### Acronyms used in 2022 Compliance Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS</td>
<td>Anti-Doping Administration and Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADEL</td>
<td>Anti-Doping Education and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADO</td>
<td>Anti-Doping Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOPAF</td>
<td>Anti-Doping Organization Program Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Corrective Action Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Court of Arbitration for Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Code Compliance Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCQ</td>
<td>Code Compliance Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Compliance Investigation Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISP</td>
<td>Code Implementation Support Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Compliance Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRMP</td>
<td>Continental Results Management Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Compliance, Rules and Standards (impact area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCF</td>
<td>Doping Control Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLDF</td>
<td>Global Learning Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>International Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCCS</td>
<td>International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISE</td>
<td>International Standard for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRM</td>
<td>International Standard for Results Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTI</td>
<td>International Standard for Testing and Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTUE</td>
<td>International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>International Testing Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEO</td>
<td>Major Event Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADO</td>
<td>National Anti-Doping Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADO</td>
<td>Regional Anti-Doping Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Registered Testing Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB</td>
<td>Strategic Impact Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMO</td>
<td>Strategic Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDP</td>
<td>Test Distribution Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDSSA</td>
<td>Technical Document for Sport Specific Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUE</td>
<td>Therapeutic Use Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADA</td>
<td>World Anti-Doping Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Executive Summary

The 2022 Compliance Annual Report is the fourth report of its kind and is published in line with WADA’s Compliance Strategy launched in 2020. The Compliance Strategy was developed by WADA’s internal Compliance Taskforce with the guidance of WADA’s independent Compliance Review Committee (CRC) and endorsed by WADA’s Executive Committee in 2019.

WADA Internal Structures, Processes and Compliance Monitoring

- In 2022, WADA completed its first full year of its reorganized structure in line with its Strategic Plan 2020-2024. The Compliance, Rules and Standards (CRS) “impact area” manages the Agency’s compliance activities through collaboration with WADA’s functional expert departments.

- In addition, further adjustments were made following the devastating passing of WADA’s Chief Operating Officer, Frédéric Donzé. Frédéric was the heartbeat of WADA and integral to WADA’s compliance activities and his knowledge, passion and dedication will be forever missed.

- A new Strategic Impact Board (SIB) has been established. The SIB ensures that all new projects are aligned with WADA’s Strategic Plan and that internal resources are maximised according to the organization’s priorities.

- WADA has three established, complementary compliance monitoring programs, namely the Code Compliance Questionnaire (CCQ), audits and continuous monitoring. Continuous monitoring will be renamed to Program Area Monitoring with the development of the Anti-Doping Organization Programs Assessment Framework (ADOPAF). WADA’s compliance monitoring programs are moving towards real-time monitoring rather than relying on historical data to assess the current situation.

- In line with WADA’s Compliance Strategy, following the publication of the 2021 Compliance Annual Report, WADA identified six priority areas and 14 objectives in its 2022 Compliance Annual Plan.

- The Compliance Investigation Section (CIS) is now fully embedded into WADA’s Intelligence & Investigation (I&I) department and has secured funding until the end of 2026, increasing WADA’s resources to investigate compliance related allegations. Three compliance investigations were concluded in 2022 and 40 compliance related allegations were received by Speak Up!, an increase from 32 in 2021. In order to allow the prosecution of cases involving historic, egregious non-conformities by Signatories, WADA is seeking to make amendments to the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS) and the World Anti-Doping Code (Code) in 2023, acting as a further deterrent to Signatories and individuals who may intentionally breach anti-doping rules.

- In 2022 a number of data analytics projects were initiated including the creation of a Data Analytics Pilot project and a Data Warehouse project. In addition, the Program Development Impact Area hired a data analyst in November 2022 to develop the ADOPAF project. The capture, storage and analysis of data will lead to more data informed decision making and more effective trend analysis especially when assessing compliance data.

- WADA continued to deliver Code Implementation Support Program (CISP) activities throughout 2022 through webinars, regional workshops and adding resources to the Anti-Doping Education and Learning (ADEL) system. CISP contributed significantly towards the reduction of CCQ non-conformities between 2017 and 2022 CCQs.

- The processes and decisions made by the Compliance Taskforce, Compliance Review Committee (CRC) and WADA’s Executive Committee, in line with the ISCCS, were effective and no decision was challenged by Signatories at the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in 2022.
The Russian Anti-Doping Agency (RUSADA) non-compliance case continued to be resource-intensive both for WADA’s monitoring and for Signatories implementing the CAS decision (e.g. as it relates to consequences in the CAS decision relating to hosting events in Russia, and the uniforms and flags associated with the Russian teams participation). Sanctions following the invasion of Ukraine limited Russian athletes’ participation in international sporting events and removed the opportunity to host events which reduced the monitoring required by WADA on the CAS decision, when compared to 2021.

Monitoring Signatory Compliance

- **Anti-doping rules and/or legislation:** Throughout 2022, WADA continued to support those Signatories who amended their anti-doping rules or legislation or who are in the process of developing new legislation. **Three** National Anti-Doping Organizations (NADOs) were placed on the “watchlist” due to non-compliant, adopted legislation. By the end of 2022, **two** remain on the watchlist with deadlines in 2023.

- **CCQ:** In 2022 a CCQ based on the 2021 Code and International Standards was issued to 117 Tier 1 and Tier 2 International Federations (IFs) and NADOs and **three** Tier 2 Major Event Organizations (MEOs).
  - 111 Corrective Action Reports (CARs) have been issued to IFs and NADOs containing over 2000 non-conformities. **39%** of corrective actions were signed off by 31 December 2022.
  - When comparing data between the 2017 and 2022 CCQs for the same IFs and NADOs, the total number of non-conformities reduced by **22%** even though the number of requirements increased in 2022. Critical non-conformities did increase by **8%**, while High Priority non-conformities decreased by **42%**.
  - **23** Signatories entered a compliance procedure for either not returning the CCQ by the deadline or because they required more time to implement corrective actions.

- **Audits:** WADA conducted **nine** audits in 2022. **Seven** audits were conducted in-person and **two** virtually. **Six** audits were conducted on NADOs and **three** on IFs.
  - **206** non-conformities were identified, **36%** have been implemented by 31 December 2022.
  - The average number of non-conformities from audit CARs increased by **5%** when compared with 2021.
  - Signatories audited in 2021 continued to implement their corrective actions in 2022. **Two** Signatories audited are **currently non-compliant**, including **one** IF from an audit in 2021. **89%** of corrective actions have been implemented by 31 December 2022.
  - **33** of the **44** Signatories (75%) audited in between CCQs recorded less non-conformities in the 2022 CCQ compared with 2017 suggesting that improvements were maintained following an audit and that audits are effective in improving anti-doping programs.

- **Continuous monitoring program:** Partial continuous monitoring was conducted in 2022. Identified non-conformities were merged into CCQ and audit CARs. Once the revised ISCCS comes into force, this program will be renamed “program area monitoring” and will move towards real-time monitoring in line with the ADOPAF project.

Key findings of Signatory Compliance Monitoring in 2022

- WADA monitored Tier 1 and 2 Signatories’ anti-doping programs through CCQ and audits while conducting limited continuous monitoring of Tier 3 and 4. The 2022 CCQ was WADA’s primary compliance activity. Coordinated by the CRS Impact Area and involving over **20** WADA staff from various functional expertise departments, some significant improvements and progress were identified when comparisons are made for
the same Signatories from their 2017 CCQ. This is even more notable in light of their being more requirements placed on Signatories in 2022.

- WADA continued to support Signatories in amending their anti-doping rules and/or legislation even though there was no requirement to do so as all Signatories by early 2022, had compliant rules and/or legislation. WADA received and reviewed 286 sets of rules and legislation, which represents a 40% increase when compared to a similar year e.g. 2019.

- In 2022 there was a significant increase of national legislation amendments and the initiation of new legislation in some countries, especially from Africa. Compliance interventions were required for those NADOs from countries who either adopted legislation not in line with the Code without WADA’s prior assessment (presenting the legislation to WADA after adoption) or adopting legislation that WADA was aware of and involved in reviewing but had not signed off as in line. 12 NADOs received a CAR in relation to legislation, with three being "watchlisted" by the Executive Committee. As of 31 December 2022, WADA was supporting another 11 countries with the development of new legislation.

- Although compliance procedures reduced in comparison to 2021 (which was a unique year due to the backlog of cases resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic with 52 procedures opened) they remained high at 39. A high number of compliance procedures suggests that compliance maturity is not yet established in the system, however as only one IF was declared non-compliant and three NADOs watchlisted, deadlines and compliance enforcement procedures continue to be effective in maintaining Signatory compliance, in particular, for cases involving anti-doping rules and/or legislation.

- Due to the various compliance monitoring programs in operation each year, precise comparisons between years has its limitations, however, based on combined CCQ and audit data in 2022, the average number of non-conformities per CAR reduced by 15% when compared to 2021 (which was limited to audit data only) as well as the number of Critical and High Priority non-conformities reducing by 30% each. Other observations include:

  ▪ Testing continued to generate the most non-conformities in 2022. The availability of verifiable data through ADAMS reports and monitoring tools contributes to the high number of non-conformities. Data from CCQ suggests that Testing requires nearly 25% of Signatories human resources and over 50% of Signatories financial resources.

  ▪ Education generated the second highest number of non-conformities, replacing Results Management, following the first global assessment of the implementation of the new International Standard for Education (ISE) introduced in January 2021. Education was the highest source of non-conformities for IFs and on average IFs generated more Education non-conformities than NADOs per CAR (the only program area to do so).

  ▪ Privacy non-conformities increased by 11% between 2017 and 2022 due to the increase in requirements in the International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information (ISPPPI) which was updated to align with the principles of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) that came into force in 2018.

  ▪ NADOs continue to generate, on average per CAR, more non-conformities than IFs (21.5 versus 14.4) due to the increased requirements and more complex nature of their anti-doping programs and legal frameworks. NADOs contributed to 71% of the Critical non-conformities recorded in CCQ, largely linked to Testing.

  ▪ Resources within WADA and Signatories were an ongoing challenge in 2022. Within WADA, adjustments have been made to the roll out of CCQs to Signatories to ensure WADA’s review and feedback can be provided in a timely manner to enable Signatories to implement their corrective actions. 24% of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Signatories completing the CCQ have either self-reported a lack of resources or it was identified through the assessment of their programs that insufficient resources were in place to meet the requirements of the 2021 Code. 81% of these Signatories were NADOs.
2. Introduction

2.1 Purpose of the Annual Report

In line with WADA’s Compliance Strategy, the purpose of the 2022 Compliance Annual Report is to inform WADA’s stakeholders of WADA’s compliance activities in 2022, including the implementation of the 2022 Compliance Annual Plan. The diagram below illustrates the cyclical interaction between the outcomes of one year’s compliance annual report and the following years annual plan.

The broad term “compliance” with the Code refers to the obligation of a Signatory to develop, maintain and enforce its anti-doping rules and implement its anti-doping programs in line with mandatory documents including, the Code, International Standards and related Technical Documents. Signatories covered in this report are either an IF, a NADO or a MEO.

The objective of the Compliance Annual Report is to:

− Enhance transparency and trust in WADA’s compliance monitoring activities through the publication of this report on its website.
− Provide a clear and integrated report on the effectiveness of WADA’s compliance monitoring program, measuring objectives through quantitative and qualitative analysis against key performance indicators (KPIs), and identifying areas for improvement.
− Support the strategic focus of WADA’s compliance monitoring program, assess the effectiveness of the Agency’s daily compliance operations and identify where resources should be invested.
− Detail the interpretation and implications of the findings, trends and lessons learned over time, towards improving compliance maturity defined in the Compliance Strategy.

− Identify opportunities for continual improvement of WADA’s compliance monitoring and program development activities that will be the foundation for the following year’s Compliance Annual Plan strategic objectives. This cycle will be repeated annually.

The Compliance Annual Plan will also synergize with the strategic objectives contained within WADA’s 2020-2024 Strategic Plan.

2.2 International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS)

Code compliance by Signatories is governed by the ISCCS, which came into force on 1 April 2018 following a stakeholder consultation process. The ISCCS provides the framework for Signatories to achieve and maintain compliance and sets out the processes, timeframes and consequences associated when a non-conformity is identified. Recommending a Signatory non-compliant is a last resort, and WADA provides support and guidance from when the non-conformity is first identified through to when the corrective action is addressed.

On 1 January 2021 a revised ISCCS came into force with minimal changes made in light of the ongoing CAS case involving RUSADA. Following the publication of the CAS decision, WADA initiated a more thorough review of the ISCCS throughout 2022, including stakeholder consultation. The challenge of dealing with
historical non-compliances identified through investigations or other sources was considered to be problematic as the ISCCS is designed to deal with existing non-conformities that can be addressed. The process for updating the ISCCS is ongoing and will involve further stakeholder consultation in 2023.

2.3 RUSADA

As per the CAS decision, RUSADA remained non-compliant throughout 2022 and WADA was responsible for monitoring the consequences contained in the CAS decision. At the end of 2022, the two-year period of consequences detailed in the CAS decision came to an end. However, RUSADA remains non-compliant. The process for RUSADA’s reinstatement will occur in a phased approach. The first phase will be an assessment by WADA management of whether the reinstatement conditions have been met or not. Once WADA’s management determines that in its opinion the reinstatement conditions have been met, the CRC will conduct its own assessment. If the CRC agrees with WADA’s management view that the conditions have been met it will make a recommendation for reinstatement to the WADA Executive Committee.

2.4 Russian Federation Invasion of Ukraine

In February 2022, the Russian Federation initiated an invasion of neighbouring Ukraine. Following the invasion, sporting authorities issued mandates to limit the participation of Russian (and Belarusian) athletes competing in events as well as preventing Russia (and Belarus) from hosting international sporting events. These mandates ran in parallel to consequences contained in the CAS decision and were still in place at the end of 2022.

2.5 Ukraine NADO

At the time of the invasion, the Ukraine NADO was subject to an ongoing compliance procedure following the publication of WADA’s I&I department’s report named “Operation Hercules”. A fast-track procedure was commenced, however the CRC decided not to make any recommendation to the WADA Executive Committee in line with the definition of “Event of Force Majeure” contained in the ISCCS. A WADA Executive Committee meeting to discuss the Ukraine NADO’s non-compliance was cancelled in the wake of the invasion. In September 2022, the CRC recommended to WADA Executive Committee that the NADO’s non-conformities should be provisionally excused while the event of force majeure (ongoing invasion) continued to prevent the Ukraine NADO’s correction of the non-conformities. The recommendation was endorsed. The status of the compliance case against the Ukraine is therefore currently on hold and will be reassessed once it is determined that the force majeure period has ended.

In order to ensure that Ukrainian athletes competing internationally were subject to an appropriate anti-doping program, including testing, WADA coordinated with a number of ADOs to ensure that testing continued. The Poland NADO also provided support and training to Ukrainian NADO staff to allow them to continue their limited operations in a safe environment.

2.6 COVID-19

Throughout 2022 public health restrictions varied across the world as countries adapted their national policy decisions in response to the evolving COVID-19 pandemic. At the start of 2022, the “omicron” variant saw the re-introduction of travel restrictions in some jurisdictions and the extension in others. The Beijing Winter Olympics and Paralympics did take place but under strict public health measures and with no spectators, similar to the Tokyo Summer Olympics and Paralympics the previous year. WADA did have an Independent Observer team at both games but did not conduct any athlete Outreach/Athlete Engagement events.

WADA’s activities also adapted to the changing restrictions. The annual ADO symposium which had been cancelled for the previous two years did take place but was moved from March to June 2022 and was offered to participants as a hybrid meeting with approximately 600 individuals attending in-person.
One audit initially planned in-person in January 2022 was switched to a virtual audit due to the pandemic. All other audits apart from a virtual audit on RUSADA were conducted in-person in line with local public health measures.

Signatories also adjusted their programs accordingly and 2022 testing figures have now returned to pre-pandemic levels.

2.7 Other Key WADA Developments in 2022 Impacting Compliance

A number of WADA’s activities in 2022 have directly or indirectly impacted the compliance program:

1. In August 2022, WADA and the world of anti-doping was devastated by the passing of WADA’s Chief Operating Officer, Frédéric Donzé. Frédéric was responsible for many important activities within WADA including WADA’s compliance mandate. The loss of his knowledge, enthusiasm, dedication and passion for sport and anti-doping will be forever missed and never replaced. As a result, WADA made some adjustments to its organization structure.

2. 2022 was the first full year of WADA’s new “matrix model” organization structure. The matrix model consolidates its strategic priorities within “impact areas” which are supported by WADA departments who provide resources and functional area expertise. The first real test of this model was undertaken through the CCQ for IFs and NADOs in 2022, where the CRS impact area was responsible for liaising with various departments within WADA to ensure that CCQs were distributed, reviewed, CARs issued and corrective actions reviewed within a timely manner.

3. WADA’s ISO9001:2015 certification for its compliance monitoring program was extended for a further three years following a successful audit of its compliance operations in February 2022.

3. Achievement of 2022 Compliance Objectives

The 2022 Compliance Annual Plan was developed from the conclusions and findings of the 2021 Compliance Annual Report. Six priority areas were identified, which resulted in 14 objectives and a number of related activities. The status of these objectives and activities by 31 December 2022 are detailed below. On track activities relate to those that have a deadline after 2022, while ongoing are considered an ongoing activity with no set deadline.

Priority Area 1: IMPLEMENTATION OF CAS DECISION ON RUSSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Planned completion date/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) CAS decision implementation</td>
<td>Monitor implementation of the CAS decision on Russia and support Signatories with the implementation of the CAS decision</td>
<td>December 2022. Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2) RUSADA monitoring | Monitor RUSADA reinstatement plan  
- RUSADA’s operational independence  
- Virtual Audit; focus on reinstatement conditions and implementation of corrective actions  
- Payment of fines | Ongoing until RUSADA reinstatement |

Objective 1:
- Monitoring the implementation of the CAS decision on Russia continued from 2021 up to the end of the two-year period of consequences which ended on 17 December 2022. Processes set up to support and monitor
Signatories implement the CAS decision continued, however following the Russian Federation invasion of Ukraine and the restrictions on Russian athlete participation in world championships and the removal of major events hosted in Russia, this monitoring activity reduced.

Objective 2:
- WADA’s multi-departmental working group set up to monitor RUSADA’s operations continued it activities. Regular contact with RUSADA’s management and supervisory board was maintained. RUSADA provided monthly operational reports and quarterly independence reports to WADA.
- WADA management provided regular updates to the CRC on progress made by Russia on the reinstatement conditions.
- A virtual audit of RUSADA was endorsed by WADA’s Executive Committee. It took place in September 2022 and by the end of 2022, one corrective action remained outstanding.
- The process for assessing reinstatement conditions for RUSADA will continue in 2023.

Priority Area 2: UKRAINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Planned completion date/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3) CRC recommendation of non-compliance to ExCo | - Monitor the situation in Ukraine  
- CRC to assess timing of bringing recommendation of non-compliance to ExCo | Ongoing, currently on hold due to “force majeure” |
| 4) Monitor Ukraine athletes competing | - Monitor Ukrainian athletes competing  
- Coordinate NADOs and IFs to conduct testing | Ongoing |

Objective 3:
- Please refer to section 2.5 of this report regarding this ongoing objective.

Objective 4:
- At its April 2022 meeting the CRC made a recommendation that the Ukraine NADO’s activities continue to be monitored, especially the testing of Ukraine athletes still competing. As a result, WADA coordinated with NADOs in countries where Ukrainian athletes either resided, trained or competed to ensure that they remained subject to an effective anti-doping program. 18 NADOs have since provided solidarity support in testing Ukraine athletes at their own cost. In addition, IFs also monitored and increased testing resources on Ukraine athletes in their Registered Testing Pools (RTPs). As a result, almost 2000 samples were collected on Ukraine athletes, including approximately 600 by the Ukraine NADO itself. The remainder were collected by IFs and other collaborating NADOs.
- The Poland NADO provided training, accommodation and office space for Ukraine NADO officials to continue their operations which included some testing of athletes within Ukraine.

Priority Area 3: WADA INTERNAL COMPLIANCE MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Planned completion date/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5) Key performance indicators | - Create organizational strategic KPIs in line with re-organization  
- Define KPIs for each main compliance area  
- Monitor KPIs | December 2022. Complete  
December 2022. Complete  
Ongoing |
| 6) Develop and implement a compliance risk management system | - Develop organization-wide process and templates  
- Create risk management compliance framework  
- Conduct risk identification with select CRC members  
- Create risk register  
- Train staff in risk management | August 2022. Complete  
September 2022. Complete  
August 2022. Complete  
December 2022. Complete  
Not complete |
### Objective 5:

- As part of WADA’s Strategic Plan, corporate level KPIs have been established and were presented to the WADA Executive Committee in September 2022. They will now be continually updated, monitored and reported. Metrics measuring Compliance maturity are included.
- Operational KPIs have also been developed and are also embedded in WADA’s ISO9001:2015 processes.
- Both strategic and operational KPIs are detailed in section 4.

### Objective 6:

- A specific compliance risk management system was developed throughout 2022 with guidance from a risk management consultant and experts from the CRC.
- The system is described in a risk management framework document and a risk register has been populated currently containing 32 risks. Internal resources have been identified as the highest risk.
- Although no formal training has been conducted, in 2023 WADA staff will develop processes to review existing risks and identify new risks linked to the impact area’s Operational Plan. The CRC is also developing its own risk register which will be integrated into the overall risk register in 2023. A new WADA Special Committee, the Audit and Risk Committee will be established in late 2023 to further coordinate such activities.

### Objective 7:

- WADA’s office of the Director General now contains a Strategic Management Office (SMO) responsible for coordinating projects across the organization. This is aligned with WADA’s Strategic Plan, budget and department operational plans.
- A Strategic Impact Board (SIB) has been established to assess, monitor and approve projects as well as monitor the work of the impact areas. All projects now follow the same process for approval, including ensuring that resources (human and financial) are secured.
- Impact areas responsible for coordinating projects are responsible for resource modelling through Full Time Equivalent (FTE) assessments and budget management.

### Objective 8:

- The mandate of the CIS was originally a trial period of three years and was due to end at the end of 2023. Subsequently additional resources have been obtained to extend its mandate for a further three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Planned completion date/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7) Operational planning: including resource modelling and project management</td>
<td>Implement ongoing risk management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement new operational planning in line with new organizational structure</td>
<td>December 2022. Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify project management activities and business as usual</td>
<td>December 2022. Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create project charters and plans for CCQ and any other compliance related projects</td>
<td>April 2022. Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure resource modelling is linked to risk management program</td>
<td>December 2022. Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) CIS</td>
<td>Bi-weekly exchange of information between CRS and CIS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIS contribute to audits planned and attend audits (where requested by CIS)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRS to support CIS investigations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure the ISCCS (or other WADA documents) are adaptable to investigation outcomes from a compliance perspective</td>
<td>November 2023. Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Three** compliance investigations were concluded in 2022.
- ISCCS improvements are currently in draft to further enhance compliance enforcement and deterrence where historical non-conformities are discovered from investigations.

## Priority Area 4: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Planned completion date/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9) Support ongoing Program Development initiatives | - TUE development project for ADOs in Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and Asia/Oceania: three objectives: (1) developing TUE infrastructure, (2) improving TUE capabilities, and (3) raising athlete and support personnel awareness of TUEs.  
- Development and training of three Results Management (RM) continental panels in Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and Asia/Oceania to assist NADOs and RADOs in timely result management decisions by independent hearing panels.  
- Strengthen ADO development through developing MEO resources, and building local and regional capacity for key organizations participating in Major Events (i.e., MEOs, NADOs and RADOs). Pilot project with the 2022 Mediterranean Games.  
- Testing development project for priority ADOs through training and mentoring.  
- Development of the ADOPAF to monitor the health of ADO programs from compliance and development data, providing a high-level view of individual ADO programs and the global anti-doping landscape by identifying trends and issues and contributing to finding potential ways to address gaps that will then be developed in coordination with WADA functional areas and key stakeholders. The Compliance Program Area Monitoring will be linked to the ADOPAF focusing on critical requirements. | On track  
On track  
On track  
December 2023. On track  
December 2023. On track |
| 10) Data analytics: enhance data analytics, leading to data-led decision making and reporting | - Recruit data analytical expert to lead the ADOPAF  
- Identify data sources including compliance data  
- Define and set up database structure and query system to automate generation of data reports for analysis  
- Manage dashboard to run data queries and analyses, providing interpretation and identifying trends  
- Data-informed decisions on future capacity building and training programs to maintain and sustain effective anti-doping programs | September 2022. Complete  
December 2022. Complete  
December 2023. On track  
April 2023. On track  
Ongoing |

**Objective 9:**

- The Program Development impact area continues to coordinate a number of projects to assist Signatories in key program areas. The following four projects were active in 2022:
  - The Results Management Continental Panels project supports **12** Regional Anti-Doping Organizations (RADOs) and over **100** NADOs that can potentially delegate Results Management to the RADOs, ensuring that hearing panels are independent and have the capacities and capabilities to conduct hearings in a timely manner and that decisions are made in compliance with the Code. In 2022, **three** continental panels were established: (1) Latin America and the Caribbean, (2) Africa and (3) Oceania and Asia. The three panels have established their structures, developed Terms of Reference and Procedural Rules. In addition, they received training with support of WADA’s Global Learning and Development Framework (GLDF) and are now fully operational.
  - The Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) development project aims to enhance RADOs’ and NADOs’ TUE programs in three key areas: infrastructure, TUE administrator and TUE Committee (TUEC)
capability, and athlete and athlete support personnel awareness. In 2022, TUE infrastructure issues for Tier 1 and Tier 2 ADOs were addressed through the CCQ exercise. In addition, a website for the five Africa RADOs was developed through which athletes from the region can now apply for a TUE. Training was provided for 16 ADOs (12 NADOs and five IFs) selected considering CCQ and ADAMS data, as well as input from the Regional Offices. The project also contributed to raising athlete and athlete support personnel awareness through four TUE webinars (English, French and Spanish): three for athletes and one for practitioners. Finally, a successful TUE social media campaign was implemented (e.g., a 49.1% increase in views for the ISTUE was observed after the campaign).

- The MEO pilot project aims to enhance WADA’s MEO resources and to support less resourced MEOs in implementing effective anti-doping programs, using this as an opportunity to strengthen local and regional capacity. During 2022, the pilot completed a thorough review of the Major Events Guidelines in collaboration with a number of WADA’s functional areas. In 2023, the Guidelines will be shared with key external partners for input before they are published in 2023. In addition to this, the pilot, in coordination with the Africa Office and European Office teams actively supported the MEO for the 2022 Mediterranean Games in Oran, Algeria, in implementing a Code compliant program. Specifically, the pilot’s support was key in: Facilitating the establishment of a Taskforce to drive the project plan, supporting the coordination of capacity building and training activities, supporting the implementation of a compliant testing program that for the first-time implemented blood and out-of-competition tests, working with authorities to fast-track to creation of the new Algerian NADO, promoting regional and international collaboration, and providing in-games support in an advisory capacity.

- In 2022, a Testing development project for priority ADOs started. The purpose of the project is to assist priority ADOs with testing program issues in developing and implementing sustainable Code compliant testing programs, by enhancing ADO testing capacity and strengthening testing administrator capability. In order to achieve this in a structured way, the project uses the following steps: assessment and selection of ADOs, engagement, training and mentoring, monitoring and evaluation. At the end of 2022, steps one and two had been completed (identification and engagement). 16 Tier 1 and 2 NADOs were selected considering CCQ data and input from WADA’s Regional Offices. Step three, training, with the support of the GLDF, will start in February and will end in May 2023.

Objective 10:

- A Data Analytics Pilot Project was established to assess WADA’s data sources and provide recommendations on future strategies by November 2025. Alongside this a WADA IT initiative of creating a data warehouse has started.

- A data analyst was hired in September 2022 to manage the ADOPAF (a project identified in objective 9) under the Program Development Impact Area. Initial assessment of the CCQ results has been used to create a baseline of information, which is now integrated with other sources of data, including ADAMS and WADA Legal department data. The capture, storage and analysis of data will lead to more data informed decision making across the organization and more effective compliance trend and interpretation analysis.

Priority Area 5: PROGRAM AREA FOCUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Planned completion date/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) TUEs</td>
<td>- Analyse CCQ and audit data to identify nature of TUE non-conformities&lt;br&gt;- Target existing resources to Signatories through corrective actions. Develop new resources based on identified gaps</td>
<td>Ongoing&lt;br&gt;Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 11:

- ADOs publishing accurate TUE processes on their website and issues relating to the timely entry of accurate data on TUE applications into ADAMS were identified as the biggest cause of non-conformities. Corrective actions in the CCQ and audit CARs addressed this and in addition the WADA Medical department provided individualised assistance to ADOs. In 2023 a new TUE module in ADAMS will be developed to improve reporting and monitoring of deadlines.

Objective 12:

- Based upon an assessment of Tier 1 and 2 CCQ data and inputs from relevant WADA departments, 16 NADOs were identified and accepted invitations for GLDF training which will start in 2023. GLDF training programs are designed to improve knowledge, capacity and capability in their organizations with the intention to reduce Testing non-conformities in the future.

Objective 13:

- The CCQ represented the first assessment of Signatory compliance with the new ISE. Education planning and evaluating were identified as key areas generating the most non-conformities. CISP continued throughout 2022, including webinars to assist Signatories with these requirements. WADA’s Education department also hosted a Global Conference on Education in Sydney, Australia in September 2022 and included compliance related sessions. The Japan NADO, in partnership with WADA, hosted two regional conferences in January and December 2022 focussing on Testing and Education compliance requirements.

Priority Area 6: ISCCS REVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Planned completion date/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14) Identify improvements through experience of implementing the ISCCS and conduct stakeholder consultation | - Identify improvements from experience of implementing the ISCCS  
- Review with the CRC  
- Provide proposals to stakeholders through consultation process  
- ExCo approval November 2022  
- Introduce revised ISCCS 1 April 2023 | April 2022. Complete  
April 2022. Complete  
July 2022. Complete  
Delayed. November 2023  
Delayed. April 2024 |

Objective 14:

- Due to the ongoing RUSADA CAS case at the time of the 2021 Code and International Standards coming into force, changes to the ISCCS were minimal. Once the CAS decision was available and in force, WADA management, the CRC and the ISCCS drafting team identified a number of improvements to the Standard based on three years of implementation and the RUSADA case. The ISCCS drafting team prepared a
revised version for stakeholder consultation which took place in June and July 2022. The revision of the ISCCS will continue through 2023.

3.1 Summary

The 2022 Compliance Annual Plan provided a clear strategic framework for WADA management to follow up on the findings of the 2021 Compliance Annual Report. WADA management provided a status update to the CRC at each of its meetings in 2022.

Substantial progress was made in advancing the quality and sustainability of WADA Compliance management, notably internal compliance management (KPIs, risk management, operational planning and integrating CIS activities), program development (including data analytics), and key program areas (TUEs, Testing, Education). All objectives were either met in 2022, or are ongoing and on track, with some activities planned to be completed in 2023. These include the revision of the ISCCS and Code, ongoing development of data analytics and program area improvements. All objectives or activities that were not achieved by 31 December 2022 will be reviewed and may roll over into the 2023 Compliance Annual Plan if they still remain a priority.

Activities related to both RUSADA reinstatement and Ukraine non-compliance are, by their nature, ongoing and will roll over to 2023. These activities remain on track.

4. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

4.1 Strategic KPIs

Strategic KPIs in line with WADA’s Strategic Plan have been developed to measure impact of WADA’s activities. They were presented to the Executive Committee in September 2022. Those relevant to compliance are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic KPIs</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improve the overall compliance maturity of Signatories and the global anti-doping system | – Reduction in the total number of non-conformities between the 2017 and 2022 CCQ  
– Reduction in critical non-conformities between the 2017 and 2022 CCQ  
– Reduction in non-conformities between 2017 and 2022 on select benchmarked anti-doping program requirements  
– Anticipated further reduction in findings between Signatories audited and not audited in between CCQs  
– Reduction in Critical findings for audits  
– Reduction in Testing and Results Management findings from audits | – Of 111 CCQ CARs issued, there is a 23% reduction in total non-conformities compared to 2017 for the same Signatories.  
– Critical corrective actions have increased by 7%.  
– Nine of the 12 benchmarked requirements are trending positively (fewer non-conformities).  
– 33 of 44 (75%) Signatories audited in between CCQs recorded fewer non-conformities in the 2022 CCQ.  
– The average number of Critical non-conformities from audit CARs remained the same as 2021 (8.2)  
– Testing non-conformities increased marginally from 8.2 to 8.4 average non-conformities per CAR. Results Management average non-conformities increased from 5.7 to 6.8 per CAR |
| Ensure Signatories are satisfied with WADA’s | – CCQ feedback, 75% either “agree” or “strongly agree” with the feedback | – Of 115 respondents, 86% strongly agree or agree. |
4.2 Operational KPIs

The following operational KPIs, which are included in WADA’s Compliance Monitoring Program ISO processes, are detailed below. Three KPIs met their performance target. The two that failed to achieve their performance target relate to the audit program and the CCQ, in both cases because of the failure to issue CARs within six weeks. In both cases, this was due to competing priorities and adjustment of resources. This will be addressed in 2023 by adjusting the timeframes to ensure the targets are achievable based on resources available and closer follow up and reminders to lead auditors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic KPIs</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance activities</td>
<td>question: “WADA’s compliance monitoring program is effective in improving anti-doping programs globally?”</td>
<td>Audit feedback indicates an average satisfaction score of 4.6 (out of 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards enhancing global</td>
<td>– Audit feedback: 4.5 out of 5 on overall rating per audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-doping programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

- Compliance maturity is improving within the anti-doping system however it is not fully achieved. ADOs are at different levels of maturity across the system. Improvements have been identified through KPIs, however compliance can’t be considered as a business as usual activity yet.
- Satisfaction from Signatories is high.
- Operational KPIs not achieved can be linked to human resource issues within WADA. Adjustments to the roll out of CCQ and reminders to audit team leads will be made and targets will be revised in the 2023 Compliance Annual Plan.
5 Compliance Monitoring Program

WADA has three well-established, complementary compliance monitoring programs, which ensure that WADA's overall compliance monitoring program is continuous in nature.

Figure 1: Scope of the three compliance monitoring programs

Table 1: Signatories assessed by each compliance monitoring program in 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Program</th>
<th>NADO</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>MEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Monitoring</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCQ*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data provided is the number of CCQs sent to Signatories. Please see the CCQ section for the number of CCQs received, reviewed and CARs issued.

5.1 Continuous Monitoring Program

In 2022, the priority for WADA's compliance resources was the IF and NADO CCQ. As a result, partial continuous monitoring was limited to DCF entry, a lack of testing and pending results management cases when compared to the full list of activities detailed in the table below. All IFs and NADOs were monitored for these three activities and any non-conformities were integrated into CCQ or audit CARs issued in 2022. The same approach will be taken for CCQ and audit CARs issued in 2023. Therefore, data from this program is included in the CCQ and audit analysis.
During the revision of the ISCCS, it was decided to rename continuous monitoring to “program area monitoring” to better reflect the nature of this compliance monitoring activity. As the revised ISCCS is still in draft, the term continuous monitoring will remain until the revised ISCCS comes into force.

In 2023, continuous monitoring and identification of non-conformities will be integrated into the ADOPAF project.

Table 2: Activities included in Continuous Monitoring/Program Area Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Compliance with the Technical Document for Sport Specific Analysis (TDSSA)</td>
<td>Signatories meeting the Minimum Levels of Analysis (MLA) for all sports and disciplines under their jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Lack of testing in particular, out-of-competition testing</td>
<td>Signatories collecting a sufficient amount of tests in particular out-of-competition testing based upon the risk of the sports and disciplines under their jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Signatories testing athletes in their RTP sufficiently or in line with the TDSSA (see Athlete Biological Passport program implementation below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Athlete Biological Passport (ABP) program implementation</td>
<td>Signatories sufficiently testing athletes from sports/disciplines with a high Erythropoietin receptor agonists (EPOs) Minimum Level of Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Sample delivery delays</td>
<td>Signatories ensuring samples collected are shipped to a WADA-accredited Laboratory within seven days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUEs</td>
<td>Entry of Doping Control Forms (DCFs) into ADAMS</td>
<td>Signatories inputting DCFs into ADAMS within 21 days of sample collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Management</td>
<td>Entry of TUEs into ADAMS</td>
<td>Signatories entering TUEs into ADAMS, within 15 days of the decision by a TUE committee, the required information, including a TUE application form, relevant medical information and, where necessary, a translation into French or English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Management</td>
<td>Compliance of Results Management decisions</td>
<td>Signatories complying with the requirements of the Code and ISRM in relation to their Results Management processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Management</td>
<td>Pending Results Management Cases</td>
<td>Signatories who have results management cases pending six months after the athlete was charged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Code Compliance Questionnaire (CCQ)

In 2022, WADA launched its second version of the CCQ to IFs and NADOs with the questionnaire based upon the requirements of the 2021 Code and International Standards. The CCQ for MEOs was also updated based upon the latest Code and International Standards requirements.

The IF and NADO CCQ comprises of approximately 240 questions for NADOs and 210 questions for IFs. Based upon lessons learned from the 2017 CCQ, the 2022 CCQ was issued in a staggered approach to Signatories based upon the Signatory Tier system to enable WADA to conduct reviews and issue CARs within a timely manner. In 2017 some Signatories received their CAR up to a year after sending in their CCQ.

The calendar for issuing CCQs in 2022, 2023 and 2024 is as follows:
- Tier 1 IFs and NADOs received their CCQ in March 2022.
− Tier 2 IFs and NADOs (plus Tier 1 IFs and the China NADO directly involved in the Beijing Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games and NADOs that were on the compliance “watchlist”) received their CCQ in May 2022.

− Tier 3 IFs and NADOs will receive their CCQ in two batches starting in quarter 1 2023.

− Tier 4 IFs and NADOs will receive their CCQ across a number of batches starting in 2024.

IFs and NADOs audited in 2021 and 2022 did not receive a CCQ as the audit covered the same period of assessment.

Based upon this roll out plan, 117 IFs and NADOs were issued a CCQ in 2022. By the end of 2022, 116 had been returned and 111 CARs issued. One NADO was in a compliance procedure for not returning their CCQ. Four CARs were not issued as the Signatories (two NADOs and two IFs) will be audited in 2023 with the CCQ CAR used as preparation for the audit. One CCQ was still under review as it was only submitted in December 2022 and will be issued in 2023.

Average non-conformities by Signatory, Tier and program area are detailed below in tables 3 and 4, conclusions are drawn in section 5.4.

Table 3: CCQ CAR data by Type of Signatory and Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Signatory</th>
<th>Average non-conformities per CAR</th>
<th>Tier 1 CARs issued</th>
<th>Average non-conformities per Tier 1 CAR</th>
<th>Tier 2 CARs issued</th>
<th>Average non-conformities per Tier 2 CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NADO (n=60)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF (n=51)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (n=111)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: CCQ Program Area Non-Conformities by Type of Signatory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Signatory</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Testing and Investigations</th>
<th>Results Management</th>
<th>TUE</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NADO average non-conformities per CAR (n=60)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF average non-conformities per CAR (n=51)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined average non-conformities per CAR (n=111)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the number of non-conformities is an important benchmark, it is also relevant to note that each section has a different number of questions that can result in a corrective action. When non-conformities are taken as a percentage of total questions per section, it becomes apparent that actually the rate of compliance with Testing (92%) and Results Management (96%) requirements is high and that the high number of Testing non-conformities come from a small number of requirements. Compliance percentages (number of compliant responses compared to the total number of questions) vary widely from section to section, with Education the lowest at 71%, due to the high number of new requirements in the ISE.

Table 5: CCQ Category of Non-Compliance by Type of Signatory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Signatory</th>
<th>Average Critical non-conformities per CAR</th>
<th>Average High Priority non-conformities per CAR</th>
<th>Average General non-conformities per CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NADO (n=60)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF (n=51)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (n=111)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- NADOs generated more than double the number of critical non-conformities than IFs. These are largely attributed to Critical Testing non-conformities.
- IFs generated more General non-conformities than NADOs due to the higher number of General Education non-conformities and the similar number of Privacy non-conformities (note all Privacy non-conformities are classified as General).
Breaking down non-compliance categories by program areas showed that Testing non-conformities were mostly (64%) Critical, while Results Management, General and TUE non-conformities were principally High priority. Almost half (46%) of the non-conformities linked to Education were categorized as General and as mentioned above all of those related to Privacy were categorized as General.

Comparison with the 2017 CCQ

It is difficult to compare the 2022 CCQ with the 2017 CCQ due to a variety of reasons including a different edition of the Code and International Standards in force (and therefore some different requirements), the different number of questions, the different non-conformity categorization for some areas (since the ISCCS came into force in 2018). However, some trends are observed when comparing the same Signatories who received a CCQ CAR in 2017 and 2022. The percentage in table 6 below represents a reduction unless stated otherwise.

Table 6: CCQ comparison between 2017 and 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>2017 CCQ</th>
<th>2022 CCQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of non-conformities for IFs and NADOs (n=111)</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>&lt;22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of non-conformities per CAR for IFs and NADOs (n=111)</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>&lt;22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of non-conformities per CAR for IFs (n=51)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>&lt;37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of non-conformities per CAR for Tier 1 IFs (n=26)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>&lt;48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of non-conformities per CAR for NADOs (n=60)</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>&lt;11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical non-conformities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High priority non-conformities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General non-conformities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- 32 of 60 (53%) NADOs recorded less non-conformities in 2022 compared with 2017. The biggest reduction was 42 non-conformities for a NADO. The biggest increase was 20 non-conformities between the CCQs for a NADO.

- 39 of 51 (76%) IFs recorded less non-conformities in 2022 compared with 2017. The biggest reduction was 35 non-conformities. The biggest increase was 31. The role of the ITA can be attributed to the significant reduction in IF non-conformities.

**Benchmarking between CCQs**

For specific anti-doping program requirements that remained constant (or with minor adjustments) between the 2017 and 2022 CCQ the table below identifies that nine of the 12 areas monitored are trending in a positive direction in terms of lower non-conformities.

**Table 7: CCQ Benchmarked Program Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area activity</th>
<th>2017 CCQ</th>
<th>2022 CCQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-conformity %* (all Signatories)</td>
<td>Tier 1 non-conformity %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Risk Assessment</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Distribution Plan</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Document for Sport Specific Analysis (Testing)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Retention and Reanalysis Strategy (Testing)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Testing Pool (Testing)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Policies</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Management Initial Review Process</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Management imposing mandatory Provisional Suspensions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUE process</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUE form</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUE Committee</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Plan</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non-conformity % is calculated by dividing the total number of Signatories by the Signatories who recorded a non-conformity for the program area activities listed above.

- New requirements contained in the revised Code and International Standards often record the highest levels of non-conformity and take time for Signatories to implement. This was the case in 2015 for intelligence policies and sample retention and reanalysis strategies. In 2022, Education plans for Signatories were reviewed in more detail than in 2017 against the requirements contained in the ISE. In 2017 the assessment was based on the self reported presence of an Education plan without a detailed assessment of its contents.

- For areas that remained relatively stable in 2021, such as intelligence policies and sample reanalysis the non-conformities have almost been eliminated.

- The introduction of the ISRM has seen fewer non-conformities in the area of Results Management.

- Proactive assistance from WADA’s Medical department has also seen fewer non-conformities in the TUE Committee and application form requirements. This is also aided by clearer guidance in the 2021 ISTUE and readily available resources for Signatories to use through the CISP. A slight increase in non-
conformities in the TUE process can be attributed to a more detailed review conducted in 2022 when compared to 2017.

- Critical Testing requirements apart from the TDP are all trending positively, due to increased availability of templates and resources through CISP, as well as improved monitoring tools within ADAMS for Signatories to check their own compliance. The nature of the increase in TDP non-conformities will be assessed further when the complexity of non-conformities is assessed.

**MEO CCQ**

The data in the table below is from three MEO CCQ CARs issued in 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of non-conformity</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average non-conformities per CAR</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Two CARs were fully implemented for two MEOs who had events in 2022.
- One CAR was delayed as an event was switched from 2022 to 2023 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The CAR was issued in late 2022 with the Critical deadline in 2023.
  - The average number of non-conformities per CAR was 13.6.
  - Critical and High Priority non-conformities on average were six per CAR.
  - Testing recorded the highest average non-conformities. TUE the second highest largely due to the TUE process and application form not being updated since the previous edition of the event.
  - Result Management is limited in terms of requirements for MEOs, and hence has the fewest non-conformities.
- A CCQ specifically for MEOs was issued to two MEOs in 2022 that have events in 2023. The deadline for submission was in early 2023 and a CAR will be issued prior to their event.
- The Independent Observer (IO) program was and will be present at all events mentioned above and the teams will review the implementation of the CAR during the event.

### 5.3 Signatory Audit Program

WADA has now conducted 75 Signatory audits between December 2016 and the end of 2022. The list of Signatories audited is maintained on the [WADA website](https://www.wada-ama.org).

The original plan for 2022 was to conduct 10 audits, however due to strict entry requirements relating to the COVID-19 pandemic for one country whose NADO was selected for an audit, that audit will now be conducted in early 2023. Due to WADA’s resources focusing on the CCQ only two audits were conducted in the first seven months of 2022 with the remaining seven audits conducted between August and the end of the year.

Of the nine audits conducted in 2022:
- Two were conducted virtually, one in early 2022 as a result of the pandemic and the second due to travel restrictions (Russia).
- Six audits were conducted on NADOs and three on IFs.
Six CARs were issued by 31 December 2022. The remaining three CARs will be issued in early 2023. For the purpose of the data below, non-conformities from all nine CARs are used as the CARs are in the final drafting phase and the number of non-conformities is confirmed.

In addition, the full data from 2021 audits is included for analysis. The audit data included in the 2021 Compliance Annual Report only contained 12 of the 13 audits as one CAR had not been drafted at the time the report was written.

From the 9 audit CARs from 2022:
- 206 non-conformities were identified, of which 75 (36%) have been resolved.
- The range of non-conformities in a CAR was between 11 and 42, with the average being 22.9. For NADOs, the range was between 11 and 42 with the average being 25.8. For IFs, the range was between 12 and 24 with the average being 17.

One IF and one NADO fully implemented all corrective actions from their 2022 audit CAR.
Two auditees entered a compliance procedure. One did not require the extra time. The remaining six have their Critical deadline in 2023.

Due to the fluctuating number of audits conducted annually between 2019 and 2022, and different editions of the applicable Code, the average number of non-conformities is used to identify trends. For purposes of analysis, WADA conducted 18 audits in 2019, eight in 2020, 13 in 2021 and nine in 2022.

Table 9: Audit Non-Conformities 2019 to 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>IFs</th>
<th>NADOs</th>
<th>IFs and NADOs combined</th>
<th>Type of Audits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Audits</td>
<td>Average non-conformities per CAR</td>
<td>No. of Audits</td>
<td>Average non-conformities per CAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average number of non-conformities per audit CAR increased slightly in 2022 when compared to 2021 from 21.8 to 22.9 (5%).

The average non-conformities per CAR for NADOs is 25.8 compared to IFs at 17. NADOs have consistently generated more non-conformities per audit CAR over the period from 2019 to 2022. The average number of non-conformities is 35% higher for NADOs than for IFs (24.5 versus 18.1).

Testing year on year generates the most non-conformities. Non-conformities increased slightly (5%) from an average of 8.2 non-conformities in 2021 to 8.6 in 2022.

The number of Results Management non-conformities per CAR also increased in 2022 when compared to 2021 from 5.7 to 6.8 (19%).

Privacy and the General section non-conformities increased in 2022 when compared to 2021.

- In the General section the highest number of non-conformities was recorded for the period of 2019 to 2022 and related to issues such as insufficient resources and governance issues such as legislation and conflict of interest documentation.

- TUE and Education non-conformities reduced between 2021 and 2022.
Critical non-conformities appeared to stabilize in 2022 and General non-conformities also maintained similar levels across the four-year period.

High priority non-conformities increased by 10% compared to 2021 with four of the nine auditees contributing to 75% of the High priority non-conformities.

Although Testing non-conformities generate the highest number of non-conformities, Critical Testing non-conformities appear to be on a downward trend between 2020 and 2022. Testing High priority non-conformities fluctuate around an average of five non-conformities per CAR.
Results Management non-conformities have demonstrated a consistent trend between 2019 and 2022 apart from the spike of Critical non-conformities in 2020.

For the other program areas, General non-conformities contribute the most, with High priority trending upwards.

Figure 7: Audits: Comparison of the % of Critical Non-Conformities per Program Area between 2019 and 2022

Although Results Management Critical non-conformities remained consistent compared with previous years, the share was identical to Testing at 39%, largely due to the reduction in Critical Testing and other program area non-conformities reducing.

Of all Results Management non-conformities, 48% were Critical.

2021 Audits
Throughout 2022, Signatories audited in 2021 continued to implement corrective actions from their audit CARs. The status of 2021 audits by 31 December 2022 was as follows:

- 13 audits were conducted in 2021. 11 CARs have been fully implemented.
  - One CAR has one General, Privacy corrective action outstanding.
  - One IF is currently non-compliant with 25 corrective actions outstanding.
- 89% of corrective actions are signed off.

5.4 Compliance Monitoring Program Conclusions
In 2022, WADA’s compliance monitoring program contains data from the CCQ and audits. As mentioned previously, continuous monitoring non-conformities were also merged into CCQ and audit CARs, resulting in a rich source of data from which to draw conclusions. When comparing with 2021 data based solely on 13 audits conducted, the average number of non-conformities per CAR reduced from 21.8 in 2021 to 18.6 in 2022 (15%).
Anti-Doping Program Areas

Figure 8: Combined Non-Conformities from CCQ and Audits per Program Area

- 111 CCQ CARs and nine audit CARs generated **2228** non-conformities.
- As in previous years, Testing generated the most non-conformities. Education generated the second most non-conformities following the first global assessment of the implementation of the ISE through the CCQ.
- Privacy, General and Education non-conformities increased. This could be due to the following factors:
  - The introduction of the ISE resulted in many more mandatory requirements for Signatories to implement. Previously mandatory requirements for Education were linked to limited articles in the Code. New requirements often take time for Signatories to adapt to and implement within their own programs. Some Signatories therefore appear reliant on the CCQ to address the changes through the corrective actions provided in the CAR.
  - General section increases can be linked to new requirements for NADO operational independence and questions linked to financial and human resources and governance requirements.
  - Privacy non-conformity increase can be attributed to the increase in requirements following the GDPR coming into force in 2018 and the subsequent changes required in the ISPPPI.
- When comparing progress made between CCQs from 2017 to 2022, Testing (by **50%**), Results Management (by **52%**) and TUE (by **32%**) non-conformities for the same Signatories decreased. **Nine of 12** benchmarked program area activities have also improved between CCQs in terms of the level of conformity. These are all either Critical or High priority requirements which demonstrates further progress for the Signatories who have completed both the 2017 and 2022 CCQ so far. A number of new requirements in 2015 such as intelligence policies and sample retention and reanalysis policy which had high percentage of non-conformities in 2017 have reduced significantly in terms of non-conformities raised in 2022. The improvements can be attributed to a number of factors:
  - The CISP project focused on assisting Signatories to implement the 2021 Code and International Standards using lessons learned from the 2017 CCQ. This included developing resources in program areas where high non-conformity was observed in 2017 such as templates, webinars and the updating of guidelines to assist Signatories.
  - Signatories themselves are more familiar with the requirements of the compliance monitoring program and the need to ensure they have programs in line with the latest version of the Code.
  - A number of requirements that remained the same or similar between the 2015 and 2021 Code’s are now embedded into Signatories’ programs and therefore required no change or adjustment.
Type of Signatory

- In 2022, NADOs generated more non-conformities when compared to IFs during audits and CCQ, often as a result of more complex anti-doping programs, covering many sports and disciplines, and more complex national legal frameworks. In addition, NADOs are subject to more unique requirements and therefore more questions during CCQ and audits.

- NADOs generated more non-conformities than IFs in all program areas apart from Education and Privacy. It would appear that NADOs already had well developed Education programs prior to the introduction of the ISE and the CCQ assessment. For Privacy, the exact same average non-conformities per CAR were recorded for NADOs and IFs.

Figure 9: Combined CCQ and Audit Non-Conformities (Average per CAR)

- In 2022, NADOs averaged 21.5 non-conformities per CAR issued for either an audit or CCQ and IFs 14.6. This represents a significant improvement when compared to 2021 data (although in 2021 the data was limited to audits). In 2021 NADOs averaged 23.9 and IFs 18.4.

- When comparing IF data between the CCQ issued in 2017 and 2022, the average number of non-conformities per CAR reduced from 23 to 14.4 (37%). Three IFs reduced the number of non-conformities by over 30 non-conformities marking a significant improvement in IF compliance. IFs continue to benefit from support provided by organizations such as the International Testing Agency (ITA) and NADOs.

- At the end of 2022, three Signatories remained non-compliant, one NADO and one IF as a result of audits and RUSADA.

Category of non-conformity

- In 2022, the average number of Critical and High Priority non-conformities per CAR also trended downwards. When combining audit and CCQ data, Critical non-conformities reduced from 8.3 to 5.7 (31%) and High priority non-conformities reduced from 11.6 to 8.2 (29%). General non-conformities (largely due to the increase in Privacy non-conformities) increased from 3 to 4.6 (53%).
Resources

- Resources play a critical role for WADA and Signatories in monitoring and managing compliance. For Signatories, resources are evaluated both by self-reporting as well as an assessment of appropriate resources based upon the quality of anti-doping programs in place. From the CCQ, 27 of 111 Signatories (24%) have insufficient resources. Of these Signatories, 22 were NADOs, some of which suggested that the increase in requirements in the 2021 Code and International Standards contributed to an inability to meet all requirements due to financial and human resources.

- WADA staggered the roll out of CCQs to Signatories and reduced the number of audits to facilitate the planned level of compliance monitoring.

- Following concerns raised by Signatories in terms of the timeliness of WADA’s responses to Signatory submissions, the roll out of CCQs in 2023 and 2024 will be adjusted and learnings will be built into future CCQ roll outs.

Value of audits on maintaining compliant programs over time

- 33 of the 44 Signatories (75%) audited in between the 2017 and 2022 CCQ recorded fewer non-conformities in the 2022 CCQ. This suggests that audits are effective in maintaining compliant anti-doping programs over time and is more notable given the fact that the number of requirements placed on Signatories were higher in 2022.
  - Of the 28 NADOs audited, 19 (68%) recorded fewer non-conformities. Of those, eight recorded over 10 fewer non-conformities in 2022, one of which recorded 34 fewer non-conformities in their 2022 CCQ.
  - Of the 16 IFs audited, 14 (88%) recorded fewer non-conformities, eight of whom recorded over 10 fewer non-conformities.

5.5 Opportunities to Improve

WADA’s compliance monitoring programs have continued to evolve and mature with adjustments made due to resource challenges, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the constant feedback and monitoring of the program by WADA, the CRC and its stakeholders. In line with the Compliance Strategy and ISO 9001 principles, opportunities to improve the program are continually sought and implemented.

In 2022, a number of opportunities to improve have been identified:

Data Analytics

- WADA is a data rich environment and the creation of an organization wide Data Analytics Pilot project as well as the hiring of a data analyst will allow the following improvements in compliance to be explored to optimize the use of data:
  - The ability to assess Signatory programs in real-time rather than “looking back in time” to assess the current situation which is routine for audits and CCQ.
  - The analysis of data identifies issues and trends for improvement within Signatory type, geographical region and program area.
  - Identifying causal links between different non-conformities may anticipate issues so that program development initiatives and compliance monitoring, become preventative rather than reactive.
  - The potential future publication of data will allow Signatories to further self-assess and reflect on their own programs and make adjustments independently of compliance interventions.
Analyzing the complexity of corrective actions can assist with Signatory resourcing as there is a
difference in effort, expertise and time required depending on the corrective action. Updating a
document takes much less time and effort that creating or developing a requirement from nothing.

Organization

- **Enhancing support to Signatories in fulfilling their compliance obligations**: The ongoing collaboration with the Program Development Impact Area will be leveraged to assist Signatories (NADOs in particular) with their compliance obligations through implementation of key program area projects aimed at improving Signatory capacity and capability. In 2023 one project will focus on Testing which has generated the most non-conformities from WADA’s compliance monitoring program.

- **Optimizing monitoring and assessment of organization-wide projects**: As part of WADA’s new organizational structure a Strategic Impact Board has been created to monitor ongoing organization-wide projects such as the CCQ and ADOPAF, as well as measure the effectiveness and impact of projects.

- **Assessment of CCQ effectiveness and purpose as a monitoring tool**: Once this iteration of the CCQ project is complete in 2024, an assessment on future CCQs will be undertaken to determine the best use of CCQ moving forward. Once more real-time monitoring is in place through the program area monitoring program, CCQ could be used as a means for Signatories to self-report on new requirements in future revisions of the Code and International Standards. This would assist with resources both within WADA and Signatories. Ensuring WADA has the required resources to ensure timely responses to Signatory actions will also be factored into future roll out plans for CCQ.

6 Anti-Doping Rules

Despite the latest version of the Code having entered into force on 1 January 2021, a significant number of Signatories continue to further amend their rules or to develop new rules throughout 2022. In addition, a number of Signatories sent rules/legislation for WADA’s review as part of the responses provided in the operational independence section of the CCQ.

Rules review is a resource-intensive activity since WADA must frequently review several versions of the Signatories’ draft rules before being able to consider the final draft to be in line with the Code. Throughout the year, WADA continued to provide regular assistance and guidance to the relevant Signatories in this process, dedicating significant time and resources to facilitate the implementation of the Code by all Signatories. This included:

- Virtual meetings;
- In-person meetings (where possible and needed);
- Targeted individual assistance to Signatories where needed; and
- Continuous cooperation programs that WADA has developed with global stakeholders such as the ITA and the Regional Anti-Doping Organizations (RADOs) to support their respective members or clients in this exercise.

Between 1 January 2022 and 31 December 2022, WADA reviewed 265 sets of rules (including, where applicable, legislation). Some Signatories provided several drafts over a number of months until their rules were approved to be in line with the Code. To compare this with 2019 when again no revised Code required changes to rules, 189 sets of rules were received. This represents a 40% increase.

In 2022, WADA noted in certain regions of the world an increase in the number of countries having chosen to implement the Code through national legislation. In these cases, which represents approximately 10% of the overall Signatory NADOs, WADA provided individualised assistance and guidance. In certain cases, despite
WADA’s reminders, new legislation or amendments to existing legislation were developed and adopted without informing or consulting WADA, resulting in the adopted legislation being in some instances non-compliant. As a result, compliance procedures had to be opened.

Throughout 2022, WADA also continued to receive anti-doping rules from a number of MEOs. Given the limited jurisdiction of MEOs and the fact that their rules only apply to the period of their specific event, not all MEOs were required to have rules in line with the 2021 Code by 1 January 2021.

The rules reviewing process continues to be certified under WADA’s compliance monitoring program ISO9001:2015 certification. Based on its ISO process, WADA has to provide feedback to Signatories on the draft rules and/or draft legislation submitted for review within a maximum of three weeks from the date of receipt. WADA met this objective 100% of the time throughout 2022. This element was crucial in order to maintain momentum in the drafting process for a number of Signatories.

Lessons learned:

| Lesson Learned                                                                 | Action Taken                                                                 |
|                                                                              |                                                                              |
| The volume of rules/legislation to review continues to be significant even a long-time after a new version of the Code has entered into force, due to the fact that a number of Signatories that had already drafted rules in line with the 2021 Code decided to make amendments to those rules or to create new rules. This trend had already been observed in the past years in relation to previous versions of the Code. WADA’s resources continue to be stretched, in particular in order to meet the pre-determined timeline for WADA to provide feedback, as per the ISO-certified process. | WADA will continue to ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to this important task.  
WADA will continue to encourage Signatories to assess what is the most adapted and efficient legal framework and integrate only essential principles in the legislation if a legislation is deemed necessary. |
| The number of Signatories implementing the Code through legislation in 2022 has been higher than in previous years, in particular in certain regions of the world such as Africa. This appears to be a new trend in those regions. In certain cases, despite WADA’s reminders, legislation was developed and adopted without informing or involving WADA or non-compliant amendments to drafts considered by WADA as being in line with the Code were made during the adoption process. Because of this practice, certain compliance procedures had to be opened. | WADA will continue to remind Signatories of the need to provide drafts for review prior to the beginning of the internal process leading to their formal adoption and, following WADA’s confirmation that the drafts are in line, to consult WADA on every amendment considered during the adoption process. This element is even more important for legislation than for rules, given the political and technical challenges implied in legislative processes.  
Furthermore, WADA will continue to ensure that sufficient resources are allocated so that individualized assistance and guidance can be provided when the Code is implemented through legislation. In addition, WADA will continue to ensure that guidance on legislation is provided in all relevant WADA meetings such as forums, webinars, seminars and meetings with groups of Signatories (e.g. RADOs), etc. |
| As already observed in previous years, the issuance of CARs and the opening of compliance procedures with deadlines have resulted in a strong acceleration of the drafting/ adoption processes in cases where non-conformities with the previous rules had been raised. | In relation to the implementation of the Code in legal systems, WADA will continue to ensure that the processes established by the ISCCS are promptly implemented when needed. |
7 Compliance Investigations Section (CIS)

As part of WADA’s I&I Department, the CIS investigates independently and cooperates closely with the Compliance Taskforce and the CRC.

The CIS started its work in November 2020 initially as part of a pilot project for three years. In 2022 it was approved to extend the mandate of the CIS for a further three years (up to the end of 2026). The CIS consists of an investigator, an intelligence analyst, and a confidential information manager (who is part of WADA’s Confidential Information Unit - CIU).

The CIS attends internal Compliance Taskforce meetings and collaborates closely with members of both the Compliance, Rules and Standards Impact Area and the Testing department. The CIS is active in the preparation of audits by the relevant audit teams.

In 2022, CIS, concluded several compliance related investigations, including:

- An investigation into historical allegations against the Czech Anti-Doping Committee (CADC) and the former CADC Director General;
- Allegations raised against the chairman of the Pakistan NADO (Operation Jasmine); and
- Allegations against the International Tennis Federation (Operation Ash).

All results have been shared with the Compliance Taskforce with recommendations for further actions where applicable. Where relevant, reports have been published on WADA’s website.

Furthermore, in 2022, the I&I Department’s CIU received through its Speak up! program 40 compliance-related allegations (up from 32 in 2021) of which four were considered serious enough to be further investigated by the CIS. The remaining 36 allegations were either sent to relevant Signatories or other organizations for follow up or referred to the Compliance Taskforce for its information.
8 Code Compliance (Enforcement) Procedures

When non-conformities are identified, the objective is to assist Signatories through dialogue and support in order to correct their non-conformities and ultimately achieve and maintain compliance with the Code. Declaring Signatories non-compliant is a last resort, as per the ISCCS.

However, if a Signatory does not correct its non-conformities within set timeframes as per the ISCCS, WADA’s internal Compliance Taskforce launches an enforcement procedure (compliance procedure), giving the Signatory written notice that a non-conformity has not been corrected and a new timeframe (of up to three months) to correct it.

If the matter is not satisfactorily addressed by the Signatory within this new timeframe, the case is referred by the Compliance Taskforce to the CRC, which may recommend to WADA’s Executive Committee that the Signatory be sent a formal notice alleging that it is non-compliant with the requirements of the Code and/or the International Standards.

The number of compliance procedures opened in 2021 was extremely high (53) due in particular to the resumption of compliance procedures in February 2021 after almost one year of freezing in light of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the number of new compliance procedures remained high in 2022 linked to the CCQ and legislation non-conformities.

More specifically, 39 compliance procedures, related to both the implementation of the Code in domestic legal systems and the compliance of the anti-doping programs implemented by Signatories, were opened in 2022.

Of these 39 procedures:

- 17 were still pending at the end of 2022.
- Nine Signatories received a referral letter that their case would be reviewed by the CRC at its next meeting as the three-month deadline given by WADA’s internal Compliance Taskforce had expired;
  - Two of these Signatories resolved their compliance issue prior to the CRC meeting.
  - Three cases remain on the agenda of the next CRC meeting to be held in March 2023.
  - Four cases were already reviewed by the CRC (concerning three NADOs and one IF). These four procedures concluded with the IF being declared non-compliant by WADA’s Executive Committee on 15 October 2022 and the three NADOs being placed on the “watchlist”.

Lessons learned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Learned</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of Signatories who entered a compliance procedure satisfactorily implemented the relevant corrective actions before it was referred to the CRC.</td>
<td>WADA will continue to prioritize dialogue and support in order to assist Signatories in correcting non-conformities as soon as possible in the process and ultimately achieve and maintain compliance with the Code. At the same time, WADA will continue to ensure that the process established by the ISCCS is promptly implemented in relation to Signatories that do not fully implement the Code in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Learned</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2021, WADA had faced an unprecedented and exceptional situation with an extremely high number of compliance procedures due to the combination of the resumption of compliance procedures in February 2021 after almost one year of freezing due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the high number of procedures related to the implementation of the 2021 Code in domestic legal systems. The number of compliance procedures opened in 2022 has been lower than 2021 but still high. As a result, WADA had to manage several compliance procedures at the same time and its resources were stretched in order to meet the pre-determined timelines and requirements set by the ISCCS.</td>
<td>WADA will have to ensure that adequate resources continue to be available in order to ensure the sustainability of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possibility provided in the ISCCS for Signatories to dispute allegations of non-compliance to CAS can create substantial extra costs for WADA and these costs are not easily quantifiable in advance, as evidenced in the past by the RUSADA case. A high number of compliance procedures means higher possibility of having a case brought to CAS.</td>
<td>WADA will continue to be flexible in its budget and resource allocation and to ensure a contingency budget is in place for potential CAS appeals related to compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The high number of compliance procedures opened or pending in 2022 confirmed the effectiveness of the processes set in the ISCCS, where WADA is not the judge but a party to the case, at the same level as the other party which is the relevant Signatory. The experience in implementing the ISCCS has also allowed WADA to identify certain adjustments that could be made to the ISCCS and to the corresponding provisions of the Code, in order to further strengthen the legal framework.</td>
<td>WADA gathers from experience that the procedure set by the ISCCS is solid and effective. That being said, WADA will continue to identify certain adjustments that could further strengthen the ISCCS and the relevant provisions of the Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As already evidenced by the RUSADA case in the past and by new cases in 2022, the monitoring of the implementation of the consequences of non-compliance by other Signatories can be a very time-consuming activity for WADA staff.</td>
<td>WADA will continue to ensure that sufficient human resources are allocated to this task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In one case where the supervision of certain activities of the relevant Signatory was one of the imposed consequences of non-compliance, WADA has been obliged to act as supervisory entity by default, in the absence of other Signatories in a position to undertake such task. This activity which was not foreseen or planned has proven to be time-consuming for WADA staff.</td>
<td>WADA will continue to ensure that sufficient human resources are available and can be allocated to this task if and when needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Risk Management

Developing a risk management system was first identified in the 2020 Compliance Annual Plan. In 2022 following the completion of WADA’s corporate risk assessment and business continuity project, the Compliance Impact Area engaged with the same consultant to develop a risk management system specific to compliance.

As part of the compliance risk assessment system, a risk framework was established to clearly articulate the approach taken to identify, analyze and manage compliance risks as well as the development of a risk register.

A structured approach is used to identify risks, based on similar risk areas used for the corporate WADA risk assessment. This allows the seamless integration of compliance risks into the overall WADA risk management plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; Regulatory</td>
<td>Risks driven by the legal environment surrounding compliance activities (e.g., decisions by CAS, legal actions by Signatories, litigation against WADA, etc.) as well as Signatories’ adherence to the Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Risks relating to the operations of the Compliance Impact Area, and the compliance process that impact the health, safety, and wellbeing of colleagues and / or their ability to carry out objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational, Governance / Management</td>
<td>Risks pertaining to the governance and management protocols within WADA that impact Compliance’s ability to achieve its objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Risks stemming from the political environment, challenges faced by WADA and the impact on stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Risks or activities that impact the overall quality and credibility of the compliance-monitoring program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Risks that affect WADA’s and/or the Compliance Impact Area’s reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Risks related to financial and human resources within the relevant departments of WADA, as well as the impact on staff (e.g. workload, motivation, fatigue/burn out, etc.). This also includes the impact on the governance bodies for compliance: the CRC and WADA Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Risks related to technology that impact Compliance’s ability to execute on its mandate, including both functionality of technology as well as data security.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Compliance risk register currently contains 32 risks to be monitored and mitigated in 2023. An annual cycle of reviewing current risks on the register as well identifying new risks will start in early 2023. In addition, the CRC will complete and maintain its own risk register.
10 Special Issues

RUSADA Reinstatement Process

As of 17 December 2022, the two-year period of consequences contained in the CAS decision came to an end. These consequences included restrictions on hosting events in Russia and the use of the Russian flag and anthems. Also contained in the CAS decision was a series of reinstatement conditions.

At the end of 2022 a number of those reinstatement conditions had not been met therefore RUSADA remains non-compliant. In addition, a Critical non-conformity resulting from the virtual audit conducted in September 2022 was also outstanding at the end of 2022.

In line with the ISCCS, WADA management will make the first assessment of whether the reinstatement conditions have been met as well as monitoring the completion of the audit non-conformity.

Only when both of these requirements have been met to the satisfaction of WADA management will it be presented to the CRC for their own assessment. Should the CRC agree with WADA management that the requirements have been met, they will present a case for RUSADA’s reinstatement to WADA’s Executive Committee.

Ukraine

In 2022, WADA monitored the ongoing situation in Ukraine following the invasion by the Russian Federation. The ongoing compliance procedure was excused by WADA’s Executive Committee in September 2022 as a result of the conflict. In 2023, WADA will continue to monitor the situation and ensure that Ukrainian athletes still competing continue to be subject to an appropriate anti-doping program through a coordinated approach with Signatories.

11 Integrated Assessment of Findings and Areas of Special Focus

11.1 WADA Internal Structures, Processes and Compliance Monitoring

WADA completed its first full year of its reorganized structure in line with its Strategic Plan 2020-2024. The Compliance, Rules and Standards Impact Area manages the Agency’s compliance activities through collaboration with WADA’s functional expert departments.

The main findings were:

- **Clearer processes for operational planning, initiating projects and greater scrutiny of resources required** have been provided by the formation of a new Strategic Management Office (SMO) within the Office of the Director General and a Strategic Impact Board as part of WADA’s re-organization.

- **Data analytics**: WADA’s compliance monitoring program is moving towards real-time monitoring, as a consequence of the implementation of data analytics. The capture, storage and analysis of data will lead to more data informed decision making and more effective trend analysis especially when assessing compliance data.

- The **CIS** is now fully embedded into WADA’s I&I department and has secured funding until the end of 2026, allowing WADA to invest resources into investigations when compliance-related allegations arise. In order to allow the prosecution of cases involving historic, egregious non-conformities by Signatories, WADA is seeking to make amendments to the ISCCS and Code in 2023, acting as a further deterrent to Signatories and individuals who may intentionally breach anti-doping rules.
- **CCQ non-conformities** were reduced as a result of CISP activities throughout 2022 (webinars, regional focussed workshops and adding resources to ADEL) when compared with 2017.

- The processes and decisions made by the Compliance Taskforce, CRC and WADA’s Executive Committee, in line with the ISCCS, were effective. No recommendations were challenged at CAS.

- **Risk management**: a structured framework has been established for the implementation of risk management in Compliance, which will be fully implemented in 2023.

- Compliance KPIs were, for the most part met, with the exception of the timely issue of CARs for audits and the CCQ, reflecting the pressure on resources.

- ISCCS revision and stakeholder consultation were conducted in 2022, with further consultation planned for 2023.

- The **RUSADA case** continued to be resource intensive for WADA’s monitoring and for Signatories that were required to implement the CAS decision, however, sanctions following the invasion of Ukraine limited Russian athletes’ participation in sports and hosting events which reduced WADA’s monitoring compared to 2021.

### 11.2 Monitoring Signatory Compliance

Despite the challenges of recent years, progress towards compliance maturity is continuing, albeit more slowly in some areas than others. The key findings of Signatory compliance monitoring in 2022 are:

- **Anti-doping rules and legislation**: This continues to be a technical, resource-intensive activity and involves both the Compliance Impact Area and Regional Offices in particular. Non-compliance cases involving national legislation are increasing.

- **The number of compliance procedures** remains high, suggesting that compliance maturity is not yet established. Deadlines and compliance enforcement procedures continue to be effective in maintaining Signatory compliance, in particular, for cases involving anti-doping rules and/or legislation.

- The **2022 CCQ** was WADA’s primary compliance activity. Some significant improvements and progress were identified when comparisons are made for the same Signatories from their 2017 CCQ. This is even more notable, given the increased requirements in the 2021 Code and International Standards.

- **Non-conformities identified by compliance programs (CCQ, audits and continuous monitoring)**:
  - **Testing** continued to generate the most non-conformities in 2022. Testing will be subject to a Program Development/GLDF project in 2023 with 16 NADOs identified through the CCQ for capacity building and capability training.
  - **Education** generated the second highest number of non-conformities, following the first global assessment of implementation of the new ISE. Education was the highest source of non-conformities for IFs.
  - When comparing data between the 2017 and 2022 CCQs the number of **Critical non-conformities** increased by 8%. Critical Testing requirements increased by 32%. This can be partially attributed to the introduction of the exhaustive list of Critical program area requirements in Annex A of the ISCCS in 2018 which formalised which areas were considered Critical.
  - **NADOs** continue to generate, on average per CAR, more non-conformities than IFs, largely linked to Testing.
− **Proactive mitigating actions** such as WADA staff support to Signatories, the provision of templates, webinars, updated guidelines, and self-monitoring tools (e.g. for Testing) were helpful in reducing the proportion of Critical non-conformities.

− **Resources within WADA and Signatories** has been an ongoing challenge in 2022, primarily for NADOs.

− **Value of the CCQ**: this plays an important role in checking that Signatories have adjusted and updated their anti-doping programs in line with the most recent revisions of the Code and Standards. This is particularly true for new requirements such as Education in 2022. The future use of CCQs will be reviewed in line with the next planned revision of the Code, balancing the resource-intensive nature of the exercise with the potential focus on new or amended requirements only. It is anticipated that program area monitoring using more real-time data may reduce the need for the CCQ to encompass all program areas, as done in the last two iterations.

### 11.3 Focus for 2023

The integrated assessment has therefore identified the following areas for consideration in 2023:

− Efficient operational planning with a focus on resources.

− Implementation of risk management plans to mitigate risks and optimize resources.

− Continued development of the data analytics capability in program area monitoring (particularly in the implementation of more real-time monitoring).

− Amendments to the ISCCS.

− Continued collaboration with CIS.

− Activities relating to the assessment of RUSADA’s reinstatement conditions.

− Continued monitoring of Ukraine NADO and Ukrainian athletes.

− Proactive mitigating actions for areas with a high proportion of Critical non-conformities, including Testing and Legislation, continuing to build on positive experience in 2022.

− Revaluation of the scope and timing of the CCQ for future editions.

### 12 Implications for WADA’s Compliance Monitoring Program in 2023

From the findings and trends identified above, WADA’s 2023 Compliance Annual Plan, will focus on:

**RUSADA Reinstatement Process**

− WADA management assessment of the reinstatement conditions and audit non-conformities

− CRC independent assessment and recommendation

**Ukraine**

− Ongoing monitoring of Ukrainian athletes

− Monitoring of force majeure situation and CRC recommendation to the Exco
Program Development

- **ADOPAF**: Support Program Development in the creation and implementation of the framework and the link to Program Area Monitoring (see below).
- **Data analytics**: Analysis, reporting and system development to identify trends and improvements in real time.
- **Testing project**: Support the implementation of the Testing capacity and capability project.

Compliance Monitoring Programs

- **Program Area Monitoring**: Through the ADOPAF develop processes and systems to implement Program Area Monitoring.
- **Legislation**: Develop strategies to mitigate challenges identified in countries developing and adopting national legislation.

ISCCS Update

- Ongoing review of the ISCCS including stakeholder consultation.