

Summary of Audit Outcomes

Audit details

Signatory	Dates of Audit	Type of Audit	Scope of Audit
ONAD Communauté française (French Community of Belgium NADO)	31 March and 1 April 2025	In-person ☒ Virtual ☐ Desk ☐	Full Audit ☒ Partial Audit ☐ If partial audit, program areas audited:

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 French Community of Belgium NADO of the audit on 31 January 2025.

The Lead Auditor communicated with the French Community of Belgium NADO via email to provide initial details and a draft audit plan, and on 10 March 2025 held a teleconference to discuss the objectives of the audit, the audit plan, logistical details, and to confirm the availability of all staff of the French Community of Belgium NADO 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 the French Community of Belgium NADO's anti-doping program. Furthermore, WADA requested that the French Community of Belgium NADO provide a number of documents in advance of the audit.

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

General findings

Date updated: 10 October 2025				
Program Area	Critical Findings	High Priority Findings	General Findings	Total
Governance	-	1	-	1
Testing	7	6	-	13
Intelligence & Investigations	-	1	-	1
Results Management	10	4	-	14
Therapeutic Use Exemptions	2	-	-	2
Education	-	2	-	2
Data Privacy	-	-	5	5
Total	19	14	5	38

Summary of findings¹

Critical findings

1. The French Community of Belgium NADO had not entered all Doping Control Forms (DCFs) into ADAMS within the 21-day requirement from sample collection, as required in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI). In addition, some data entry errors were identified, leading to certain samples not being matched in ADAMS.
2. Although the French Community of Belgium NADO had conducted a testing risk assessment, it did not fully comply with the ISTI. The risk assessment also did not include a certain number of sports and sport disciplines in which athletes perform at national and international level in Belgium.
3. The Test Distribution Plan (TDP) was not aligned with the risk assessment, as required in the ISTI. The TDP also did not prioritise between sports and/or sport disciplines, nor did it determine what types of testing are required in an order of priority to detect and deter doping practices within sports/sport disciplines.

¹ 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 French Community of Belgium NADO did not sufficiently prioritize between different athletes for the purposes of target testing, as required in the ISTI. In one sport, notification of athletes selected for sample collection was carried out by displaying the list of athletes selected, which is contrary to no-advance notice testing as described in the ISTI.
5. The criteria for inclusion in the French Community of Belgium NADO's Registered Testing Pool (RTP) and Testing Pool (TP) could not be updated as needed due to regulatory factors. Insufficient samples were collected on several TP athletes, contrary to the ISTI.
6. There were several cases in which the French Community of Belgium NADO did not notify the relevant Anti-Doping Organizations (ADOs) with a right of appeal of its reasoned decision not to bring forward an Adverse Analytical Finding (AAF) as an Anti-Doping Rule Violation (ADRV), as required in the Code and International Standard for Results Management (ISRM).
7. There were several cases in which a notice or notice of charge issued by the French Community of Belgium NADO to an athlete was not simultaneously provided to the athlete's National Anti-Doping Organization (NADO), International Federation (IF) and WADA, nor were these notifications uploaded into ADAMS within a reasonable time, as required in the Code and ISRM.
8. When notifying an athlete of an AAF, the notification did not include the athlete's right to request copies of the "A" sample laboratory documentation package, as required in the ISRM.
9. When a notice of charge is sent to an athlete, the notice does not indicate the possibility for the athlete to admit the ADRV(s) within twenty (20) days from receipt of the letter of charge and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility under Code Article 10.8.1 (if applicable), as required in the ISRM.
10. In several cases, the French Community of Belgium NADO did not promptly report a decision to register a whereabouts failure into ADAMS, as required in the Code and ISRM. Also, when notifying an athlete of a filing failure, the French Community of Belgium NADO did not indicate that the athlete must file the required whereabouts filing (or update) by the deadline specified in the notice (which must be within 48 hours after receipt of the notice), as required in the ISRM. When the French Community of Belgium NADO decides not to register an apparent whereabouts failure, it did not notify WADA, the IF and the ADO which uncovered the whereabouts failure, giving reasons for its decision.
11. In case of an AAF or Adverse Passport Finding (APF) for a prohibited substance or prohibited method other than a specified substance or a specified method, the French Community of Belgium NADO did not impose a provisional suspension promptly upon or after the review and notification required under Code Article 7.2.
12. The procedural regulation of the Commission interfédérale disciplinaire en matière de dopage (CIDD), which acts as the first instance and appeal panels, is not fully consistent with the hearing independence requirements set out in the Code and ISRM. In addition, several decisions of the CIDD did not include all mandatory requirements in their decisions as required in the Code and ISRM.
13. The French Community of Belgium could not confirm whether the members of its Therapeutic Use Exemption Committee or the independent experts who may be consulted on specific Therapeutic Use Exemptions (TUE) questions, sign conflict of interest declarations. Some aspects of the TUE application

process published on the French Community of Belgium NADO's website were either partially described or incorrect.

High priority findings

1. The general statistical reports published on the French Community of Belgium's website contain statistical information pertaining only to Testing, rather than to all of its doping control activities, as required in the Code.
2. The French Community of Belgium NADO did not coordinate its testing efforts with other ADOs with overlapping testing authority to maximise the effectiveness of those combined efforts, to avoid unnecessarily repetitive testing of particular athletes and to ensure athletes competing at international events are suitably tested in advance, as required in the ISTI.
3. The French Community of Belgium NADO does not follow up on Athlete Passport Management Unit (APMU) target testing recommendations, as required in the ISTI.
4. While the French Community of Belgium NADO uses temperature loggers to record the temperature of blood samples from sample collection to analysis, it does not report the data into ADAMS, as required in the ISTI.
5. The RTP inclusion letter of the French Community of Belgium NADO does not allow an RTP athlete to use their overnight address or training location for their 60-minute timeslot, as permitted by the ISTI, although in practice the audit team noted that athletes could in fact do so.
6. The policies and procedures of the French Community of Belgium NADO in relation to intelligence gathering did not properly address the risk of leaks or inadvertent disclosure, as required in the ISTI.
7. In some cases, where a possible failure to comply came to the attention of the French Community of Belgium NADO, it did not inform WADA accordingly, as required in the ISRM.
8. In several cases, disqualification of results took place when the CIDD imposed a provisional suspension, rather than once an ADRV decision had been rendered, as required in the ISRM.
9. Upon appointment to a hearing panel, the CIDD members did not sign a declaration that there are no facts or circumstances known to them which might call into question their impartiality in the eyes of any of the parties, other than any circumstances disclosed in the declaration, as required in the ISRM. In the framework of the procedure before the CIDD, parties were not notified of the identity of the hearing panel members appointed to hear and determine the matter nor of their right to challenge their appointment, as required in the ISRM.
10. The education plan does not include information on the human, financial and material resources available and potentially available to support its education program, as required in the International Standard for Education (ISE). In addition, the French Community of Belgium NADO did not carry out a yearly evaluation of its education program, as required in the ISE.

General findings

1. In the area of data privacy five findings were identified.

Conclusion

The French Community of Belgium NADO recorded a high number of findings during its audit. Shortfalls were identified mainly in Testing and Results Management, with 13 (seven critical) and 14 (10 critical) corrective actions respectively. Some key findings relate to the complexity of the legal framework as well as the anti-doping landscape in Belgium, which is the only country in the world that does not have a single, centralized NADO. It is recommended that the four NADOs of Belgium attempt to streamline their activities in a more efficient manner.