to have been received by the Athlete five working days after it was deposited in the mail;

[11.3.1(a) Comment: For these purposes, the Athlete should specify an address where he/she lives or otherwise knows that mail received there will be immediately brought to his/her attention. An ADO is encouraged also to supplement this basic provision with other notice and/or "deemed notice" provisions in its rules (for example, permitting use of fax, email, SMS text or

other methods of service of notice; permitting proof of actual receipt as a substitute for deemed receipt; allowing notice to be served on the Athlete's National Federation if it is returned undelivered from the address supplied by the Athlete). The aim of such provisions should be to shorten the results management timelines set out in Clause 11.6.]

- b. details of any disability of the *Athlete* that may affect the procedure to be followed in conducting a *Sample* collection session;
- c. specific confirmation of the *Athlete's* consent to the sharing of his/her Whereabouts Filing with other *ADOs* having authority to test him/her: see *Code Article 14.6*;
- d. for each day during the following quarter, the full address of the place where the *Athlete* will be residing (e.g. home, temporary lodgings, hotel, etc);
- e. for each day during the following quarter, the name and address of each location where the *Athlete* will train, work or conduct any other regular activity (e.g. school), as well as the usual time-frames for such regular activities; and

[11.3.1(e) Comment: This requirement applies only to regular activities, i.e. activities that are part of the Athlete's regular routine. For example, if the Athlete's regular routine includes training at the gym, the pool and the track, and regular physio sessions, then the Athlete should provide the name and address of the gym, track, pool and physio in his or her Whereabouts Filing, and then set out his/her usual routine, e.g. "Mondays: 9-11 gym, 13-17 gym; Tuesdays: 9-11 gym, 16-18 gym; Wednesdays: 9-11 track, 3-5 physio; Thursdays: 9-12 gym 16-18 track; Fridays: 9-11 pool 3-5 physio; Saturdays: 9-12 track, 13-15 pool; Sundays: 9-11 track, 13-15 pool".

If the Athlete is not currently training, he/she should specify that in his/her Whereabouts Filing and detail any other routine that he/she will be following in the forthcoming filing period, e.g. his/her work routine, or school schedule, or rehab routine, or other routine, and identify the name and address of each location where that routine is conducted and the time-frame during which it is conducted.]

- f. the *Athlete's* competition schedule for the following quarter, including the name and address of each location where the *Athlete* is scheduled to compete during the quarter and the date(s) on which he/she is scheduled to compete at such location(s).

11.3.2 The Whereabouts Filing must also include, for each day during the following quarter, one specific 60-minute time slot between 6 a.m. and 11 p.m. each day where the *Athlete* will be available and accessible for *Testing* at a specific location.

[11.3.2 Comment: The Athlete can choose which location to identify for this 60-minute time slot. It could be the Athlete's place of residence, training or competition, or it could be another location (e.g. work or school). A failure to be available for Testing at the specified location during the specified time slot will be pursued as an apparent Missed Test, in accordance with Clause 11.6.3.]

11.3.3 When making a Whereabouts Filing, it is the Athlete's responsibility to ensure that he/she provides all of the information required accurately and in sufficient detail to enable any ADO wishing to do so to locate the Athlete for Testing on any given day in the quarter, including but not limited to during the 60-minute time slot specified for that day in the Whereabouts Filing.

[11.3.3 Comment: The Responsible ADO shall make ADAMS (or another centralized database of similar functionality and security) available to the Athlete or else provide other electronic filing form(s) or paper form(s) to use in making an Whereabouts Filing. WADA will make a template form available for use/adaptation by ADOs.

Where an Athlete does not know precisely what his/her whereabouts will be at all times during the forthcoming quarter, he/she must provide his/her best information, based on where he/she expects to be at the relevant times, and then update that information as necessary in accordance with Clause 11.4.2. ADOs should provide appropriate mechanisms (e.g. phone, fax, Internet, email, SMS) to facilitate the filing of such updates.

When specifying a location in his/her Whereabouts Filing (whether in his/her original quarterly filing or in an update), the Athlete must provide sufficient information to enable the DCO to find the location, to gain access to the location, and to find the Athlete at the location. For example, declarations such as "running in the Black Forest" are insufficient and are likely to result in a Whereabouts Failure. Similarly, specifying a location that the DCO cannot access (e.g. a "restricted-access" building or area) is likely to result in an unsuccessful attempt to test the Athlete and therefore a Whereabouts Failure.

In such circumstances, there are several possibilities:

- a. Where the ADO is able to determine the insufficiency of the information from the Whereabouts Filing itself, the ADO should pursue such insufficiency as an apparent Filing Failure, in accordance with Clause 11.6.2.*
- b. Where the ADO only discovers the insufficiency of the information when it attempts to test the Athlete and is unable to locate him/her:*
 - i. if the insufficient information relates to the 60-minute time slot, the ADO should pursue the matter as an apparent Missed Test, in accordance with Clause 11.6.3, and/or (where the circumstances warrant) as an evasion of Sample collection under Code Article 2.3, and/or as Tampering or Attempted Tampering with Doping Control under Code Article 2.5; and*

- ii. *if the insufficient information relates to periods outside the 60-minute time slot, then the ADO should pursue the matter as an apparent Filing Failure, in accordance with Clause 11.6.4, and/or (where the circumstances warrant) as an evasion of Sample collection under Code Article 2.3, and/or as Tampering or Attempting to Tamper with Doping Control under Code Article 2.5.]*

11.3.4 Any *Athlete* who provides fraudulent information in his/her Whereabouts Filing, whether in relation to his/her location during the specified daily 60-minute time slot, or in relation to his/her whereabouts outside that time slot, or otherwise, thereby commits an anti-doping rule violation under Code Article 2.3 (evading *Sample* collection) and/or Code Article 2.5 (*Tampering* or *Attempting to Tamper with Doping Control*).

[11.3.4 Comment: Any decision to treat an incident as evading Sample collection under Code Article 2.3 and/or as Tampering or Attempting to Tamper with Doping Control under Code Article 2.5 shall be without prejudice to the ADO's ability to treat the same incident as a Whereabouts Failure under Code Article 2.4; and vice versa.]

11.3.5 An *Athlete* may only be declared to have committed a Filing Failure where the Responsible ADO, following the results management procedure set out in Clause 11.6.2, can establish each of the following:

- a. that the *Athlete* was duly notified (i) that he/she was designated for inclusion in a *Registered Testing Pool*, (ii) of the consequent requirement to make Whereabouts Filings; and (iii) of the consequences of any failure to comply with that requirement;
- b. that the *Athlete* failed to comply with that requirement by the applicable deadline;

[11.3.5(a) Comment: An Athlete fails to comply with the requirement to make Whereabouts Filings in the following circumstances:

- i. *when he/she does not make any such filing; or*
- ii. *where he/she makes the filing (i.e. either the original quarterly filing or an update) but does not include all of the required information (e.g. he/she does not include the place where he/she will be residing for each day in the following quarter, or for each day covered by the update, or omits to declare a regular activity that he/she will be pursuing during the quarter, or during the period covered by the update); or*
- iii. *where he/she includes information (whether in the original quarterly filing or an update) that is inaccurate (e.g. an address that does not exist) or insufficient to enable the ADO to locate him/her for Testing (e.g. "running in the Black Forest"). As noted in the comment to Clause 11.3.3, if the inaccuracy or insufficiency relates to the 60-minute time slot, and is only discovered when an attempt is made to test the Athlete during that time slot,*

that may be pursued as a Missed Test. In other circumstances, such inaccuracy or insufficiency should be pursued as a Filing Failure.]

- c. (in the case of a second or third Filing Failure in the same quarter) that he/she was given notice of the previous Filing Failure in accordance with Clause 11.6.2(a) and failed to rectify that Filing Failure by the deadline specified in that notice; and

[11.3.5(c) Comment: The purpose of this requirement is to ensure fairness to the Athlete. In the notice of the first Filing Failure that the Responsible ADO sends to the Athlete in accordance with Clause 11.6.2(a), the Responsible ADO must advise the Athlete that, in order to avoid a further Filing Failure, he/she must file the required Whereabouts Filing by the deadline specified in the notice. That deadline may be set by the ADO but it must be no less than 24 hours after receipt of the notice and not later than the end of the month in which the notice is received.]

- d. that the *Athlete's* failure to comply was at least negligent. For these purposes, the *Athlete* will be presumed to have committed the failure negligently upon proof that he/she was notified of the requirement yet failed to comply with it. That presumption may only be rebutted by the *Athlete* establishing that no negligent behaviour on his/her part caused or contributed to the failure.

[11.3.5(d) Comment: In the event that a Code Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation is established, the actual degree of fault involved on the part of the Athlete (i.e. negligence or greater) will be relevant to the assessment, under Code Article 10.3.3, of the period of Ineligibility to be imposed.]

11.3.6 An *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* may choose to delegate the making of some or all of his/her Whereabouts Filings required under Clauses 11.3.1 and 11.3.2 (and/or any updates to his/her Whereabouts Filings required under Clause 11.4.3) to a third party, such as (for example, and depending on the rules of the Responsible ADO) a coach, a manager or a National Federation, provided that the third party agrees to such delegation.

[11.3.6 Comment: See Clause 11.5.4 for a discussion of the application of this Clause 11.3.6 in the specific context of a Team Sport. For the avoidance of doubt, however, an Athlete in a sport that is not a Team Sport may also delegate the making of his/her Whereabouts Filings to a third party for some or all relevant periods, provided that the third party agrees.

The Responsible ADO may require written notice of any agreed delegation pursuant to Clause 11.3.6 to be filed with it, signed by both the Athlete in question and the third party delegate.]

11.3.7 In all cases, however, including in *Team Sports*:

- a. each *Athlete* in an *Registered Testing Pool* remains ultimately responsible at all times for making accurate and complete Whereabouts Filings as required by this Clause 11.3, whether he/she makes each filing personally or delegates it to a third party (or a mixture of the two). It shall not be a defence to an allegation of a Filing Failure under *Code* Article 2.4 that the *Athlete* delegated such responsibility to a third party and that third party failed to comply with the applicable requirements; and
- b. such *Athlete* remains personally responsible at all times for ensuring he/she is available for *Testing* at the whereabouts declared on his/her Whereabouts Filings, whether he/she made that filing personally or delegated it to a third party (or a mixture of the two). It shall not be a defence to an allegation of a Missed Test under *Code* Article 2.4 that the *Athlete* had delegated responsibility for filing his/her whereabouts information for the relevant period to a third party and that third party had failed to file the correct information or failed to update previously-filed information so as to ensure that the whereabouts information in the Whereabouts Filing for the day in question was current and accurate.

11.4 Availability for *Testing*

11.4.1 An *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* must specifically be present and available for *Testing* on any given day in the relevant quarter for the 60-minute time slot specified for that day in his/her Whereabouts Filing, at the location that the *Athlete* has specified for that time slot in such filing.

[11.4.1 Comment: This specific requirement is without prejudice to the Athlete's basic obligation to provide information as to his/her whereabouts generally during the forthcoming quarter, and to submit to Testing at any time and any place during that quarter.

To achieve Testing that is effective in deterring and detecting cheating, best practice requires test distribution planning that makes the timing of Testing unpredictable. To achieve this, Testing needs to be attempted at different times of the day. Thus, the intent behind the 60-minute time slot is not to limit Testing to that period, or to create a 'default' period for Testing, but rather:

- a. *to make it very clear when an unsuccessful attempt to test an Athlete will count as a Missed Test (which helps the Athlete to avoid a Missed Test and helps an ADO, as well as a hearing panel, to determine when there has been a Missed Test);*
- b. *to guarantee that the Athlete can be found, and a Sample can be collected, at least once per day (which should deter cheating, or, as a minimum, make it far more difficult);*

- c. *to increase the reliability of the rest of the whereabouts information provided by the Athlete, and so to assist the ADO in locating the Athlete for Testing outside the 60-minute time slot:*
 - i. *The 60-minute time slot “anchors” the Athlete to a certain location for a particular day. Combined with the information that the Athlete must provide as to where he/she is residing, training, competing and conducting other ‘regular’ activities during that day, the ADO should be able to locate the Athlete for Testing outside the 60-minute time slot, or alternatively to determine whether the information provided as to his/her whereabouts outside that time slot is incomplete and/or inaccurate (which may be pursued, depending on the circumstances, as a Filing Failure under Code Article 2.4, a sample evasion case under Code Article 2.3, and/or a Tampering case under Code Article 2.5).*
 - ii. *It is of course in the interests of the Athlete to provide as much information as possible about his/her whereabouts outside the 60-minute time slot, so that ADOs are able to test him/her outside the 60-minute time slot and therefore he/she never risks liability for a Missed Test; and*
- d. *to generate useful anti-doping intelligence, e.g. if the Athlete regularly specifies time slots with large gaps between them, and/or changes his time slot and/or location at the last minute. Such intelligence can be relied upon as a basis for the Target Testing of such Athlete.]*

11.4.2 It is the *Athlete’s* responsibility to ensure (including by updates, where necessary) that the whereabouts information provided in his/her Whereabouts Filing is sufficient to enable any ADO to locate him/her for *Testing* on any given day in the quarter, including but not limited to during the 60-minute time slot specified for that day in his/her Whereabouts Filing. Where any change in circumstances means that the information previously provided by or on behalf of the *Athlete* (whether in the initial Whereabouts Filing or in any subsequent update) is no longer accurate or complete (i.e. it is not sufficient to enable any ADO to locate the *Athlete* for *Testing* on any given day in the relevant quarter, including but not limited to during the 60-minute time slot that he/she has specified for that day), the *Athlete* must update his/her Whereabouts Filing so that the information on file is again accurate and complete. He/she must make such update as soon as possible, and in any event prior to the 60-minute time slot specified in his/her filing for that day. A failure to do so shall have the following consequences:

- a. if, as a result of such failure, an ADO’s attempt to test the *Athlete* during the 60-minute time slot is unsuccessful, then the unsuccessful attempt shall be pursued as an apparent Missed Test in accordance with Clause 11.6.3; and

b. if the circumstances so warrant, the failure may be pursued as evasion of Sample collection under *Code Article 2.3*, and/or Tampering or Attempted Tampering with Doping Control under *Code Article 2.5*; and

c. in any event, the ADO shall consider Target Testing of the Athlete.

[11.4.2 Comment: It is the responsibility of the ADO to ensure that it checks for any updates filed by the Athlete prior to attempting to collect a Sample from the Athlete based on his/her Whereabouts Filing. For the avoidance of doubt, however, an Athlete who updates his/her 60-minute time slot for a particular day prior to the original 60-minute slot must still submit to Testing during the original 60-minute time slot, if he/she is located for Testing during that original 60-minute time slot.

*An update of the 60-minute time slot may be made at any time up until the beginning of the time slot. In appropriate circumstances, however, last-minute updates by an Athlete may be pursued as a possible anti-doping rule violation of evading Sample collection under *Code Article 2.3* and/or Tampering (or Attempting to Tamper) with Doping Control under *Code Article 2.5*.*

*If an update is filed by the Athlete, but the updated information filed is incomplete, or inaccurate, or insufficient to enable the ADO to locate the Athlete, then it may be pursued as a Filing Failure in accordance with *Clause 11.3.5(b)*.]*

11.4.3 An Athlete may only be declared to have committed a Missed Test where the Responsible ADO, following the results management procedure set out in *Clause 11.6.3*, can establish each of the following:

- a. that when the Athlete was given notice that he/she had been designated for inclusion in a *Registered Testing Pool*, he/she was advised of his/her liability for a Missed Test if he/she was unavailable for Testing during the 60-minute time slot specified in his/her Whereabouts Filing at the location specified for that time slot;
- b. that a DCO attempted to test the Athlete on a given day in the quarter, during the 60-minute time slot specified in the Athlete's Whereabouts Filing for that day, by visiting the location specified for that time slot;

*[11.4.3(b) Comment: If the Athlete is not available for Testing at the beginning of the 60-minute time slot, but becomes available for Testing later on in the 60-minute time slot, the DCO should collect the Sample and should not process the attempt as an unsuccessful attempt to test, but should include full details of the delay in availability of the Athlete in the DCO's Sample collection report. Any pattern of behaviour of this type should be investigated by the Responsible ADO as a possible anti-doping rule violation of evading Sample collection under *Code Article 2.3* or *Code Article 2.5*. It may also prompt Target Testing of the Athlete.*

If located for Testing, the Athlete must remain with the DCO until the Sample collection has been completed, even if this takes longer than the 60-minute time slot.

If an Athlete is not available for Testing during his/her specified 60-minute time slot at the location specified for that time slot for that day, he/she will be liable for a Missed Test even if he/she is located later that day and a Sample is successfully collected from him/her.]

- c. that during that specified 60-minute time slot, the DCO did what was reasonable in the circumstances (i.e. given the nature of the specified location) to try to locate the *Athlete*, short of giving the *Athlete* any *Advance Notice* of the test;

[11.4.3(c) Comment: Once the DCO has arrived at the location specified for the 60-minute time slot, if the Athlete cannot be located immediately then the DCO should remain at that location for whatever time is left of the 60-minute time slot and during that remaining time he/she should do what is reasonable in the circumstances to try to locate the Athlete.]

- d. that the provisions of Clause 11.4.4 (if applicable) have been met; and
- e. that the *Athlete's* failure to be available for *Testing* at the specified location during the specified 60-minute time slot was at least negligent. For these purposes, the *Athlete* will be presumed to have been negligent upon proof of the matters set out at sub-Clauses 11.4.3(a) to (d). That presumption may only be rebutted by the *Athlete* establishing that no negligent behaviour on his/her part caused or contributed to him/her (i) being unavailable for *Testing* at such location during such time slot; and (ii) failing to update his/her most recent Whereabouts Filing to give notice of a different location where he/she would instead be available for *Testing* during a specified 60-minute time slot on the relevant day.

[11.4.3(e) Comment: In the event that a Code Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation is established, the actual degree of fault involved on the part of the Athlete (i.e. whether negligence or greater) will be relevant to the assessment, under Code Article 10.3.3, of the period of Ineligibility to be imposed.]

11.4.4 To ensure fairness to the *Athlete*, where an unsuccessful attempt has been made to test an *Athlete* during one of the 60-minute time slots specified in his/her Whereabouts Filing, any subsequent attempt to test that *Athlete* (by the same or any other *ADO*) may only be counted as a Missed Test against that *Athlete* if that subsequent attempt takes place after the *Athlete* has received notice, in accordance with Clause 11.6.3(b), of the original unsuccessful attempt.

11.5 Team Sports

[11.5 Comment: During the 2007-08 consultation phase on revisions to the 2007 Version 3.0 of the International Standard for Testing, a common theme of many of the submissions made by Team Sports was that any harmonised whereabouts system needs to be flexible enough to reflect the fact that Team Sports are organized and carried out on a team basis rather than on an individual basis, with most of the activities carried out in pursuit of that sport being conducted on a collective basis rather than on an individual basis. The purpose of this Clause 11.5 is to reflect that characteristic of Team Sports by allowing for a Registered Testing Pool to be defined by reference to teams. It also allows for whereabouts information in relation to Athletes on such teams to be submitted on a collective basis, with information as to the team's collective activities being supplemented by submission of individual whereabouts information for periods when the Athletes are not with the team. In line with the systems implemented in 2004-2007 in Team Sports such as water polo and rugby union, the individual Athlete remains personally responsible at all times for the accuracy of that whereabouts information and for making him/herself available for Testing at such whereabouts.]

11.5.1 An IF of a *Team Sport* may define its *Registered Testing Pool* by reference to teams, i.e. so that the *Athletes* in its *Registered Testing Pool* are some or all of the *Athletes* on particular teams within the relevant period.

[11.5.1 Comment: For example, an IF may choose to define its Registered Testing Pool by reference to its top-ranked national representative teams at any given time. In a year in which that IF's World Championships are played, it may choose to expand its Registered Testing Pool to include all of the national representative teams that have qualified to compete in the World Championships. In accordance with Clause 11.7.5, the IF may delegate the responsibility for collecting such Athletes' whereabouts information to the relevant National Federations.

A NADO that includes a Team Sport within its national Registered Testing Pool may take the same approach.]

11.5.2 In such circumstances, in accordance with Clause 11.2.4, to reflect the fact that membership of a team may change regularly, the IF shall issue rules addressing changes in the composition of the *Registered Testing Pool* during the relevant period.

[11.5.2 Comment: For example, in a Team Sport where a Registered Testing Pool is identified by reference to national representative teams, the IF might fix membership by reference to the Athletes included in the last national representative squad selected prior to the quarter in question. If a new squad is selected during the quarter that is different in composition from the prior squad, the IF's rules will determine whether the changes are reflected immediately (e.g., any Athlete from the first squad who is not in the second squad drops out of the Registered Testing Pool with immediate effect) or alternatively as of the beginning of the next quarter (i.e., the Athlete not in the second squad remains in the Registered Testing Pool until the end of the quarter).]

11.5.3 In a *Team Sport* where the *Registered Testing Pool* is defined by reference to teams, *Athletes* on the designated teams are likely to carry out most of their sporting activities (e.g., training, travelling, tactical sessions) on a collective basis. Accordingly, much of the whereabouts information required under Clause 11.3 will be the same for all of the *Athletes* on the team. Furthermore, on occasions when an *Athlete* on a team is not participating in a scheduled team collective activity (e.g. because of injury), he/she is likely to be pursuing other activities under the supervision of his/her team (e.g. treatment by a team doctor). Such team-based activities, collective or otherwise, shall be known, for purposes of this *International Standard for Testing*, as "Team Activity".

11.5.4 An Athlete who is included in a *Registered Testing Pool* by reference to the fact that he/she plays for a particular team is subject to the same individual whereabouts requirements set out in this Section 11 as an *Athlete* who is included in a *Registered Testing Pool* by reference to some other criterion. In accordance with Clauses 11.3.6 and 11.3.7, however, in the circumstances outlined in Clause 11.5.3 the *Athlete* may delegate the task of making some or all of the Whereabouts Filings required under Clauses 11.3.1 and 11.3.2 (and/or any updates to Whereabouts Filings required under Clause 11.4.2) to the team, to be carried out by (for example, depending on the rules of the Responsible ADO) a coach, a manager or a National Federation.

[11.5.4 Comment: For the avoidance of doubt, for the sake of convenience and efficiency, an Athlete in a Team Sport may delegate the making of his/her Whereabouts Filings to his/her team not only in respect of periods of Team Activity but also in respect of periods where he/she is not with the team, provided the team agrees. In such circumstances, it will be necessary for the Athlete to provide the information as to his/her individual whereabouts for the period in question to the team, to supplement the information it provides in relation to Team Activities.

In those Team Sports where an Athlete may play for more than one team, and therefore may be involved in Team Activity for more than one team in any given filing period, clear provision should be made in the relevant rules for the collection and submission of the information required under Clause 11.3. For example, where an IF defines its Registered Testing Pool by reference to national representative teams, the Athletes on such teams may spend much of their time with their national representative teams, competing in International Events, but they may also spend a significant amount of time with their clubs, competing in domestic and/or regional Events. In such circumstances, the National Federation should collect the information as to the Athlete's Team Activities for his/her club and include it in the Whereabouts Filing alongside the information as to the national representative team's Team Activities and the Athlete's individual whereabouts information for the relevant period.]

11.5.5 In the circumstances identified in Clause 11.5.4, the team (e.g. the National Federation) may make the Whereabouts Filing on behalf of its *Athletes*, providing the information required under Clause 11.3, as follows:

- a. a complete mailing address for formal notice purposes, in accordance with Clause 11.3.1(a). Where agreed with the *Athlete*, this notice may be sent care of the team.
- b. the information specified in Clauses 11.3.1(b), (c), (d) and (f);
- c. for each day in the following quarter, the time(s) each day of any Team Activity, whether that is a collective activity (e.g. training) or an individual activity under the supervision of the team (e.g. medical treatment), along with the venue and any other details required in order for the *Athlete* to be located during the time(s) in question; and

[11.5.5(c) Comment: If the Athlete conducts other regular activities outside Team Activities (e.g., he is an amateur Athlete and therefore also works or goes to school), then the locations and time-frames of such other regular activities should also be disclosed, in accordance with Clause 11.3.1(e).]

- d. for each day in the following quarter, one specific 60-minute time slot between 6 a.m. and 11 p.m. where the *Athlete* will be available and accessible for *Testing* at a specific location. For the avoidance of doubt, this 60-minute time slot may be during any Team Activity conducted on the day in question.

11.5.6 For *Athletes* in *Registered Testing Pools* in *Team Sports*, liability for Filing Failures shall be determined in accordance with Clause 11.3.5, and liability for Missed Tests shall be determined in accordance with Clause 11.4.2. In accordance with Clause 11.3.7:

- a. if the team does not make a required Whereabouts Filing, or makes the Whereabouts Filing but does not include all of the required information, then (subject to the requirements of Clause 11.3.5) the *Athlete* will be liable for a Filing Failure under *Code* Article 2.4; and
- b. if any of the required information changes after a Whereabouts Filing is made, then in accordance with Clause 11.4.2 an update must be filed so that the Whereabouts Filing remains accurate at all times. If an update is not made, and as a result an attempt to test the *Athlete* during the 60-minute time slot is unsuccessful, then (subject to the requirements of Clause 11.4.3) the *Athlete* will be liable for a Missed Test under *Code* Article 2.4.

[11.5.6 Comment: For example, if an attempt to test an Athlete during a 60-minute time slot designated within a particular Team Activity period is unsuccessful due to a team official filing the wrong information in relation to the Team Activity, or failing to update previously-filed information where the details of the Team Activity have subsequently changed, the team may be liable for sanction under the applicable rules]

of the IF for such failure, but the Athlete him/herself will still be liable (assuming that the requirements of Clause 11.4.3 are satisfied) for a Missed Test. This must be the case because if an Athlete is able to blame his/her team if he/she is not available for Testing at a location declared by his team, then he/she will be able to avoid accountability for his/her whereabouts for Testing. Of course the team has the same interest as the Athlete in ensuring the accuracy of the Whereabouts Filing and avoiding any Whereabouts Failures on the part of the Athlete.]

11.5.7 In accordance with Clause 11.1.6, in addition to maintaining a Registered Testing Pool in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Clause 11.5, an ADO in a Team Sport may establish one or more further testing pool(s) for other teams/Athletes under its jurisdiction, and may apply different whereabouts requirements to such pool(s) for purposes of Code Article 2.4.

[11.5.7 Comment: A good example of such an additional pool is the whereabouts pool maintained by the Football Association in England in the period 2006-08, consisting of all Athletes playing for certain teams. Under the FA's approach, which has been identified by FIFA and the IFs of certain other Team Sports as a useful model, a team designated for inclusion in such pool is responsible for making periodic whereabouts filings with the Football Association, declaring the names of the Athletes registered with the team and the team's training and competition schedule for the following period. In other words, the Football Association is advised of the collective whereabouts of the team during the Team Activities referred to in Clause 11.5.3. If an attempt is then made to test an Athlete on that team during such a Team Activity and the Athlete in question is not available for Testing at the specified location, then the Athlete is investigated for a potential Missed Test. If upon investigation it is determined that the Athlete was not available for Testing because the team failed to provide accurate information as to the Athlete's participation in and/or the location of the relevant Team Activity to the Football Association, then the team rather than the Athlete is subject to sanction. Otherwise, however, absent exceptional circumstances a Missed Test is declared against the Athlete.

Nothing in this Standard is intended to prevent ADOs in Team Sports from maintaining pools of this type, applying whereabouts requirements of this type. For the avoidance of doubt, this is to be done in addition to (not instead of) maintaining a Registered Testing Pool in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Clause 11.5, to which the full requirements of this Section 11 apply.]

11.6 Results Management

11.6.1 Annex A of the International Standard for Testing ("Investigating a possible Failure to Comply") shall not apply with respect to Whereabouts Failures. Instead, the provisions of this Clause 11.6 shall apply.

11.6.2 The results management process in respect of an apparent Filing Failure shall be as follows:

- a. If it appears that all of the Clause 11.3.5 requirements relating to Filing Failures are satisfied, then no later than 14 (fourteen) days after the date of discovery of the apparent Filing Failure the Responsible ADO must send notice to the *Athlete* in question of the apparent Filing Failure, inviting a response within 14 (fourteen) days of receipt of the notice. In the notice, the Responsible ADO should warn the *Athlete*:
 - i. that unless the *Athlete* persuades the Responsible ADO that there has not been any Filing Failure, then (subject to the remainder of the results management process set out below) an alleged Whereabouts Failure will be recorded against the *Athlete*; and
 - ii. of the consequences to the *Athlete* if a hearing panel upholds the alleged Whereabouts Failure.

[11.6.2(a)(ii) Comment: The notice should advise the Athlete whether any other Whereabouts Failures have been alleged against him/her in the 18-month period prior to this alleged Whereabouts Failure.]

- b. Where the *Athlete* disputes the apparent Filing Failure, the Responsible ADO must re-assess whether all of the Clause 11.3.5 requirements are met. The Responsible ADO must advise the *Athlete*, by letter sent no later than 14 (fourteen) days after receipt of the *Athlete's* response, whether or not it maintains there has been a Filing Failure.

[11.6.2(b) Comment: Any notice sent to an Athlete pursuant to Clause 11.6.2(b) agreeing that there has not been any Filing Failure shall also be sent to WADA and any other party/ies with a right of appeal under Code Article 13, and may be appealed by WADA and/or such other party/ies in accordance with that Article.]

- c. If no response is received from the *Athlete* by the relevant deadline, or if the Responsible ADO maintains (notwithstanding the *Athlete's* response) that there has been a Filing Failure, the Responsible ADO shall send notice to the *Athlete* that an alleged Filing Failure is to be recorded against him/her. The Responsible ADO shall at the same time advise the *Athlete* that he/she has the right to an administrative review of that decision;
- d. Where it is requested by the *Athlete*, such administrative review shall be conducted by a designee of the Responsible ADO who was not involved in the previous assessment of the alleged Filing Failure. The review shall be based on written submissions only, and shall consider whether all of the requirements of Clause 11.3.5 are met. The review shall be completed within 14 (fourteen) days of receipt of the *Athlete's* request and the

decision shall be communicated to the *Athlete* by letter sent no more than 7 (seven) days after the decision is made;

[11.6.2(d) Comment: Nothing in this Article prevents a sufficiently resourced ADO using a panel of up to three persons to conduct such administrative review, provided that none of those persons has been involved in the previous assessment of the alleged Filing Failure.]

- e. If it appears, upon such review, that the requirements of Clause 11.3.5 have not been met, then the alleged Filing Failure shall not be treated as a Whereabouts Failure for any purpose; and

[11.6.2(e) Comment: Any notice sent to an Athlete pursuant to Clause 11.6.3(e), agreeing that there has been no Filing Failure, shall also be sent to WADA and any other party/ies with a right of appeal under Code Article 13, and may be appealed by WADA and/or such party/ies in accordance with that Article.]

- f. If the *Athlete* does not request an administrative review of the alleged Filing Failure by the relevant deadline, or if the administrative review leads to the conclusion that all of the requirements of Clause 11.3.5 have been met, then the Responsible ADO shall record an alleged Filing Failure against the *Athlete* and shall notify the *Athlete* and (on a confidential basis) WADA and all other relevant ADOs of that alleged Filing Failure and the date of its occurrence.

[11.6.2(f) Comment: For the avoidance of doubt, the Responsible ADO is not precluded from notifying other relevant ADOs (on a strictly confidential basis) of the alleged Filing Failure at an earlier stage of the results management process. Rather, the Responsible ADO is entitled to do so, where it considers it appropriate (for test planning purposes or otherwise).

The Clause 11.6.2(f) notice should again advise the Athlete whether any other Whereabouts Failures have been alleged against him/her in respect of the 18-month period prior to this alleged Filing Failure.]

11.6.3 The results management process in the case of an apparent Missed Test shall be as follows:

- a. The DCO shall file an Unsuccessful Attempt Report with his/her ADO, setting out the details of the attempted *Sample* collection, including the date of the attempt, the location visited, the exact arrival and departure times at the location, the step(s) taken at the location to try to find the *Athlete*, including details of any contact made with third parties, and any other relevant details about the attempted *Sample* collection.

[11.6.3(a) Comment: WADA will make a template Unsuccessful Attempt Report available for use/adaptation by ADOs. When commissioning another ADO to conduct a test on its behalf, the commissioning ADO may specify a deadline for the submission to it of an Unsuccessful Attempt Report.]

- b. If it appears that all of the Clause 11.4.3 requirements relating to Missed Tests are satisfied, then no later than 14 (fourteen) days after the date of the unsuccessful attempt, the Responsible ADO (i.e. the ADO on whose behalf the test was attempted) must send notice to the *Athlete* of the unsuccessful attempt, inviting a response within 14 (fourteen) days of receipt of the notice. In the notice, the Responsible ADO should warn the *Athlete*:
- i. that unless the *Athlete* persuades the Responsible ADO that there has not been any Missed Test, then (subject to the remainder of the results management process set out below) an alleged Missed Test will be recorded against the *Athlete*; and
 - ii. of the consequences to the *Athlete* if a hearing panel upholds the alleged Missed Test.

[11.6.3(b)(ii) Comment: The notice should also advise the Athlete whether any other Whereabouts Failures have been declared against him/her in the 18-month period prior to this alleged Missed Test. (See also comment to Clause 11.6.3(d)).]

- c. Where the *Athlete* disputes the apparent Missed Test, the Responsible ADO must re-assess whether all of the Clause 11.4.3 requirements are met. The Responsible ADO must advise the *Athlete*, by letter sent no later than 14 (fourteen) days after receipt of the *Athlete's* response, whether or not it maintains that there has been a Missed Test.

[11.6.3(c) Comment: WADA intends to issue guidelines relating to the assessment of unsuccessful attempts, including what explanations may or may not excuse an apparent Missed Test.

Any notice sent to an Athlete pursuant to Clause 11.6.3(c), agreeing that there has been no Missed Test, shall also be sent to WADA and any other party/ies with a right of appeal under Code Article 13, and may be appealed by WADA and/or such party/ies in accordance with that Article.]

- d. If no response is received from the *Athlete* by the relevant deadline, or if the Responsible ADO maintains (notwithstanding the *Athlete's* response) that there has been a Missed Test, the Responsible ADO shall send notice to the *Athlete* that an alleged Missed Test is to be recorded against him/her. The Responsible ADO shall at the same time advise the *Athlete* that he/she has the right to request an administrative review of the

alleged Missed Test. The Unsuccessful Attempt Report must be provided to the *Athlete* at this point if it has not been provided earlier in the process.

[11.6.3(d) Comment: The ADO may provide the Unsuccessful Attempt Report to the Athlete prior to this stage if it so chooses (i.e. when it sends the initial notice in accordance with Clause 11.6.3(b)), or it may initially provide only the basic details of the apparent Missed Test, holding back the full Unsuccessful Attempt Report to be provided only at this stage.]

- e. Where requested, such administrative review shall be conducted by a designee of the Responsible ADO who was not involved in the previous assessment of the alleged Missed Test, shall be based on written submissions alone, and shall consider whether all of the requirements of Clause 11.4.3 are met. If necessary, the relevant DCO may be asked to provide further information to the designee. The review shall be completed within 14 (fourteen) days of receipt of the *Athlete's* request and the decision shall be communicated to the *Athlete* by letter sent no more than 7 (seven) days after the decision is made.

[11.6.3(e) Comment: Nothing in this Article prevents a sufficiently resourced ADO setting up a panel of up to three persons to conduct such administrative review, provided that none of those persons has been involved in the previous assessment of the alleged Missed Test.]

- f. If it appears to the designee that the requirements of Clause 11.4.3 have not been met, then the unsuccessful attempt to test the *Athlete* shall not be treated as a Missed Test for any purpose; and

[11.6.3(f) Comment: Any notice sent to an Athlete pursuant to Clause 11.6.3(f), agreeing that there has been no Missed Test, shall also be sent to WADA and any other party/ies with a right of appeal under Code Article 13, and may be appealed by WADA and/or such party/ies in accordance with that Article.]

- g. If the *Athlete* does not request an administrative review of the alleged Missed Test by the relevant deadline, or if the administrative review leads to the conclusion that all of the requirements of Clause 11.4.3 have been met, then the Responsible ADO shall record an alleged Missed Test against the *Athlete* and shall notify the *Athlete* and (on a confidential basis) WADA and all other relevant ADOs of that alleged Missed Test and the date of its occurrence.

[11.6.3(g) Comment: For the avoidance of doubt, the ADO that attempted the test is not precluded from notifying other relevant ADOs (on a strictly confidential basis) of the alleged Missed Test at an earlier stage of the results]

management process. Rather, it is entitled to do so, where it considers it appropriate (for test planning purposes or otherwise).

The Clause 11.6.3(g) notice should again advise the Athlete whether any other Whereabouts Failures have been alleged against him/her in respect of the 18-month period prior to this alleged Missed Test.

Whenever such notice is received, if the ADO with results management responsibility, as determined by Clause 11.7.5, is different from the ADO that attempted the test, then the ADO with results management responsibility is encouraged to review the file immediately to determine whether, in its view, the evidence in relation to the Missed Test declared by the ADO that attempted the test is sufficient to establish a Whereabouts Failure under Code Article 2.4. The reviewing ADO should raise any issues of concern with the notifying ADO as soon as possible, i.e. it should not wait until an Athlete has amassed three alleged Whereabouts Failures within any one 18-month period before raising any concern. Any decision by the reviewing ADO that a Whereabouts Failure recorded by another ADO should be disregarded for lack of sufficient evidence shall be communicated to the other ADO and to WADA, shall be without prejudice to WADA's right of appeal under Code Article 13, and in any event shall not affect the validity of any other Whereabouts Failures declared against the Athlete in question.]

11.6.4 An ADO that declares, or that receives notice of, a Whereabouts Failure in respect of an *Athlete* shall not disclose that information beyond those persons with a need to know unless and until that *Athlete* is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation under Code Article 2.4 based on (among other things) such Whereabouts Failure. Such persons who need to know shall also maintain the confidentiality of such information until the same point.

[11.6.4 Comment: This shall not preclude an ADO from publishing a general statistical report of its activities that discloses in general terms the number of Whereabouts Failures that have been declared in respect of Athletes under its jurisdiction during a particular period, provided that it does not publish any information that might reveal the identity of the Athletes involved. An ADO should not disclose that a particular Athlete does (or does not) have any Whereabouts Failures alleged against him/her (or that a particular sport does, or does not, have Athletes with Whereabouts Failures alleged against them).]

11.6.5 The Responsible ADO shall keep a record of all Whereabouts Failures alleged in respect of each *Athlete* within its *Registered Testing Pool*. Where it is alleged that such an *Athlete* has committed 3 (three) Whereabouts Failures within any 18-month period:

- a. Where two or more of those Whereabouts Failures were alleged by an ADO that had the *Athlete* in its *Registered Testing Pool* at the time of those failures, then that ADO (whether the IF or a *NADO*) shall be the Responsible ADO for purposes of bringing proceedings against the *Athlete*

under *Code Article 2.4*. If not (for example, if the Whereabouts Failures were alleged by three different *ADOs*), then the Responsible ADO for these purposes will be the *ADO* whose *Registered Testing Pool* the *Athlete* was in as of the date of the third Whereabouts Failure. If the *Athlete* was in both the international and a national *Registered Testing Pool* as of that date, the Responsible ADO for these purposes shall be the IF.

*[11.6.5(a) Comment: The Responsible ADO shall have the right to receive, from any other *ADO* that has recorded one of the alleged Whereabouts Failures, such further information about that alleged Whereabouts Failure as the Responsible ADO may reasonably require in order to assess the strength of the evidence of such alleged Whereabouts Failure and to bring proceedings under *Code Article 2.4* in reliance thereon. If the Responsible ADO decides in good faith that the evidence in relation to such alleged Whereabouts Failure(s) is insufficient to support such proceedings under *Code Article 2.4*, then it may decline to bring proceedings based on such alleged Whereabouts Failure(s). Any decision by a Responsible ADO that a declared Whereabouts Failure should be disregarded for lack of sufficient evidence shall be communicated to the other *ADO* and to WADA, shall be without prejudice to WADA's right of appeal under *Code Article 13*, and in any event shall not affect the validity of the other Whereabouts Failures alleged against the *Athlete* in question.]*

- b. Where the Responsible ADO fails to bring proceedings against an *Athlete* under *Code Article 2.4* within 30 (thirty) days of WADA receiving notice of that *Athlete's* third alleged Whereabouts Failure in any 18-month period, then it shall be deemed that the Responsible ADO has decided that no anti-doping rule violation was committed, for purposes of triggering the appeal rights set out at *Code Article 13* (in particular *Article 13.2*).

*[11.6.5(b) Comment: In such circumstances, the *ADO(s)* that alleged such Whereabouts Failure(s) must provide to WADA, upon request, such further information about the alleged Whereabouts Failure(s) as WADA shall reasonably require in order to assess the strength of the evidence of such alleged Whereabouts Failure(s) and (where it deems it appropriate) to bring an appeal in accordance with *Code Article 13*.]*

11.6.6 An *Athlete* alleged to have committed an anti-doping rule violation under *Code Article 2.4* shall have the right to have such allegation determined at a full evidentiary hearing in accordance with *Code Article 8*. The hearing panel shall not be bound by any determination made during the results management process, whether as to the adequacy of any explanation offered for a Whereabouts Failure or otherwise. Instead, the burden shall be on the *ADO* bringing the proceedings to establish all of the requisite elements of each alleged Whereabouts Failure.

*[11.6.6 Comment: Nothing in Clause 11.6.6 is intended to prevent the *ADO* challenging an argument raised on the *Athlete's* behalf at the hearing on the basis that*

it could have been but was not raised at an earlier stage of the results management process.

The ADO that brings proceedings against an Athlete under Code Article 2.4 should also consider in good faith whether or not a Provisional Suspension should be imposed on the Athlete pending determination of the proceedings, in accordance with Code Article 7.5.2.

If the hearing panel decides that one (or two) alleged Whereabouts Failures have been established to the required standard, but that the third alleged Whereabouts Failure has not, then no Code Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation shall be found to have occurred. However, if the Athlete then commits one (or two) further Whereabouts Failures within the relevant 18-month period, new proceedings may be brought based on a combination of the Whereabouts Failure(s) established to the satisfaction of the hearing panel in the previous proceedings (in accordance with Code Article 3.2.3) and the Whereabouts Failure(s) subsequently committed by the Athlete.

A finding that an Athlete has committed an anti-doping rule violation under Code Article 2.4 of the Code has the following Consequences:

- a. imposition of a period of Ineligibility in accordance with Code Article 10.3.3 (first violation) or Code Article 10.7 (second violation); and*
- b. in accordance with Code Article 10.8, Disqualification (unless fairness requires otherwise) of all individual results obtained by an Athlete from the date of the anti-doping rule violation through to the date of commencement of any Provisional Suspension or Ineligibility period, with all of the resulting consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes. For these purposes, the anti-doping rule violation shall be deemed to have occurred on the date of the third Whereabouts Failure found by the hearing panel to have occurred.*

The impact of any Code Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation by an individual Athlete on the results of any team for which that Athlete has played during the relevant period shall be determined in accordance with Code Article 11.]

11.7 Whereabouts Responsibilities of Anti-Doping Organizations

11.7.1 The IF is responsible for the following:

- a. designating Athletes for inclusion in the international Registered Testing Pool, and revising the list of designated Athletes as appropriate from time to time, all in accordance with Code Article 14.3 and Clause 11.2;*
- b. notifying each Athlete designated for inclusion in the international Registered Testing Pool, either directly or through the National Federation*

or Olympic/Paralympic Committee to which the IF has delegated the responsibility to provide notification to the *Athlete*:

- i. of the fact that he/she has been designated for inclusion in the international *Registered Testing Pool*;
 - ii. of the whereabouts requirements with which he/she must comply as a result of such inclusion; and
 - iii. of the potential consequences if he/she fails to comply with such requirements;
- c. agreeing with the *NADO*, in accordance with Clause 11.3.1, which of them shall take responsibility for receiving the Whereabouts Filings of *Athletes* who are in both the *NADO's* national *Registered Testing Pool* and the IF's international *Registered Testing Pool*;
- d. establishing a workable system for the collection, maintenance and sharing of Whereabouts Filings, preferably using an on-line system (capable of recording who enters information and when) or at least fax, e-mail and/or SMS text messaging, to ensure that:
- i. the information provided by the *Athlete* is stored safely and securely (ideally in ADAMS or another centralized database system of similar functionality and security);
 - ii. the information can be accessed by (A) authorized individuals acting on behalf of the IF on a need-to-know basis only; (B) *WADA*; and (C) other *ADOs* with *Testing* jurisdiction over the *Athlete*, in accordance with *Code* Article 14.3; and
 - iii. the information is maintained in strict confidence at all times, is used by the IF exclusively for the purpose of planning, coordinating or conducting *Testing*, and is destroyed in accordance with relevant confidentiality requirements after it is no longer relevant;
- e. conducting results management in accordance with Clause 11.6 in respect of:
- i. any apparent Filing Failure on the part of an *Athlete* in the international *Registered Testing Pool* (unless the *Athlete* is also in a national *Registered Testing Pool* and files his/her Whereabouts Filing with the *NADO*, in which case it will be the *NADO* that conducts results management in respect of any apparent Filing Failure by that *Athlete*); and

- ii. any apparent Missed Test in respect of such *Athlete*, where the unsuccessful attempt to test the *Athlete* was made on behalf of the IF; and
- f. in the circumstances specified in Clause 11.6.5(a), bringing disciplinary proceedings against an *Athlete* under *Code* Article 2.4.

11.7.2 Notwithstanding Clause 11.7.1:

- a. an IF may propose, and a *NADO* may agree to, the delegation of some or all of the responsibilities set out in sub-Clauses 11.7.1(b) to (e) to the *NADO*;
- b. an IF may delegate some or all of the responsibilities set out in Clause 11.7.1 to the *Athlete's* National Federation; or
- c. where *WADA* determines that the IF is not discharging some or all of its responsibilities set out in Clause 11.7.1, *WADA* may delegate some or all of those responsibilities to any other appropriate *ADO*.

11.7.3 The *NADO* is responsible for the following:

- a. designating *Athletes* for inclusion in the national *Registered Testing Pool*, and revising the list of designated *Athletes* as appropriate from time to time, all in accordance with *Code* Article 14.3 and Clause 11.2;
- b. notifying each *Athlete* designated for inclusion in the national *Registered Testing Pool*:
 - i. of the fact that he/she has been designated for inclusion in the national *Registered Testing Pool*;
 - ii. of the whereabouts requirements with which he/she must comply as a result of such inclusion; and
 - iii. of the potential consequences if he/she fails to comply with such requirements;
- c. agreeing with the IF, in accordance with Clause 11.3.1, which of them shall take responsibility for receiving the Whereabouts Filings of *Athletes* who are in both the *NADO's* national *Registered Testing Pool* and the IF's international *Registered Testing Pool*;

- d. establishing a workable system for the collection, maintenance and sharing of Whereabouts Filings made by *Athletes* in the national *Registered Testing Pool*, preferably using an on-line system (capable of recording who enters information and when) or at least fax, e-mail and/or SMS text messaging, to ensure that:
 - i. the information is stored safely and securely (ideally in ADAMS or another centralized database system of similar functionality and security);
 - ii. the information can be accessed by (A) authorized individuals acting on behalf of the *NADO* on a need-to-know basis only; (B) *WADA*; and (C) other *ADOs* with authority to test the *Athlete(s)* in question, in accordance with *Code* Article 14.3; and
 - iii. the information is maintained in strict confidence at all times, is used by the *NADO* exclusively for the purpose of planning, coordinating or conducting *Testing*, and is destroyed in accordance with relevant confidentiality requirements after it is no longer relevant;
- e. conducting results management in accordance with Clause 11.6 in respect of:
 - i. any apparent Filing Failure on the part of an *Athlete* in the national *Registered Testing Pool* (unless the *Athlete* is also in an international *Registered Testing Pool* and files his/her Whereabouts Filing with the IE, in which case it will be the IE that conducts results management in respect of any apparent Filing Failure by that *Athlete*); and
 - ii. any apparent Missed Test in respect of such *Athlete*, where the unsuccessful attempt to test the *Athlete* was made on behalf of the *NADO*; and
- f. in the circumstances specified in Clause 11.6.5(a), bringing disciplinary proceedings against an *Athlete* under *Code* Article 2.4.

11.7.4 Notwithstanding Clause 11.7.3:

- a. a *NADO* may delegate some or all of the responsibilities set out in Clause 11.7.3 to the relevant *Athlete's* National Federation or other appropriate *ADO* with authority over the *Athlete* in question;
- b. where no appropriate *NADO* exists, the *National Olympic Committee* shall assume the responsibilities of the *NADO* set out in Clause 11.7.3; and

- c. where *WADA* determines that the responsibilities set out in Clause 11.7.3 are not being properly exercised, *WADA* may delegate some or all of those responsibilities to any other appropriate *ADO*.

11.7.5 In addition to any specific responsibilities delegated to it in accordance with Clause 11.7.2 or Clause 11.7.4, a National Federation must use its best efforts to assist the Responsible ADO in collecting Whereabouts Filings from *Athletes* within that National Federation's jurisdiction, including (without limitation) making special provision in its rules for that purpose.

11.7.6 Any *ADO* with *Testing* jurisdiction over an *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* (see *Code* Article 15):

- a. may access that *Athlete's* Whereabouts Filings, as filed with his/her IE or NADO, for use in conducting such *Testing*, in accordance with *Code* Article 14.3, provided that:
 - i. it shall ensure that such information is accessed by authorized individuals acting on behalf of the *ADO* on a need-to-know basis only, is maintained in strict confidence at all times, is used exclusively for the purpose of planning, coordinating or conducting *Testing*, and is destroyed in accordance with relevant confidentiality requirements after it is no longer relevant; and
 - ii. it shall have due regard, in accordance with *Code* Article 15.2, to the need to co-ordinate its *Sample* collection activities with the *Sample* collection activities of other *ADOs*, in order to maximize the effectiveness of the combined *Testing* effort and to avoid unnecessary repetitive testing of individual *Athletes*;
- b. it must provide information from the most current Whereabouts Filing to the DCO charged with testing the *Athlete*, and must issue the DCO with clear instructions as to how he/she should go about attempting to locate the *Athlete*, in accordance with Clause 11.4.3(d);
- c. it must conduct results management in respect of any apparent Missed Test arising out of its attempt to test the *Athlete*, in accordance with Clause 11.6.3;

11.7.6(c) Comment: Where the ADO attempts the test by agreement with another ADO, that agreement may specify that the requesting ADO will conduct results management with respect to any apparent Missed Test arising out of the attempt.

- d. it must report unsuccessful attempts promptly to the Responsible ADO for the *Athlete* in question, in accordance with Clause 11.4.3(h); and

- e. it must cooperate as reasonably requested with the Responsible ADO and/or *WADA* in its investigation of any such Whereabouts Failures and in its pursuit of any proceedings brought in reliance on such Whereabouts Failures, including providing any further information requested and producing witnesses and/or documentation as required to evidence, in any disciplinary or related proceedings, any facts within its knowledge on which the charge is based.

PART THREE: ANNEXES

Annex A - Investigating a possible Failure to Comply

A.1 Objective

To ensure that any matters occurring before, during or after a Sample Collection Session that may lead to a determination of a Failure to Comply are assessed, documented and acted upon.

A.2 Scope

Investigating a possible Failure to Comply begins when the *ADO* or a DCO becomes aware of a possible Failure to Comply and ends when the *ADO* takes appropriate follow-up action based on the outcomes of its investigation.

A.3 Responsibility

A.3.1 The *ADO* is responsible for ensuring that:

- a) An investigation of the possible Failure to Comply is instigated based on all relevant information and documentation.
- b) The *Athlete* or other party is informed of the possible Failure to Comply in writing and has the opportunity to respond.
- c) The evaluation process is documented.
- d) The final determination is made available to other *ADOs* in accordance with the *Code*.

A. 3.2 The DCO is responsible for:

- a) Informing the *Athlete* or other party of the consequences of a possible Failure to Comply.
- b) Completing the *Athlete's* Sample Collection Session where possible.
- c) Providing a detailed written report of any possible Failure to Comply.

A.3.3 Sample Collection Personnel are responsible for:

- a) Informing the *Athlete* or other party of the consequences of a possible Failure to Comply.
- b) Reporting to the DCO any possible Failure to Comply.

A.4 Requirements

A.4.1 Any potential Failure to Comply shall be reported by the DCO and/or followed up by the *ADO* as soon as practicable.

A.4.2 If the *ADO* determines that there has been a potential Failure to Comply, the *Athlete* or other party shall be promptly notified in writing:

- a) Of the possible consequences;
- b) That a potential Failure to Comply will be investigated by the *ADO* and appropriate follow-up action will be taken.

A.4.3 Any additional necessary information about the potential Failure to Comply shall be obtained from all relevant sources, including the *Athlete* or other party as soon as possible and recorded.

A.4.4 The *ADO* shall establish a system for ensuring that the outcomes of its investigation into the potential Failure to Comply are considered for results management action and, if applicable, for further planning and *Target Testing*.

Annex B - Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities

B.1 Objective

To ensure that the special needs of *Athletes* with disabilities are considered, where possible, in relation to the provision of a *Sample*, without compromising the integrity of the *Sample Collection Session*.

B.2 Scope

Determining whether modifications are necessary starts with identification of situations where *Sample* collection involves *Athletes* with disabilities and ends with modifications to *Sample* collection procedures and equipment where necessary and where possible.

B.3 Responsibility

The *ADO* has responsibility for ensuring, when possible, that the *DCO* has any information and *Sample Collection Equipment* necessary to conduct a *Sample Collection Session* with an *Athlete* with a disability.

The *DCO* has responsibility for *Sample* collection.

B.4 Requirements

B.4.1 All aspects of notification and *Sample* collection for *Athletes* with disabilities shall be carried out in accordance with the standard notification and *Sample* collection procedures unless modifications are necessary due to the *Athlete's* disability.

B.4.2 In planning or arranging *Sample* collection, the *ADO* and *DCO* shall consider whether there will be any *Sample* collection for *Athletes* with disabilities that may require modifications to the standard procedures for notification or *Sample* collection, including *Sample Collection Equipment* and facilities.

B.4.3 The *DCO* shall have the authority to make modifications as the situation requires when possible and as long as such modifications will not compromise the identity, security or integrity of the *Sample*. All such modifications must be documented.

B.4.4 An *Athlete* with an intellectual, physical or sensorial disability can be assisted by the *Athlete's* representative or *Sample Collection Personnel* during the *Sample Collection Session* where authorised by the *Athlete* and agreed to by the *DCO*.

B.4.5 The DCO can decide that alternative Sample Collection Equipment or facilities will be used when required to enable the *Athlete* to provide the *Sample* as long as the *Sample's* identity, security and integrity will not be affected.

B.4.6 *Athletes* who are using urine collection or drainage systems are required to eliminate existing urine from such systems before providing a urine *Sample* for analysis. Where possible, the existing urine collection or drainage system should be replaced with a new, unused catheter or drainage system.

B.4.7 The DCO will record modifications made to the standard *Sample* collection procedures for *Athletes* with disabilities, including any applicable modifications specified in the above actions.

Annex C - Modifications for *Athletes* who are *Minors*

C.1 Objective

To ensure that the needs of *Athletes* who are *Minors* are met, in relation to the provision of a *Sample*, without compromising the integrity of the *Sample Collection Session*.

C.2 Scope

Determining whether modifications are necessary starts with identification of situations where *Sample* collection involves *Athletes* who are *Minors* and ends with modifications to *Sample* collection procedures where necessary and where possible.

C.3 Responsibility

The *ADO* has responsibility for ensuring, when possible, that the *DCO* has any information necessary to conduct a *Sample Collection Session* with an *Athlete* who is a *Minor*. This includes confirming wherever necessary that parental consent clauses are in place when arranging *Testing* at an *Event*..

C.4 Requirements

C.4.1 All aspects of notification and *Sample* collection for *Athletes* who are *Minors* shall be carried out in accordance with the standard notification and *Sample* collection procedures unless modifications are necessary due to the *Athlete* being a *Minor*.

C.4.2 In planning or arranging *Sample* collection, the *ADO* and *DCO* shall consider whether there will be any *Sample* collection for *Athletes* who are *Minors* that may require modifications to the standard procedures for notification or *Sample* collection.

C.4.3 The *DCO* and the *ADO* shall have the authority to make modifications as the situation requires when possible and as long as such modifications will not compromise the identity, security or integrity of the *Sample*.

C.4.4 *Athletes* who are *Minors* may be accompanied by a representative throughout the entire *Sample* Collection Session. The representative shall not witness the passing of a urine *Sample* unless requested to do so by the *Minor*. The objective is to ensure that the *DCO* is observing the *Sample* provision correctly. Even if the *Minor* declines a representative, the *ADO*, *DCO* or *Chaperone*, as applicable, shall consider whether a third party ought

to be present during notification of and/or collection of the *Sample* from the *Athlete*.

C.4.5 For *Athletes* who are *Minors*, the DCO shall determine who, in addition to the *Sample Collection Personnel*, may be present during the *Sample Collection Session*, namely a *Minor's* representative to observe the *Sample Collection Session* (including observing the DCO when the *Minor* is passing the urine *Sample*, but not to directly observe the passing of the urine *Sample* unless requested to do so by the *Minor*) and the DCO's/Chaperone's representative, to observe the DCO/Chaperone when a *Minor* is passing a urine *Sample*, but without the representative directly observing the passing of the *Sample* unless requested by the *Minor* to do so.

C.4.6 Should a *Minor* decline to have a representative present during the *Sample Collection Session*, this should be clearly documented by the DCO. This does not invalidate the test, but must be recorded. If a *Minor* declines the presence of a representative, the representative of the DCO/Chaperone must be present.

C.4.7 Should a *Minor* fall within a *Registered Testing Pool*, the preferred venue for all *Out-of-Competition Testing* is a location where the presence of an adult is most likely, e.g. training venue.

C.4.8 The *ADO* shall consider the appropriate course of action when no adult is present at the *Testing* of an *Athlete* who is a *Minor* and shall accommodate the *Athlete* in locating a representative in order to proceed with *Testing*.

Annex D - Collection of urine *Samples*

D.1 Objective

To collect an *Athlete's* urine *Sample* in a manner that ensures:

- a) Consistency with relevant principles of internationally recognised standard precautions in healthcare settings so that the health and safety of the *Athlete* and Sample Collection Personnel are not compromised;
- b) The *Sample* meets the Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis and the Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis. Failure of a *Sample* to meet these requirements in no way invalidates the suitability of the *Sample* for analysis. The determination of a *Sample's* suitability for analysis is the decision of the relevant laboratory, in consultation with the *ADO*.
- c) The *Sample* has not been manipulated, substituted, contaminated or otherwise tampered with in any way.
- d) The *Sample* is clearly and accurately identified; and
- e) The *Sample* is securely sealed in a tamper-evident kit.

D.2 Scope

The collection of a urine *Sample* begins with ensuring the *Athlete* is informed of the *Sample* collection requirements and ends with discarding any residual urine remaining at the end of the *Athlete's* Sample Collection Session.

D.3 Responsibility

The DCO has the responsibility for ensuring that each *Sample* is properly collected, identified and sealed.

The DCO/Chaperone has the responsibility for directly witnessing the passing of the urine *Sample*.

D.4 Requirements

D.4.1 The DCO shall ensure that the *Athlete* is informed of the requirements of the Sample Collection Session, including any modifications as provided for in Annex B – Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities.

D.4.2 The DCO shall ensure that the *Athlete* is offered a choice of appropriate equipment for collecting the *Sample*. If the nature of an *Athlete's* disability requires that he/she must use additional or other equipment as

provided for in Annex B – Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities, the DCO shall inspect that equipment to ensure that it will not affect the identity or integrity of the *Sample*.

D.4.3 The DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to select a collection vessel.

D.4.4 When the *Athlete* selects a collection vessel and for selection of all other Sample Collection Equipment that directly holds the urine *Sample*, the DCO will instruct the *Athlete* to check that all seals on the selected equipment are intact and the equipment has not been tampered with. If the *Athlete* is not satisfied with the selected equipment, he/she may select another. If the *Athlete* is not satisfied with any of the equipment available for selection, this shall be recorded by the DCO.

If the DCO does not agree with the *Athlete* that all of the equipment available for the selection is unsatisfactory, the DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to proceed with the Sample Collection Session.

If the DCO agrees with the *Athlete* that all of the equipment available for the selection is unsatisfactory, the DCO shall terminate the collection of the *Athlete's* urine *Sample* and this shall be recorded by the DCO.

D.4.5 The *Athlete* shall retain control of the collection vessel and any *Sample* provided until the *Sample* is sealed, unless assistance is required by an *Athlete's* disability as provided for in Annex B – Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities. Additional assistance may be provided in exceptional circumstances to any *Athlete* by the *Athlete's* representative or Sample Collection Personnel during the Sample Collection Session where authorised by the *Athlete* and agreed to by the DCO.

D.4.6 The DCO/Chaperone who witnesses the passing of the *Sample* shall be of the same gender as the *Athlete* providing the *Sample*.

D.4.7 The DCO/Chaperone should where practicable ensure the *Athlete* thoroughly washes his or her hands prior to the provision of the *Sample*.

D.4.8 The DCO/Chaperone and *Athlete* shall proceed to an area of privacy to collect a *Sample*.

D.4.9 The DCO/Chaperone shall ensure an unobstructed view of the *Sample* leaving the *Athlete's* body and must continue to observe the *Sample* after provision until the *Sample* is securely sealed, and the DCO/Chaperone shall record the witnessing in writing. In order to ensure a clear and unobstructed view of the passing of the *Sample*, the DCO/Chaperone shall instruct the *Athlete* to remove or adjust clothing which restricts the clear view of *Sample* provision. Once the *Sample* has been provided, the DCO/Chaperone shall also ensure that no additional volume is passed by the

athlete at the time of provision, which could have been secured in the collection vessel.

D.4.10 The DCO shall verify, in full view of the *Athlete*, that the Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis has been provided.

D.4.11 Where the volume of urine is insufficient, the DCO shall conduct a partial *Sample* collection procedure as prescribed in Annex F – Urine *Samples* – insufficient volume.

D.4.12 The DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to select a *Sample* collection kit containing A and B bottles in accordance with Clause C.4.4.

D.4.13 Once a *Sample* collection kit has been selected, the DCO and the *Athlete* shall check that all code numbers match and that this code number is recorded accurately by the DCO.

If the *Athlete* or DCO finds that the numbers are not the same, the DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to choose another kit in accordance with Clause C.4.4. The DCO shall record the matter.

D.4.14 The *Athlete* shall pour the minimum Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis into the B bottle (to a minimum of 30 mL), and then pour the remainder of the urine into the A bottle (to a minimum of 60 mL). If more than the minimum Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis has been provided, the DCO shall ensure that the *Athlete* fills the A bottle to capacity as per the recommendation of the equipment manufacturer. Should there still be urine remaining, the DCO shall ensure that the *Athlete* fills the B bottle to capacity as per the recommendation of the equipment manufacturer. The DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to ensure that a small amount of urine is left in the collection vessel, explaining that this is to enable the DCO to test that residual urine in accordance with Clause D.4.17.

D.4.15 Urine should only be discarded when both the A and B bottles have been filled to capacity in accordance with Clause D.4.14, and after the residual urine has been tested in accordance with Clause D.4.17. The Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis shall be viewed as an absolute minimum.

D.4.16 The *Athlete* shall seal the bottles as directed by the DCO. The DCO shall check, in full view of the *Athlete*, that the bottles have been properly sealed.

D.4.17 The DCO shall test the residual urine in the collection vessel to determine if the *Sample* has a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis. If the DCO's field reading indicates that the *Sample* does not have a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis, then the DCO shall follow Annex G (Urine

Samples that do not meet requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis).

D.4.18 The DCO shall ensure that the *Athlete* has been given the option of requiring that any residual urine that will not be sent for analysis is discarded in full view of the *Athlete*.

Annex E - Collection of blood *Samples*

E.1 Objective

To collect an *Athlete's* blood *Sample* in a manner that ensures:

- a) The health and safety of the *Athlete* and Sample Collection Personnel are not compromised;
- b) The *Sample* is of a quality and quantity that meets the relevant analytical guidelines;
- c) The *Sample* has not been manipulated, substituted, contaminated or otherwise tampered with in any way;
- d) The *Sample* is clearly and accurately identified; and
- e) The *Sample* is securely sealed.

E.2 Scope

The collection of a blood *Sample* begins with ensuring the *Athlete* is informed of the *Sample* collection requirements and ends with properly storing the *Sample* prior to dispatch for analysis at the *WADA* accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by *WADA*.

E.3 Responsibility

E.3.1 The DCO has the responsibility for ensuring that:

- a) Each *Sample* is properly collected, identified and sealed; and
- b) All *Samples* have been properly stored and dispatched in accordance with the relevant analytical guidelines.

E.3.2 The Blood Collection Officer has the responsibility for collecting the blood *Sample*, answering related questions during the provision of the *Sample*, and proper disposal of used blood sampling equipment not required for completing the Sample Collection Session.

E.4 Requirements

E.4.1 Procedures involving blood shall be consistent with the local standards and regulatory requirements regarding precautions in health care settings.

E.4.2 Blood Sample Collection Equipment shall consist of (a) a single sample tube for blood profiling purposes; or (b) both an A and a B sample tube for blood analysis; or (c) as otherwise specified by the relevant laboratory.

E.4.3 The DCO shall ensure that the *Athlete* is informed of the requirements of the *Sample* collection, including any modifications as provided for in Annex B – Modifications for *Athletes* with disabilities.

E.4.4 The DCO/Chaperone and *Athlete* shall proceed to the area where the *Sample* will be provided.

E.4.5 The DCO shall ensure the *Athlete* is offered comfortable conditions including being in a relaxed position for at least 10 minutes prior to providing a *Sample*.

E.4.6 The DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to select the *Sample* collection kit/s required for collecting the *Sample* and to check that the selected equipment has not been tampered with and the seals are intact. If the *Athlete* is not satisfied with a selected kit, he/she may select another. If the *Athlete* is not satisfied with any kits and no others are available, this shall be recorded by the DCO.

If the DCO does not agree with the *Athlete* that all of the available kits are unsatisfactory, the DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to proceed with the Sample Collection Session.

If the DCO agrees with the *Athlete* that all available kits are unsatisfactory, the DCO shall terminate the collection of the *Athlete's* blood *Sample* and this shall be recorded by the DCO.

E.4.7 When a *Sample* collection kit has been selected, the DCO and the *Athlete* shall check that all code numbers match and that this code number is recorded accurately by the DCO.

If the *Athlete* or DCO finds that the numbers are not the same, the DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to choose another kit. The DCO shall record the matter.

E.4.8 The Blood Collection Officer shall clean the skin with a sterile disinfectant wipe or swab in a location unlikely to adversely affect the *Athlete* or his/her performance and, if required, apply a tourniquet. The Blood Collection Officer shall take the blood *Sample* from a superficial vein into the tube. The tourniquet, if applied, shall be immediately removed after the venipuncture has been made.

E.4.9 The amount of blood removed shall be adequate to satisfy the relevant analytical requirements for the *Sample* analysis to be performed.

E.4.10 If the amount of blood that can be removed from the *Athlete* at the first attempt is insufficient, the Blood Collection Officer shall repeat the procedure. Maximum attempts shall be three. Should all attempts fail, then the Blood Collection Officer shall inform the DCO. The DCO shall terminate

the collection of the blood *Sample* and record this and the reasons for terminating the collection.

E.4.11 The Blood Collection Officer shall apply a dressing to the puncture site/s.

E.4.12 The Blood Collection Officer shall dispose of used blood sampling equipment not required for completing the Sample Collection Session in accordance with the required local standards for handling blood.

E.4.13 If the *Sample* requires further on-site processing, such as centrifugation or separation of serum, the *Athlete* shall remain to observe the *Sample* until final sealing in secure, tamper-evident kit.

E.4.14 The *Athlete* shall seal his/her *Sample* into the *Sample* collection kit as directed by the DCO. In full view of the *Athlete*, the DCO shall check that the sealing is satisfactory.

E.4.15 The sealed *Sample* shall be stored in a manner that protects its integrity, identity and security prior to transport from the Doping Control Station to the *WADA* accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by *WADA*.

Annex F - Urine *Samples* - Insufficient volume

F.1 Objective

To ensure that where a Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis is not provided, appropriate procedures are followed.

F.2 Scope

The procedure begins with informing the *Athlete* that the *Sample* is not of Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis and ends with the provision of a *Sample* of sufficient volume.

F.3 Responsibility

The DCO has the responsibility for declaring the *Sample* volume insufficient and for collecting the additional *Sample/s* to obtain a combined *Sample* of sufficient volume.

F.4 Requirements

F.4.1 If the *Sample* collected is of insufficient volume, the DCO shall inform the *Athlete* that a further *Sample* shall be collected to meet the Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis requirements.

F.4.2 The DCO shall instruct the *Athlete* to select partial Sample Collection Equipment in accordance with Clause D.4.4.

F.4.3 The DCO shall then instruct the *Athlete* to open the relevant equipment, pour the insufficient *Sample* into the container and seal it as directed by the DCO. The DCO shall check, in full view of the *Athlete*, that the container has been properly sealed.

F.4.4 The DCO and the *Athlete* shall check that the equipment code number and the volume and identity of the insufficient *Sample* are recorded accurately by the DCO. Either the *Athlete* or the DCO shall retain control of the sealed partial *Sample*.

F.4.5 While waiting to provide an additional *Sample*, the *Athlete* shall remain under continuous observation and be given the opportunity to hydrate.

F.4.6 When the *Athlete* is able to provide an additional *Sample*, the procedures for collection of the *Sample* shall be repeated as prescribed in Annex D – Collection of urine *Samples* until a sufficient volume of urine will be provided by combining the initial and additional *Sample/s*.

F.4.7 When the DCO is satisfied that the requirements for Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis have been met, the DCO and *Athlete* shall check the integrity of the seal(s) on the partial *Sample* container(s) containing the previously provided insufficient *Sample(s)*. Any irregularity with the integrity of the seal/s will be recorded by the DCO and investigated according to Annex A – Investigating a Possible Failure to Comply.

F.4.8 The DCO shall then direct the *Athlete* to break the seal/s and combine the *Samples*, ensuring that additional *Samples* are added sequentially to the first entire *Sample* collected until, as a minimum, the requirement for Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis is met.

F.4.9 The DCO and *Athlete* shall then continue with Clause D.4.12 or Clause D.4.14 as appropriate.

F.4.10 The DCO shall check the residual urine to ensure that it meets the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.

F.4.11 Urine should only be discarded when both the A and B bottles have been filled to capacity in accordance with Clause D.4.1.4. The Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis shall be viewed as an absolute minimum.

Annex G - Urine *Samples* that do not meet the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis

G.1 Objective

To ensure that when the urine *Sample* does not meet the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis, appropriate procedures are followed.

G.2 Scope

The procedure begins with the DCO informing the *Athlete* that a further *Sample* is required and ends with the collection of a *Sample* that meets the requirements for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis, or appropriate follow-up action by the *ADO* if required.

G.3 Responsibility

The *ADO* is responsible for establishing procedures to ensure that a suitable *Sample* is collected. If the original *Sample* collected does not meet the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis, the DCO is responsible for collecting additional *Samples* until a suitable *Sample* is obtained.

G.4 Requirements

G.4.1 The DCO shall determine that the requirements for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis have not been met.

G.4.2 The DCO shall inform the *Athlete* that he/she is required to provide a further *Sample*.

G.4.3 While waiting to provide additional *Samples*, the *Athlete* shall remain under continuous observation.

G.4.4 The *Athlete* shall be encouraged not to hydrate excessively, since this may delay the production of a suitable *Sample*.

G.4.5 When the *Athlete* is able to provide an additional *Sample*, the DCO shall repeat the procedures for collection of the *Sample* as prescribed in Annex D – Collection of urine *Samples*.

G.4.6 The DCO should continue to collect additional *Samples* until the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis is met, or until the DCO determines that there are exceptional circumstances which mean that for logistical reasons it is impossible to continue with the Sample Collection Session. Such exceptional circumstances shall be documented accordingly by the DCO.

G.4.6 Comment: It is the responsibility of the Athlete to provide a Sample with a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis. If his/her first Sample is too dilute, he/she should not need further hydration and therefore should avoid drinking as far as possible until a Sample with a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis is provided. The DCO should wait as long as necessary to collect such a Sample. The ADO may produce guidelines to be followed by the DCO in determining whether exceptional circumstances exist that make it impossible to continue with the Sample Collection Session.

G.4.7 The DCO shall record that the *Samples* collected belong to a single *Athlete* and the order in which the *Samples* were provided.

G.4.8 The DCO shall then continue with the Sample Collection Session in accordance with Clause D.4.16.

G.4.9 If it is determined that none of the *Athlete's Samples* meets the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis and the DCO determines that for logistical reasons it is impossible to continue with the Sample Collection Session, the DCO may end the Sample Collection Session. In such circumstances, if appropriate the *ADO* may investigate a possible anti-doping rule violation.

G.4.10 The DCO shall send to the laboratory for analysis all *Samples* which were collected, irrespective of whether or not they meet the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.

G.4.11 The laboratory shall, in conjunction with the *ADO*, determine which *Samples* shall be analyzed.

Annex H - *Sample* Collection Personnel Requirements

H.1 Objective

To ensure that Sample Collection Personnel have no conflict of interest and have adequate qualifications and experience to conduct Sample Collection Sessions.

H.2 Scope

Sample Collection Personnel requirements start with the development of the necessary competencies for Sample Collection Personnel and end with the provision of identifiable accreditation.

H.3 Responsibility

The *ADO* has the responsibility for all activities defined in this Annex H.

H.4 Requirements - Qualifications and Training

H.4.1 The *ADO* shall determine the necessary competence and qualification requirements for the positions of Doping Control Officer, Chaperone and Blood Collection Officer. The *ADO* shall develop duty statements for all Sample Collection Personnel that outline their respective responsibilities. As a minimum:

- a) Sample Collection Personnel shall not be *Minors*.
- b) Blood Collection Officers shall have adequate qualifications and practical skills required to perform blood collection from a vein.

H.4.2 The *ADO* shall ensure that Sample Collection Personnel that have an interest in the outcome of the collection or testing of a *Sample* from any *Athlete* who might provide a *Sample* at a session are not appointed to that Sample Collection Session. Sample Collection Personnel are deemed to have an interest in the collection of a *Sample* if they are:

- a) Involved in the planning of the sport for which *Testing* is being conducted; or
- b) Related to, or involved in the personal affairs of, any *Athlete* who might provide a *Sample* at that session.

H.4.3 The *ADO* shall establish a system that ensures that Sample Collection Personnel are adequately trained to carry out their duties.

H.4.3.1 The training program for Blood Collection Officers as a minimum shall include studies of all relevant requirements of the *Testing* process and familiarization with relevant standard precautions in healthcare settings.

H.4.3.2 The training program for Doping Control Officers as a minimum shall include:

- a) Comprehensive theoretical training in different types of *Testing* activities relevant to the Doping Control Officer position;
- b) Observation of all Doping Control activities related to requirements in this standard, preferably on site;
- c) The satisfactory performance of one complete Sample Collection Session on site under observation by a qualified Doping Control Officer or similar. The requirement related to actual passing of *Sample* shall not be included in the on-site observations.

H.4.3.3 The training program for Chaperones shall include studies of all relevant requirements of the Sample collection process.

H.4.4 The *ADO* shall maintain records of education, training, skills and experience.

H.5 Requirements - Accreditation, re-accreditation and delegation

H.5.1 The *ADO* shall establish a system for accrediting and re-accrediting Sample Collection Personnel.

H.5.2 The *ADO* shall ensure that Sample Collection Personnel have completed the training program and are familiar with the requirements of this *International Standard for Testing* before granting accreditation.

H.5.3 Accreditation shall only be valid for a maximum of two years. Sample Collection Personnel shall be required to repeat a full training program if they have not participated in *Sample* collection activities within the year prior to re-accreditation.

H.5.4 Only Sample Collection Personnel that have an accreditation recognised by the *ADO* shall be authorised by the *ADO* to conduct *Sample* collection activities on behalf of the *ADO*.

H.5.5 Doping Control Officers may personally perform any activities involved in the Sample Collection Session, with the exception of blood collection unless particularly qualified, or they may direct a Chaperone to perform specified activities that fall within the scope of the Chaperone's authorised duties.