

2027 CODE & IS UPDATE PROCESS

Final Draft: Summary of Major Changes

International Standard for Education

Executive Summary

Following the careful review and consideration of stakeholder comments provided during the [Third Consultation Phase](#), including Athlete feedback provided as part of the [Athlete-Centered Consultation](#), and through extensive consultations with the anti-doping community during the Final Drafting Phase, the International Standard for Education (ISE) Drafting Team has proposed further key changes in a final draft of the 2027 ISE as part of the ongoing [2027 Code & IS Update Process](#).

The purpose of this document is to summarize the major changes proposed in the final draft of the 2027 ISE, which predominantly build on those proposed in the [second draft of the 2027 ISE](#) and as summarized in the corresponding [second draft Summary of Major Changes](#).

Similar to the previous [Consultation Phase](#), it is important to note that the major changes from the Second Drafting Phase were largely accepted and supported by the anti-doping community. As such, it was necessary for these changes to be further reflected in Article 18 of the proposed final draft of the 2027 World Anti-Doping Code (Code) to ensure coherent alignment between both documents. These changes are now reflected in the proposed final draft of the 2027 Code and take into consideration stakeholder comments throughout the process thus far.

All 262 stakeholder submissions and contributions related to the second draft of the 2027 ISE have been reviewed by the ISE Drafting Team, thoroughly discussed, and factored into an updated version of the final draft of the 2027 ISE. These changes were further endorsed by the [WADA Education Committee](#). There was also ongoing communication with other Drafting Teams (Code and International Standards) to ensure ongoing changes across the World Anti-Doping Program were considered in the updated ISE. Over 500 responses from the Athlete-Centered Consultation were also considered. The purpose of this document is to outline the proposed major changes to the final draft of the 2027 ISE.

In addition, and just for reference purposes, the structure for all International Standards has been adapted and harmonized to support use and readability. This primarily relates to **Article 3: Interpretation**. There is no change in the structure to the ISE which was already structured in line with the Code. Article 3 also provides additional clarifications to clearly distinguish between mandatory requirements and recommendations in the document.

Changes from the Second Draft

There are several considerations for those reviewing the final draft of the 2027 ISE:

- As was the case for the first draft, there is broad support for the general direction of the proposed amendments to the ISE which is reflected in the stakeholder feedback.
- Changes between the second and final draft are minimal and relatively inconsequential in relation to compliance or mandatory requirements.
- A significant number of comments coalesced around the need for further clarity or additional explanations. While the ISE Drafting Team has endeavored to do this as much as possible, there are limitations in using a regulatory document such as the ISE to elaborate on all items. This noted, and to assist Signatories in clearly understanding the requirements of the ISE, Signatories shall receive a summary of major changes as well as all relevant material included as part of the Code Implementation Support Program (CISP), including notably an updated version of the [ISE Guidelines](#).
- Like the previous version, the perspective adopted by the ISE Drafting Team is that if there is no compliance consequence to the interpretation of a term, then further explanation is not provided as the Signatory is likely better placed to make an informed interpretation of that term, e.g., when determining the most influential Athlete Support Personnel (ASP) or describing the cultural context of a sport or country.
- There were further reservations from stakeholders regarding the expansion of the Education Pool, particularly vis-à-vis the ability to reach individuals within larger groups, and the potential subsequent compliance implications of this. The ISE Drafting Team has considered these factors in this final draft and wish to reiterate the drafting principles adopted at the beginning of this 2027 Code & IS Update Process according to which the 2027 ISE is purposefully ambitious in seeking to advance the education sector for the benefit of all Athletes, ASP and clean sport, to where it should be in 2027, as opposed to where it is in 2025.
- It is important to note that Signatories shall include the specified groups and categories as listed in ISE Article 6 within their Education Pool and to document in an Education Plan, the specific Education Activities that will be delivered to these groups and how they will be delivered. This noted, there will be no compliance ramifications for not reaching specific individuals who may form part of these groups and categories. This is similar to the principle according to which it may not always be possible to test every Athlete who is subject to testing although efforts should always be made to do so. Further clarification on this is provided below.
- Another important consideration in relation to the broadening of the Education Pool is that 89% of 509 Athletes who responded to the Athlete-Centered Consultation felt this was a positive development of the ISE. This was further illustrated by their comments which highlighted the need to know and understand anti-doping rules, procedures, rights and responsibilities and key risks associated with unintentional doping as some examples.

It is to be noted that any new changes in the final draft of the 2027 ISE, which do not otherwise stem from or build on those changes indicated in the second draft, will be accordingly marked as “New Addition”. Particularly, in this respect, the ISE Drafting Team wishes to draw the attention of stakeholders to the following new changes which have been included in this final draft:

- The defined term “Talented Level Athletes” has been added to Appendix I: Definitions to ensure clarity and consistency in its use throughout the document.
- ASP receiving notification of potential anti-doping rule violations have been added to Article 6.2.1 to align with Article 6.1.1.

- The requirement for Signatories to have information on their website related to the mandatory topics specified in Article 8.1.1, as currently required under the 2021 ISE, has been reinstated. This is to address the issues highlighted as part of the Athlete-Centered Consultation that there is still very much a need for Athletes to be able to access relevant information about anti-doping rules and clean sport.

Furthermore, the ISE Drafting Team wishes to mention certain other key developments which arose from its review of Athlete and stakeholder comments as well as through discussions with the anti-doping community during the Final Drafting Phase:

- The term “sport environment” has been revised to “sport culture” to better reflect the collective responsibility and shared values inherent in fostering a positive and inclusive sporting context.
- The accreditation and reaccreditation of Educators will be granted for a defined period not exceeding four years, in order to emphasize the importance of continuous professional development and the need for ongoing upskilling to maintain high standards of practice.
- The section on Event-Specific Education has been revised to further clarify the concept of Event-Specific Education and to provide preciseness of who is responsible for delivering education related to Events or series of Events.

Finally, as mentioned above, the ISE Drafting Team wishes to reiterate that additional guidance and supporting material will be provided in the revised 2027 Guidelines for the International Standard for Education and other CISP resources. Signatories are strongly encouraged to read and use the resources available to support the implementation of the 2027 ISE.

The following section offers a concise article-by-article summary of the changes in this final draft of the 2027 ISE.

Article 6: Establishing an Education Pool

Changes from the Second Draft

The proposed changes to this Article, as outlined during the Third Consultation Phase, involve restructuring the content by separating it according to Signatory requirements. This revision aims to provide greater clarity regarding the varying levels of obligations expected from different types of Signatories, ensuring a more accessible and practical understanding of compliance responsibilities.

Specifically, all mandatory categories of Athletes required to be included in an Education Pool are identified in Article 6.1.1. All other Athletes who should be considered for inclusion, but who are not otherwise included in the mandatory categories, are identified in Article 6.1.2 (i.e., Children and Youth, Talented-Level Athletes and University Athletes).

It is also noted that the requirements for inclusion in the Education Pool are well supported by the Athlete community with 89% in agreement with the proposals.

To support implementation, additional resources including templates, case studies, training materials, and other tools will be made available through CISP. These resources will be designed to assist Signatories in effectively meeting their obligations under the 2027 ISE.

Further clarification

In response to certain comments made during the Third Consultation Phase, and to offer further clarification,

the ISE Drafting Team wishes to provide some additional commentary below to support the interpretation of this Article.

In the final draft of the 2027 ISE, two core groups must be considered for inclusion in a Signatory's Education Pool. These are Athletes and ASP. Within these groups, specific categories of Athletes (for example Registered Testing Pool Athletes) and ASP (for example coaches) must be considered for inclusion – some categories are mandatory, and some are optional as outlined in Article 6.

These specific categories of Athletes and ASP must be targeted for education and included in a Signatory's Education Plan. Education Activities must be developed and delivered for these categories. As indicated in the comments to Article 6, the final draft of the 2027 ISE acknowledges that it may not be possible to reach every individual in each category. Finally, for the specific category of Athletes receiving notification of a potential anti-doping rule violation, it is not the intention that such Athletes be invited to general education sessions but rather that educational information is provided to Athletes to support their understanding of the results management process including their rights and responsibilities.

Signatories are encouraged and reminded to consult the additional comments as presented in Article 6.

Article 6.2.1: Requirements for all Signatories (Athlete Support Personnel)

NEW ADDITION

ASP receiving notification of potential anti-doping rule violations have been added to the list of categories of ASP that are required to be included in the Education Pool of all Signatories. This is to ensure consistency with Article 6.1.1 as it relates to Athletes and acknowledges that ASP also have the right to be educated in this situation.

Like the clarification for Athletes, it is expected that education is focused on rights and responsibilities and the understanding of the results management process.

Article 8.1.1: Mandatory Topics

Changes from the Second Draft

Additional terminology and clarifying language have been incorporated to more effectively highlight the concept of unintentional doping. These enhancements aim to increase awareness of the potential risks – particularly those associated with supplement use – and to ensure that the messaging more accurately reflects the realities Athletes may face when unintentionally violating anti-doping rules.

Further clarification

In response to certain comments made during the Third Consultation Phase, and to offer further clarification, the ISE Drafting team wishes to provide additional commentary below to support the interpretation of this Article.

As highlighted in the final draft of the 2027 ISE, Signatories can adapt the level and depth of content as it relates to each of the mandatory topics to meet the needs of their learners. This is the rationale for having a curriculum that outlines how this may be implemented while also understanding that there may be further adaptations based on the needs of the learners.

As our understanding of unintentional doping grows, it is essential that current and new risks are included in a

Signatory's Education Plan, including, where feasible, practical advice for Athlete and/or ASP on how to manage such risks. This is firmly reinforced by the feedback received from Athletes as part of the Athlete-Centered Consultation.

As it relates to the topic 'Governance of anti-doping', this is aimed at ensuring Athletes have a degree of understanding of the anti-doping system, including the involved organizations and structures, to advance their knowledge of the system and key agencies. The purpose is to help prepare Athletes understand their relationship to the anti-doping system and their interactions with all Anti-Doping Organizations. It will also help them to contribute to the anti-doping system as it adapts and evolves and to help maintain a positive Athlete experience.

NEW ADDITION

The requirement for Signatories to have information on their websites relating to all mandatory topics specified in Article 8.1.1, which is currently a requirement under the 2021 ISE, has been reinstated in the final draft of the 2027 ISE. The reason for this reinstatement stems from the feedback received as part of the Athlete-Centered Consultation whereby participating Athletes emphasized the need to have access to accurate information as it relates to the anti-doping rules to which they are subjected.

Finally, this Article also underlines that the information available to Athletes should describe the behaviors which are expected of them in order to reduce the risk of unintentional doping. This again acknowledges the input from Athletes who seek clarity on their expectations.

Article 11: Event-Specific Education

Changes from the Second Draft

In the second draft of the 2027 ISE, Event-Specific Education was elevated to its own standalone Article, supported by sub-Articles to provide more detailed guidance, particularly regarding responsibilities for International and National Events. While these changes were generally well received, confusion remained regarding the roles and responsibilities of Signatories in coordinating with other organizations hosting an International Event. To address this, the final draft of the 2027 ISE provides clarification by outlining that the delivery of Event-Specific Education related to International Events is primarily the responsibility of Major Event Organizers and International Federations (i.e., the 'owners' of these events). This separation has enabled a clearer articulation of the principle that Event-Specific Education is uniquely tailored to the anti-doping program of a particular event. This does not exclude other Signatories (e.g., National Anti-Doping Organizations) from supporting Event-Specific Education by preparing Athletes in coordination with the Event 'owners'. References to how this may be implemented are now specified in Articles 10 (Coordinating Education Delivery) and 14 (Roles and Responsibilities of Signatories).

Reference to education expectations for the Olympic and Paralympic Games have now been consolidated into one Article alongside the expectations of other International and Major Events.

Further clarification

In response to certain comments from Athletes as part of the Athlete-Centered Consultation, additional clarifications have been introduced to this Article to mitigate the risk of excessive duplication of generic anti-doping Education which is delivered prior to an Event, especially to International-Level Athletes. For these Athletes it is recognized and appreciated that many Anti-Doping Organizations are keen to ensure that this category of Athlete is well educated; however, by separating generic education (that covers broadly education topics listed in ISE Article 8.1.1) and Event-Specific Education (directly connected to and focused on the anti-

doping rules and program of the Event) as well as outlining clearer roles and responsibilities, the intention is to help ensure that the same Athlete is not being asked to complete the same type and form of education in advance of an Event.

Appendix I: Definitions

Changes from the Second Draft

A new definition for “Education Pool” has been introduced to ensure consistency and alignment with the revised provisions outlined in Article 6. This addition provides greater clarity regarding which individuals should be included in a Signatory’s education efforts and supports the implementation of a more structured and targeted approach to anti-doping education.

NEW ADDITION

The term “Talented Level Athletes” has been introduced as a defined term to provide greater clarity regarding the specific requirements and expectations applicable to this Athlete group. This addition directly responds to stakeholder feedback requesting clearer guidance on the classification and obligations of Athletes at this developmental stage within the Athlete Pathway framework.

Athlete-Centered Consultation Feedback

Explanatory text (if shared)	Question posed	Responses (n=509)		
		Yes	No	Not sure
Education Pool: In the latest draft of the ISE, the Education Pool has been broadened to include more groups who must receive education, such as minors (competing internationally) and athlete support personnel who support athletes (e.g., coaches, medical professionals, parents). (Reference: 2nd draft of the ISE, Article 6)	Do you think this is a positive change? (509 total responses)	89%	2%	9%

Summary of feedback provided

Nearly 90% of Athletes agreed that broadening the Education Pool in the second draft of the 2027 ISE is a positive change with only 2% disagreeing with these changes and 9% stating they were unsure. This strong support from the Athlete community reflects a general recognition to include a wider range and level of both Athletes (for example strong support for the inclusion of Minors) and Athlete Support Personnel as well as Minors competing internationally where testing takes place.

“Yes, I think this is a positive change. Expanding the education pool to include minors and athlete support personnel helps create a more comprehensive approach to clean sport. It ensures that everyone involved in the athlete’s journey understands the rules, the importance of fair play, and the consequences of doping, which strengthens the integrity of the sport as a whole.”

Many Athletes emphasized that they, and especially minors, often rely heavily on their coaches, parents, and

medical professionals for guidance. Including these categories of ASP in the Education Pool ensures they become targeted for anti-doping education. This supports an underlying principle of anti-doping education which is to enable a shared understanding of the anti-doping rules, and in turn, help create a more informed and safer environment for Athletes. It was also noted that broadening the Education Pool reinforces clean sport values and reduces the risk of unintentional doping due to misinformation or lack of awareness.

A very small number of Athletes expressed concerns about mandatory education, suggesting that such courses could be optional rather than imposed. One respondent questioned whether ASP could be effectively educated at all. Additionally, there was a suggestion to extend education requirements to sport federation leadership, such as board members, who also play a role in shaping the Athlete environment and experience with anti-doping programs. To reflect these views, the final draft of the 2027 ISE does not require the inclusion of all ASP in the Education Pool and reference has been made to support the benefits and principles of education being applied to other/wider groups.

Overall, the feedback received from Athletes confirms that expanding the Education Pool is viewed as a positive change and importantly a necessary step toward a more comprehensive and effective anti-doping Education Program, especially for safeguarding young Athletes and reinforcing a clean sport culture.

Explanatory text (if shared)	Question posed	Responses (n=496)		
		Yes	No	Not sure
	When you first became subject to anti-doping rules and/or became part of a Testing Pool, were you fully aware of the rules, your rights and responsibilities and the consequences of breaking the rules?	66%	15%	19%

Summary of feedback provided

Most Athletes (66%) felt they were fully aware of the rules, their rights and responsibilities and the potential consequences. However, a concerning portion (34%) were either not fully aware or not confident to affirm that they were aware, with 15% stating “No” and 19% “Not sure”. This highlights areas where anti-doping education may require improvements.

“ Access to information can be confusing and overwhelming. The recent ADEL course was good before this I had a really hard time finding the right information.”

Among those who answered “No,” many expressed that while they were partially informed, they lacked full understanding, especially around specific rights particularly during testing such as the right to have a representative present. In addition, information related to the TUE process, whereabouts requirements, and the seriousness of unintentional violations was felt by some Athletes to be missing. Several Athletes shared that their first experience of anti-doping and exposure to the anti-doping rules occurred during the testing process, rather than through education, which caused some Athletes to express that this experience led to confusion, anxiety, or a sense of unpreparedness. The final draft of the 2027 ISE continues to reinforce the principle that an Athletes first experience with anti-doping should be through education rather than testing.

“I had no idea of what the testing process entailed, or what substances they were looking for. For these reasons, I was very surprised by the process of “witnessing” and felt unprepared, scared and a bit violated. “

Common themes in the feedback shared by Athletes included:

- **Information gaps:** Many Athletes shared that they had not received anti-doping education and consequently lacked detailed knowledge regarding banned substances, the testing process, sanctions, and available support mechanisms.
- **Lack of early or accessible education:** Several Athletes considered that education came too late and was not tailored to younger or recreational Athletes. Some Athletes considered that they only received adequate education years after first being tested while others shared that this was at times through their own research.
- **Format and delivery of education:** Some Athletes called for more accessible, engaging education, including more videos, graphics, subtitles, as examples, and that Anti-Doping Organizations should use opportunities to reach Athletes earlier particularly targeting grassroots levels and involving parents of younger Athletes.
- **National federation support:** Several Athletes indicated that their national federations provided minimal anti-doping education or did not clearly explain their rights and responsibilities upon joining the sport and/or the federation.

Overall, while many Athletes eventually became informed, the data suggests a need for earlier, clearer, and more Athlete-centered anti-doping education, especially at the initial stages of involvement in sport.

Explanatory text (if shared)	Question posed	Responses (n=516)		
Unintentional Doping: Given the increasing complexity of anti-doping as well as the risks of unknowingly committing an anti-doping rule violation, in the latest draft of the ISE, unintentional doping has been added as a mandatory topic, which includes the “risks of supplements” topic to reflect that the risks that are associated with unintentional doping go beyond just the use of supplements. (Reference: 2nd draft of the ISE, Article 8.1.1)	Do you agree that unintentional doping should be a mandatory education topic?	Yes	No	Not sure
		81%	4%	15%

Summary of feedback provided

A significant majority of Athletes (81%) agreed that unintentional doping should be a mandatory Education topic, with only 4% saying no and 15% stating they were unsure. This feedback reflects the strong concern among many Athletes (and stakeholders) about the risks associated with unintentional doping (sometimes phrased as unintentionally committing an anti-doping rule violation) due to: (i) the increasing complexity of substances; (ii) confusion over supplements and medications; (iii) the increasing complexity of anti-doping rules; (iv) improvements in the detection of substances; and (v) a lack of awareness of certain procedures such as TUEs, to name a few examples.

“Yes, I agree that unintentional doping should be a mandatory education topic. With the growing complexity of anti-doping regulations

and the risks associated with things like contaminated supplements or unknowingly using banned substances, it's important for athletes to be educated on these risks. This helps prevent accidental violations and ensures athletes can make informed decisions to protect their careers and the integrity of the sport."

Athletes widely agreed that the lack of knowledge is a leading cause of unintentional doping, especially among minor Athletes. Many shared that unintentional violations often result from contaminated supplements, medications, advice from uninformed personnel, or simply not knowing where to find reliable information. Athletes emphasized that education is a powerful tool to prevent unintentional doping, protect Athletes, and promote fairness in sport.

Several Athletes stated that intent does not necessarily eliminate consequences under the strict liability principle making education even more critical to help Athletes reduce the risk of unintentional doping. Suggestions related to how this could be achieved were provided and included real-life examples, product lists, and guidance on identifying high-risk products or situations. Some Athletes suggested that Anti-Doping Organizations and sport federations should go further in simplifying and clarifying the messaging, especially for those with limited access to expert support.

Only a small minority of Athletes expressed reservations with the inclusion of this topic. A few questioned whether education alone is sufficient or expressed general opposition to mandatory learning. However, even among their reservations, there was often an acknowledgment that more awareness would be beneficial.

In conclusion, the strong consensus indicates that Athletes want and need clear, accessible, and proactive education about unintentional doping to navigate the growing complexities of being a clean Athlete within the rules and requirements of the current anti-doping system.

A follow-up question was asked offering Athletes the possibility to share their views on what they believe constitutes the biggest risks for Athletes as it relates to unintentional doping and what could be done to mitigate such risks.

Question posed
What do you think are the biggest risks that could lead an athlete to unintentionally break anti-doping rules? What could be done to mitigate or eliminate that risk?

Summary of feedback provided

The high volume of Athletes responses to this topic highlights the broad recognition that unintentional doping is both a real and preventable risk (in some scenarios) as well as a risk that Athletes face regularly due to misinformation, lack of access to education, or unclear information provided by ASP.

Athletes' answers stress that unintentional violations often stem from everyday scenarios, such as using contaminated supplements, taking prescribed medications without properly checking their status on the Prohibited List, a lack of awareness regarding the options to apply for a TUE, and misunderstanding their rights and responsibilities during testing, to name a few examples.

Of specific concern, and at particular risk, were minors and those Athletes participating at grassroots/recreational level (who often do not know how or where to verify permitted substances). Many shared that they felt anti-doping education in the past was too focused on intent or morality, rather than equipping Athletes with practical, scenario-based knowledge that could help them navigate complex decisions.

There was also a strong consensus that the principle of strict liability makes education on unintentional doping

more critical. Several respondents pointed out that the consequences of such violations can be devastating to an Athlete's career and reputation, even when there was no intention to cheat or gain an advantage. Therefore, learning how to avoid these risks from the outset is seen as a vital protective measure.

Many respondents also emphasized the importance of targeting this education to different levels of sport, including young and recreational Athletes as well as those from countries with limited resources or developed anti-doping infrastructure. These groups are particularly vulnerable and often lack access to tailored support. Additionally, there was a call to ensure that the information is delivered in accessible formats, using visuals, translations, and support for those with learning differences or limited internet access.

Amongst the small minority who disagreed or were unsure, they offered varying concerns, and their comments revealed some common themes. A few expressed that the term "unintentional" might confuse Athletes into thinking that a lack of intent could absolve them of consequences. Others were wary of mandating too many educational topics and considered that Athletes should be free to engage with the content that is most relevant to them, or that education alone might not prevent violations. Nevertheless, even within this group, there was an acknowledgment that increasing awareness would likely benefit most Athletes.

In conclusion, the responses make it clear that unintentional doping is viewed as a real, present, and preventable threat to clean sport. Adding this as a mandatory topic for anti-doping education programs is of crucial importance, especially if done in a way that is practical, understandable, and adapted to diverse Athlete needs and levels of experience. This shift would not only reduce accidental violations but also empower Athletes to make informed and confident decisions throughout their careers.