

# Summary of Audit Outcomes

## Audit details

Signatory	Dates of Audit	Type of Audit	Scope of Audit
International Powerlifting Federation (IPF)	3-4 October 2024	In-person <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virtual <input type="checkbox"/> Desk <input type="checkbox"/>	Full Audit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial Audit <input type="checkbox"/>

## Background of the audit

The audit was proposed by WADA's internal Compliance Taskforce and endorsed by the Compliance Review Committee (CRC) based on the monitoring process outlined in the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS), specifically Articles 7.2.1 and 7.2.2. WADA officially notified IPF of the audit on 3 June 2024.

The Lead Auditor communicated with IPF via email to provide initial details and a draft audit plan, and on 10 September 2024 held a teleconference to discuss the objectives of the audit, the audit plan, logistical details, and to confirm the availability of all IPF staff and documentation during the period of the audit.

## Methodology

To prepare for this audit, the audit team used data held by WADA, including ADAMS, Gracenote, and the legal department's database, as part of its review of IPF's anti-doping program. Furthermore, WADA requested that IPF provide a number of documents in advance of the audit.

From the discussions, interviews, observation of procedures and review of documents provided by IPF during the audit, it was apparent that IPF had prepared for the audit and was open in the discussions. Staff and documents were available to the audit team during the audit.

## Table of findings

Date Updated:	3 September 2025			
Program Area	Critical Findings	High Priority Findings	General Findings	Total
	(completed and signed off)	(completed and signed off)	(completed and signed off)	(completed and signed off)
Governance	-	-	-	-
Testing	8 (3)	5 (3)	-	13 (6)
Intelligence & Investigations	-	-	-	-
Results Management	-	2 (2)	-	2 (2)
Therapeutic Use Exemptions	1 (1)	2 (2)	-	3 (3)
Education	1 (1)	1 (1)	-	2 (2)
Data Privacy	-	-	5 (5)	5 (5)
Total	10 (5)	10 (8)	5 (5)	25 (18)

## Summary of findings<sup>1</sup>

### Critical findings

1. It was identified that IPF had not entered all Doping Control Forms (DCFs) within 21-days of sample collection, that additional errors were found on other DCFs and potential duplicate athlete profiles were present requiring attention.
2. Although IPF had completed a testing risk assessment, it did not meet the requirements of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI), including, a detailed analysis of the physical demands of the sport, which substances would benefit athletes and a seasonal analysis of when substances may benefit athletes based on the sport calendar.
3. The Test Distribution Plan (TDP) was not aligned with the testing risk assessment, did not prioritise out-of-competition testing or the collection of blood samples and IPF did not update the TDP regularly.

<sup>1</sup> The following is a summary of the key findings of the audit as opposed to an exhaustive list of all findings. In respect of each finding, WADA required a specific corrective action to be undertaken in order to avoid similar issues in the future.

4. The Registered Testing Pool (RTP) list in ADAMS was not maintained, some RTP athletes had not provided their whereabouts in ADAMS and insufficient tests had been conducted on both RTP and Testing Pool athletes. Some shortfalls were also identified in the Testing Pool notification letter.
5. IPF's Therapeutic Use Exemption Committee (TUEC) members had not signed a conflict of interest and confidentiality declaration as required in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUE).
6. IPF's website did not contain all mandatory education information requirements as detailed in the Code, including, principles and values of clean sport, participants' rights and responsibilities under the Code, strict liability, consequences of doping and sample collection procedures.

### High priority findings

1. IPF did not have a written strategy for the retention of samples and further analysis.
2. It was identified that on a number of occasions, Athlete Passport Management Unit (APMU) recommendations had not been followed by IPF. In addition, IPF has not reset certain passports or consulted with its APMU to determine whether a passport reset is warranted following Adverse Analytical Findings (AAFs).
3. Shortfalls were identified in various sample collection procedures, including, documented authority for sample collection agencies to test on behalf of IPF and instructions on what is considered a reasonable out-of-competition test attempt.
4. IPF's anti-doping rule violation notification letter did not contain a number of the mandatory requirements as detailed in the International Standard for Results Management (ISRM). In addition, no evidence was presented that IPF uses reasonable efforts to obtain the athlete's (or other person's) consent to publicly disclose decisions in cases where it is determined that the athlete or other person did not commit an anti-doping rule violation.
5. IPF's Therapeutic Use Exemption Committee (TUEC) did not always meet the 21-day period to make a decision on Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) applications. In addition, the TUEC did not meet the 21-day period to report its decisions into ADAMS as required in the ISTUE.
6. IPF did not monitor or evaluate its education program as required by the Code.

### General findings

1. In the area of data privacy a number of findings were identified

## Conclusion

IPF recorded a significant number of findings from its audit, with the majority in the area of testing. IPF was required to update its testing risk assessment, TDP (especially the prioritization of out-of-competition and blood

testing) and its RTP and ABP programs. Improvements to TUE processing and uploading into ADAMS was also identified.