

WADA Independent Observer Mission Report

16th Asian Games
Guangzhou, China
November 2010

Introduction

The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) Independent Observer (IO) program was established to enhance athlete and public confidence at major events by randomly monitoring and reporting on all phases of the Doping Control and results management processes in a neutral and unbiased manner. It now exists to provide expert auditing and advice or recommendations during major games/sporting events with the aim of contributing to effective games-time Doping Control services and ensuring programs are run in a World Anti-Doping Code compliant way. The IO Team's observations/audits provide a system of evaluation to assess whether or not procedures conform to the existing documented standards and rules and to provide on-site advice, guidance or assistance to the Major Event Organizers as may be needed.

For the Guangzhou 2010 Asian Games, the Agreement between WADA and the Olympic Council of Asia (OCA) outlined this mandate for the IO Team:

- Test Distribution Planning
- Selection of Competitors
- Notification for Doping control
- Therapeutic Use Exemption procedures
- Sample collection procedures
- Transport and chain of custody of samples
- Sample analysis at the laboratory (which was not acted upon as the laboratory was in Beijing)
- Results management processes including all hearings

Our formal onsite observations were made from the date of the Opening Ceremony (November 12) until the date of the Closing Ceremony (November 27). Our meetings with the OCA Medical Committee and Anti-Doping Commission (MCADC) began earlier and the IO Team attended and was introduced at the NOC Team Physicians meeting (November 11). One member of the IO Team attended each daily meeting of the OCA MCADC starting on November 10. As a courtesy, we received copies of Doping Control documentation for the pre-competition testing prior to the opening Ceremony which started from the opening of the Athlete Village on November 6. We visited almost every venue at least once, many more than once, as well as the Polyclinic in the Athlete Village. There were several Adverse Analytical Findings (AAFs) reported after the closing of the Games; we did not observe their results management.

The success of the mission was due in large measure to being welcomed in such a collegial fashion by both the OCA and the Guangzhou Asian Games Organizing Committee (GAGOC). All staff were aware of our presence and our role, and facilitated it, especially important at the individual Doping Control Stations. We would like to acknowledge and thank the OCA MCADC and its Chair Dr. M. Jegathesan for not just accepting but encouraging our work. OCA staff Mr. Mahmoud Ali and Ms. Nadia Al-Shamali assisted us in many ways, large and small. The GAGOC Anti-Doping Program led by Dr. Li Jie was a pleasure to work with; it gave careful consideration to our observations and recommendations. GAGOC, through the support of the International

Relations Manager Ms. Su Fang, also provided the IO Team with two enthusiastic and capable volunteers, Ms. Zhang Xi and Ms. Huang Shiyun. They supported and participated in our work for many hours each day.

We provided daily oral reports of our observations and detailed recommendations, with written summaries provided the subsequent day. Those reports address a number of technical opportunities for improvement that are not repeated in this Final Report.

It is worth noting that this was an extremely large and intricate Games. It had the full summer Olympic program, plus Asian sports (Dragon Boat, Kabaddi, Sepaktakraw and Wushu) and non-Olympic sports (such as Billiard Sports, Chess, Cricket, Dance Sport, Roller Sports and Rugby 7s). There were more athletes competing than at the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympics and many had limited experience with Doping Control. The anti-doping program was therefore of unprecedented complexity. Over 1700 urine and blood samples were collected over the course of the Games, including pre-competition tests.

General Conclusions

The anti-doping program of the 2010 Guangzhou Asian Games was effective and overall in accordance with the OCA Anti-Doping Rules. This Report and the more detailed daily observations of this IO Team identify issues and opportunities for improvement. Some are substantial, some quite mundane. We have responded to the OCA's request that our oral and daily reporting, and this final Report, be detailed and comprehensive. Notwithstanding that detail, we are clearly of the view that athletes and other participants in these Games were well-served by the OCA's anti-doping work, and by the delivery of Doping Control by the GAGOC Anti-Doping Program.

Progress since the 2006 Doha Asian Games

The WADA IO Team report for the 2006 Doha Asian Games identified a number of areas for improvement. We observed considerable progress in all areas at these Games. For example:

- At Doha, the notification and chaperoning should have been stronger. Chaperones did not appear to be sufficiently trained to carry out their very important task. At Guangzhou, the improvement in this aspect of the program was marked. This was due to rigorous recruitment and training for both Chaperones and all Doping Control staff. Isolated incidents still occurred but on the whole the Chaperones did a very good job. The role of well-organized Chaperone Coordinators certainly contributed to this result.
- Late Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) applications and insufficient information made it difficult for the small TUE Committee at Doha; most of the work fell to the Chair. Some athletes competed without knowing if their TUE would be approved or not. At Guangzhou, TUE applications still have arrived late and not in some cases not in

- accordance with the International Standard for TUEs. But a much more efficient Committee kept abreast of the situation. All applications were processed in a relatively timely way; however improvements still can be made in this area (as outlined later in this report).
- Collecting whereabouts for pre-competition and target testing is a problem common to most major competitions. The provision of whereabouts information at Doha was inconsistent at best. While the provision of whereabouts at Guangzhou fell short of what is required according to the OCA's Anti-Doping Rules 2009, the GAGOC Team used other sources of information (such as athlete arrival information, rooming lists and training session information) to conduct effective testing in the village and otherwise outside of the competitions proper. As discussed below, the OCA may want to consider revising the whereabouts requirement for Games-time information as currently outlined in their Anti-Doping Rules.
 - At Doha there were delays experienced in matching Laboratory results with testing documentation. Due to the dedicated staff of the OCA as well as the use of ADAMS, this was not the case at Guangzhou.
 - Follow-up investigations and hearings were much more effective at Guangzhou (and the number fewer).

Observations and Recommendations

OCA Anti-Doping Rules / Doping Control Guide

The governing rules for these Games were the OCA Anti-Doping Rules 2009 Applicable to the Asian Games Series (OCA Anti-Doping Rules). An additional document provided detail specific to these Games: the OCA Doping Control Guide 2010 (OCA DC Guide). Finally, there was the 2010 Guangzhou Asian Games Doping Control Standard Operating Procedures (2010) (DC SOP) addressing operational procedures and routines. As a general matter, the documents fit well together and provided a sound set of rules and procedures for the Games' anti-doping work.

There were some instances where the OCA Anti-Doping Rules, the OCA DC Guide and the DC SOP differed. There were a few provisions in these documents that were not followed exactly as stated. In other cases, provisions of the documents require clarification. For example:

- OCA DC Guide, Appendix 1, Section 1, sets out requirements for game-time whereabouts information, which were not followed. As discussed below, other sources of information available to GAGOC permitted effective pre-competition testing.
- OCA DC Guide, Appendix 1, Section 5, Step 9 indicates a urine sample volume of 90ml for both standard and EPO analysis. However, DC SOP Section 8, Operating Procedures, Procedure Code 005(3) indicates 75ml of urine for standard analysis and 110ml for EPO analysis. In fact, 90ml of urine was collected for standard analysis and 130ml for EPO analysis.

- OCA DC Guide, Appendix 1, Section 9.3 provides that the Doping Control Station Manager seal the transport bag containing the day's samples. This was not done and, in view of the GAGOC Anti-Doping Program method for transporting samples to the Doping Control Command Centre (described below), was not necessary.
- Some provisions of the OCA Anti-Doping Rules could be adjusted to maintain a clearer distinction between an AAF and a possible Anti-Doping Rule Violation (ADRV). An ADRV is determined by decision of the OCA President and Executive Board, and not by the fact of an AAF. But some provisions of the Rules blur the distinction. For example: Rules 7.2.1 and 7.2.3 seem to equate an AAF and an ADRV at the time of preparation of the lab certificate; the heading to Rule 7.2.2 is "Verification of validity of anti-Doping rule violation;" the heading to Rule 7.2.4 is "Notifying Athlete or other persons concerned of the anti-Doping rule violation;" and Rule 7.2.4 (2) refers to notification of "the anti-Doping rule violation." (emphasis added) Yet each of these steps precedes the determination of the ADRV (through the recommendation of the Disciplinary Committee and the decision of the OCA President and Executive Board). In other words, until that decision there is only a possible ADRV.
- While Article 13.1 of the OCA Anti-Doping Rules refers to the possibility of an athlete waiving his/her right to a hearing, nothing in the results management procedures of Rule 7 or in the notification to the Chef de Mission provides a process for exercising this right. Such a process might be useful if an AAF is reported after the conclusion of the Games and an in-person hearing is not possible.

Recommendations

- *The OCA should ensure that the procedures and processes outlined in the OCA DC Guide and DC SOP are consistent (and consistent with the OCA Anti-Doping Rules).*
- *Consider whether requirement for whereabouts set out in the OCA DC Guide should be continued given (a) other information available to an organizing committee (such as arrival info, room lists, venue training schedules, etc.) and (b) lack of NOC capacity to provide it. Perhaps the Guide or the OCA AD Rules could be revised to maintain the right to require whereabouts information but that the right only be exercised by the OCA when necessary.*
- *The OCA should review and adjust the treatment of possible ADRVs in the OCA Anti-Doping Rules and determine if a provision for waiver of the right to a hearing would be useful games-time.*

OCA Medical Committee and Anti-Doping Commission (MCADC)

This was a functional and dedicated Committee. Dr. Jegathesan and his colleagues actively managed test distribution planning and the conduct of Doping Control, both pre- and in-competition. The OCA MCADC conducted initial reviews of adverse analytical findings. Its members visited all venues in the course of the Games, usually multiple times. On most days

most of its members were in the field at the Doping Control Stations (and venue Medical Stations). Frequently, their observations and those of the IO Team matched.

The Committee's cooperation with the GAGOC Anti-Doping Program was close. They met every morning to review the previous day's work and prepare for the coming day. Meetings began with Dr. Li of GAGOC and members of his team reviewing the previous day's testing and any matters of note. Ms. Yang Xiaoye of Dr. Li's team would also review follow-up on previously-reported issues. Reports from the field (from GAGOC, as well as from Committee members and from the IO Team) were reviewed and discussed, and decisions made on how best to adjust the GAGOC program in response.

We observed OCA trouble shooting and follow-up to be decisive and immediate. Target testing was ordered as a result of intelligence provided by WADA as well as due to suspicious circumstances in Doping Control Stations. However, the Committee did not address the number and any possible patterns in dilute samples until quite late in the Games. This should have been considered from the outset.

Recommendation

- *The OCA ought to be more aggressive about tracking dilute samples, analyzing for suspicious patterns, and initiating target testing or other follow-up investigations. This is especially important when athletes are only required to provide a maximum of two samples.*

GAGOC Anti-Doping Program

The GAGOC team operated from a central Command Centre (which we visited three times). It directed the operations of the Doping Control Stations. It recruited and trained the Doping Control personnel with assistance from the China Anti-Doping Agency (CHINADA). It maintained effective systems and had adequate personnel for managing the many Doping Control Stations (through an e-mailed daily newsletter and telephone communication with Station Managers) and for conducting in-competition and pre-competition sample collection. The system was able to respond quickly when Station personnel required guidance, to communicate effectively instructions for addressing weaknesses or mistakes and to manage efficiently securing samples and transporting them to the WADA-accredited laboratory in Beijing.

Education

There was no visible anti-doping education outside of the WADA Outreach booth in the dining hall of the main Athlete Village. The waiting rooms of the Doping Control Stations contained no anti-doping information except for a poster illustrating the sample collection procedure and the playing of a Doping Control instruction video in stations without a television feed. This was a

missed opportunity to reach hundreds of athletes and team officials from Asia and would have enlivened otherwise sterile Doping Control Station waiting rooms.

Recommendations

- *Produce OCA/WADA/Organizing Committee co-branding educational handouts, posters, pins or playing cards for future Games. For example, place large posters for athletes to sign in the Doping Control Stations.*
- *The OCA should also encourage its member NOCs to conduct ongoing educational programs for their athletes and coaches, and to provide comprehensive anti-doping information to teams prior to departure for OCA-sanctioned games.*
- *Ensure links to WADA and other Online education programs are on OCA, NOC and LOC Websites.*

TUE Committee

The OCA TUE Committee (TUEC) was chaired by Dr. Abdul Wahab Al-Musleh. It was constituted according to the International Standard for TUEs and section 4.3.3 of the OCA Anti-Doping Rules. The Committee received fifty-eight declarations of use relating to these Games, twenty of which were unnecessarily submitted as TUE applications. It dealt with twenty-seven TUE applications, four of which were invalid (as not being in the proper form) and eight of which were incomplete and never completed despite Committee follow-up. Those athletes competed without a valid TUE. The Committee granted fourteen TUEs, and refused one. All TUE applications were considered by at least three Committee members (sometimes by e-mail as some members had to return home before the Games completed). TUEs granted by other anti-doping organizations were reviewed rather than being accepted automatically. While the TUE Committee worked efficiently, it had to operate in a relatively open setting, or behind a flimsy partition, and sometimes lacked the privacy needed for candid deliberations.

We observed that not all members were sports medicine specialists or clinicians with directly-relevant expertise (as encouraged by section 6.1 of the International Standard for TUEs (ISTUE)), and some seemed to lack intimate knowledge of the ISTUE and List of Prohibited Substances and Methods. Some TUE applications would have been given more exacting consideration by TUE committee members with greater experience. It appeared that at least one TUE was approved without having all of the required information.

As at Doha, the majority of the declarations of use and TUE applications were submitted just before or during the Games, and not well in advance as set out in Section 7 of the OCA DC Guide.

Recommendations

- *The OCA should ensure that all of the physicians who are members of the TUE Committee better meet the provisions of the ISTUE including a sound knowledge of clinical, sports and exercise medicine.*
- *The OCA should take steps to increase awareness of TUE requirements among its NOCs and be stricter in requiring TUEs applications to be submitted in advance of such Games.*
- *The OCA TUEC should be provided with a private room with internet access for its meetings.*

Interpretation / Language

Communication during Doping Control was often an issue, despite the provisions for interpretation described in DC SOP Section 4.3.

Given the diversity of Asian languages, English is the working language of the OCA and at the Games. However many athletes or their representatives were frequently unable to communicate effectively in English. Doping Control personnel had varying levels of command of English; some were excellent, many were functional, but many were not. Except for the International DCOs, few Doping Control personnel could speak other Asian languages. Despite the best efforts of the Doping Control personnel the issue of communication seemed especially acute for Korean athletes (especially for DPRK athletes) and for Russian-speaking athletes. The result was many very long sample processing sessions (up to an hour and twenty minutes) and multiple re-writes of notification or Doping Control forms. Athletes' rights were not always communicated effectively at notification. Athletes and their representatives were not always able to correctly understand Doping Control form questions related to research, medication or transfusions.

Interpretation services were never called on in our presence (except when a team official or other person associated with the Games happened to be available). Multilingual materials, except for a basic ten picture, six language poster illustrating the basic steps in giving a sample as well as a multi-lingual notification form, were not available or not used in our presence.

Recommendations

- *The OCA should anticipate likely medalists in a particular sport or event and ensure organizing committees make provision for interpretation. In any Asian Games, the need for interpretation, and for translation of materials, into at least Chinese, Korean, Arabic, Russian and Japanese is clear.*
- *Utilize the International DCOs to address some of the language issues. This was done quite well for some sports; while in other sports it was not utilized (despite the presence of the International DCOs).*
- *Produce more detailed multi-lingual/illustrated guides as well printed translations of the key portions of the notification and Doping Control forms for use in all Doping Control Stations*

(especially the athlete's rights and responsibilities and the request for agreement to use samples for anti-doping research).

- *Make laptop computers and a sample collection video available in processing rooms to illustrate the process if verbal communication is problematic. These videos should have the option to be viewed in multiple languages.*

Doping Control Stations

The size and facilities of the Doping Control Stations ranged from barely adequate to superb. Some were purpose-built in new venues, such as at Athletics, Aquatics and Judo/Wrestling. Some were temporary, as at Shooting, Triathlon/Road Cycling and Rowing/Sprint Canoe/Kayak. Temporary outdoor stations, or ones using flimsy plastic partitions in built space, did not always fully protect athletes from the heat, or protect their privacy (for example at (initially) Rowing, at Shooting, and initially at Triathlon/Road Cycling). However this never compromised the integrity of the samples. In some Stations, the waiting rooms or the processing rooms were too small to properly hold two DCOs, an athlete and representative, a member of the OCA MCADC and an IO Team member. In a number of locations, also accommodating an interpreter would have been problematic.

Access was generally well-controlled, with the use of special Doping Control Station passes, vigorous check-in and check-out procedures and a security official at the door of each Station. While there were large televisions in the waiting rooms of all Stations, many did not have a television feed. Often those in the waiting rooms could not watch the competition. This does not endear athletes to the Doping Control process.

Single processing room Doping Control Stations can be inadequate if two or more athletes have to give samples at once, especially if there is no contingency plan for the situation (i.e. using the Doping Control Station Manager's office as a processing room).

Stations were generally well-staffed with an adequate number of chaperones, DCOs and BCOs. Sometimes there were more chaperones than necessary. Sometimes chaperones were allowed to wait for their duties in the Doping Control Stations which caused overcrowding. In the better-managed Stations, the chaperones were instructed to wait outside by the Doping Control Station Manager.

The approach to mobile phone use in the waiting rooms was inconsistent. Even after the OCA MCADC instructed the GAGOC anti-doping team that mobile phone use in the waiting rooms could be permitted unless it interfered with the sample collection process or was disruptive, practices continued to vary from Station to Station. In this day and age (and in sterile Doping Control Stations) an outright ban on mobile phone use seems overly restrictive.

Recommendations

- *The OCA should stipulate that Doping Control Station design and furnishing ensure privacy in the processing rooms from those in the waiting area or outside the station. If temporary partitions must be used, they must be sound proof and reach to the ceiling. If there are windows, they must be covered to ensure the privacy of the athlete.*
- *Waiting areas should be furnished with televisions that broadcast the venue competition or other Games coverage.*
- *Processing rooms must be able to accommodate six people each as well as the necessary furnishing and equipment.*
- *The OCA should ensure the LOC consistently applies the article in their anti-doping rules regarding the use of mobile phones, which permits their use in the waiting room unless disruptive or interfering with the sample collection process.*
- *Ideally, all Doping Control Stations should have at least two processing rooms. This provides redundancy in case of an unanticipated situation and better ensures that Doping Control is completed as quickly as possible. This should be an OCA requirement.*

Doping Control Personnel

All DC Station Managers were CHINADA certified and from Beijing. Assistant Station Managers were recruited locally and mainly responsible for logistics. DCOs were recruited and trained locally, except for International DCOs who received a half day's training to GAGOC and OCA procedures on their arrival before the start of the Games. We were advised that there were test events at some venues. Pre-Games Doping Control team rehearsals were conducted at each station. Some Station Managers were responsible for two stations operating at the same time, and not always within the same venue complex. For obvious reasons this is less than ideal.

The OCA should be commended for its International DCO Program. For each of its major games the OCA invites DCOs from various countries who have been trained through the Regional Anti-Doping Organization (RADO) program. In addition they also invite DCOs from countries who will be hosting future OCA events. This is a significant commitment to building the anti-doping capacity throughout Asia.

As with any Major Games, the work of the Station Managers and their teams improved as the Games progressed. We observed many examples of good practice right from the outset, such as Station Managers intervening when DCOs were uncertain about certain procedures, requiring remedial on-the-spot training of DCOs, DCOs who responded to athletes who urgently needed to pass their samples and who processed urine sample collection in under 15 minutes, and Chaperones who kept a respectful distance from their athletes, and were careful to stay out of television camera shots or inhibit legitimate athlete contact with teammates, coaches and trainers.

We saw large and complex Doping Control Stations such as at Swimming and at Athletics managed with military precision. As the Games proceeded, Doping Control personnel became better able to deal with unexpected situations for which they were not specifically trained.

We did observe some instances of Doping Control personnel not having a full understanding of a particular sport and how a competition unfolds (for example the possibility and implications of extra time or athletes competing in a second event). This resulted in chaperoning challenges, which were generally handled well, as well as unexpected influxes of athletes at the Doping Control Station at one time.

Recommendations

- *Require Games organizing committees to ensure that each Doping Control Station has its own Station Manager on-site when sample collection is taking place.*
- *Require Games organizing committees to provide additional pre-arrival orientation and training (on-line) to better integrate International DCOs into the Organizing Committee's anti-doping team. Experienced International DCOs would better adapt their practices to GAGOC protocols; inexperienced International DCOs would receive more in-depth training and experience with which to return to their home programs.*
- *Doping Control personnel need to be more knowledgeable about the particular sports of their venues, and the demands they place on the athletes, including the culture and rituals of each sport. Particular celebrations (such as at the centre of the diamond after a baseball match) should not be interrupted by premature notification. Require Games organizing committees to provide the necessary training, relying on IF contacts if need be.*
- *Organizing committees also need to equip Doping Control Station Managers with more discretion and flexibility. Require them to plan for the worst case scenario at their stations (such as four athletes all having to give samples at the same time in a station with only one processing room). Use all available options to speed the athletes' completion of Doping Control and ensure their comfort during the process (such as collecting sample in the changing room toilet if processing room in use or filling out portions of the Doping Control form in the waiting area to free-up processing rooms).*
- *Require Games organizing committees to improve venue coordination. Doping Control Station Managers must ensure they coordinate carefully with media and medal ceremony functions so that athletes are not made to report prematurely for Doping Control or are held so long in the Doping Control Station that medal ceremonies are impacted. At the same time, Doping Control personnel must insist on more discipline by those managing the media so that athletes are not prevented from reporting for Doping Control by ad hoc media scrums outside official media conferences.*
- *Organizing committees should conduct test events for the Doping Control teams in every venue in the year leading up to the Games (even if only national or regional competitions) for preparation of station teams and for testing coordination between venue functions.*

- *Always ensure an appropriate gender balance of DCOs given the sport program and the TDP for any given day.*

Doping Control Processes

Planning / Athlete Selection

The OCA continues to increase its Doping Control program for the Asian Games. The Guangzhou testing program represented an increase of approximately 500 tests from the last Asian Games in Doha. In total, 1602 urine samples were taken (176 pre-competition and 1426 post-competition) and 114 blood samples were taken (42 pre-competition and 72 post-competition). Athletics and Swimming were the most-tested events. There were no major departures or inconsistencies and the test distribution planning and random selections were effective.

Generally the gold and silver medalists were tested in some events with a further random selection (from between 3rd to 8th place). In team sports one or two athletes were selected at random from each team. While the TDP for each sport was quite extensive and appropriate, it did not strictly adhere to the OCA Anti-Doping Rules. For example, Article 5.6.2 states “In general, for sports competed on an individual basis each Athlete finishing in the top four placements in all disciplines in the competition, plus at least one other Athlete (in the lead-up competitions or the final) selected at random”. Given financial considerations and the already vast program it is understandable that this was not applied. However the OCA may want to consider revising their rules to reflect their actual practice. In addition, a number of target tests were done based on observations during the Games and on information from other sources.

Different approaches were adopted for random selections involving the Technical Delegates (TD) or OCA MCADC members and generally all worked reasonably well. In the absence of such an official, the Station Managers and their assistants were authorized to do the draw. In some sports with preliminary rounds (such as Track Cycling) athletes were selected based on finishing positions. This is problematic when the competitors finish at different times and their final placing is not known until all athletes have completed the competition. In addition, in Mountain Bike, due to a small field, a few of the athletes retired from the race and therefore no rider finished in the selected position, and a new selection had to be done rapidly. This can result in difficulties in locating the new selection.

Recommendation

- *Provide random selection criteria in the TDP based on the sport characteristics to avoid extra difficulty in identifying and locating athletes, particularly in preliminary competitions. For example, by conducting random selection by athlete names and not finishing position, it would be easy to identify and notify the selection immediately after they are finished competing.*

Notification/Chaperoning

No major departures or inconsistencies were observed. The chaperoning and notification was conducted very effectively. This was impressive, especially given the challenging nature of the work and the fact that the Chaperones were all volunteers. Overall they did a tremendous job and credit should be given to GAGOC for the recruitment and training of these Chaperones.

The Doping Control teams did not always have an understanding of their sports and the organization of the competitions. Individual chaperones were sometimes overzealous in their desire to notify the athletes.

This resulted in challenging situations that could have been addressed by better preparation, better sensitivity to the peculiarities of particular sports and more respect for athletes. For example, at Baseball and again at Cricket, chaperones entered the field of play immediately after the competition and attempted to notify athletes in the midst of team celebrations. This resulted in diminishing the athletes' enjoyment of their victories and drew considerable public attention to the athletes selected for Doping Control. In both cases it would have been easy to observe the athletes from the edge of the field of play and begin notification once they had left it. We also observed instances of notification being conducted just before or even in the mixed zone in full view of media, or in the middle of noisy corridors and in disorderly circumstances. Again, this makes the already challenging job of the chaperone more difficult than is necessary. We question whether the athletes' rights and responsibilities (such as the right to a translator or legitimate reasons for leaving the Station) were properly communicated in these circumstances. From subsequent interchanges in the Doping Control Station, it did not appear that this was always the case.

At the outset of the Games we observed chaperones at many venues being too close to their athletes. This was unnecessary and did not properly respect the athletes. This improved as the Games progressed. We also observed that chaperones rarely tracked athlete hydration. After some events there were numerous dilute samples provided by athletes (such as at Rugby 7s). On the other hand, because sealed drinks were not provided by the notifying chaperones, at times there was a considerable wait before the athlete arrived at the Doping Control Station and began to hydrate (particularly if medal ceremonies and media conferences intervened, as at Rowing). This delayed athletes' ability to give a sample.

All that said, we saw some very fine chaperoning and some well thought-out responses to difficult venue lay-out (as at Artistic Gymnastics) or restrictions on chaperone access to the field of play due to IF practices (as at Aquatics during Diving, where chaperone teams excluded from the pool deck covered both ends of the field of play with radio communication).

Recommendations

- *Avoid notification before athletes enter the mixed zone if at all possible. Establish a quiet place for notification to be completed and for communicating the athlete's rights and responsibilities. Respect and do not interfere with team celebrations where observation at a distance can be maintained. Give the athletes some space; it is rarely necessary to be within arm's-length.*
- *The OCA should consider having organizing committees to equip chaperones to provide sealed drinks at notification (to enable hydration to start immediately) when access to beverages at the Doping Control Station will be delayed.*
- *All Doping Control Station Managers should follow the example of the team at the swimming venue: have chaperones track athlete hydration and discourage over-hydration (and the risk of a dilute sample).*

Sample Collection

We witnessed no major departures or inconsistencies in the sample collection process. While some sample collection sessions were slow, the integrity of the sample was protected at all times. Despite obvious language difficulties, the DCOs remained positive and focused on their duties. And overall the athletes appeared to be satisfied with the sample collection process.

The quickest and most efficient sample collection sessions were achieved where the processing and the witnessing DCOs worked well together and divided the responsibility for guiding the athlete and for completing the paper work. We saw some sessions take as little as ten minutes which is world-class.

The OCA required only a maximum of two samples to be provided by athletes in the case of dilute samples. However, the International Standard for Testing states that “the DCO should continue to collect additional *Samples* until the requirement for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis is met, or until the DCO determines that there are exceptional circumstances which mean that for logistical reasons it is impossible to continue with the Sample Collection Session.” The IO questions whether there should be a general policy of collecting only two samples. By having such a policy, the OCA is opening up the possibility of sample manipulation by over hydration. If only two samples are to be collected, Doping Control personnel must be trained to manage athlete hydration in a sensitive and sensible way.

In two cases, athletes who were minors were not so identified until the sample collection session was underway, and finding appropriate representatives delayed the session. In two cases samples were discarded because they were deemed too dilute by Doping Control Station personnel and additional samples were taken.

In another case a rower broke the neck of the B sample bottle in tightening the cap (and he cut himself). The A sample was sent to the laboratory but the remaining portion of the B sample in the broken bottle was discarded.

The IO Team observed inconsistencies in how partial samples were processed. In some Doping Control sessions, the DCO would mix the initial sample and any subsequent samples to a maximum of 90ml (or 130ml if EPO); while in other sessions the DCO would mix and seal all of the provided urine. In one instance this inconsistency led to an argument between the lead DCO, the witness DCO, the coach as well as the Station Manager. Contributing to the confusion is the fact that the initial urine provided by an athlete would often visually appear to have a different (usually higher) density than the subsequent and more dilute urine. Therefore the risk to an athlete is that when adding additional urine to the partial sample, a total sample volume of more than the required 90ml or 130ml may result in the full sample being too dilute. A second sample may need to be collected and it is likely to be even more dilute than the first. In other words, what is more useful for laboratory analysis: one sample with the minimum required volume that meets density requirements, or two dilute samples that do not? The lack of clarity on this issue may have to be addressed not only in the OCA anti-doping documents, but also in the IST (in Annex D.4.14, F.4.6 and F.4.11, for example).

As suggested above, when verbal communication was difficult, better use could have been made of visual aids to demonstrate and speed sample collection and securing in A and B bottles. In some Doping Control Stations it was a good idea to have a collection vessel full of tea to show the 90ml required volume; however, there was none to show the 130 ml required for EPO analysis.

With respect to blood sample collection, we observed that the requirement of IST Annex E.4.5, as outlined in section 6.4 of the OCA DG Guide, that the athlete remain seated for 10 minutes prior to collection, was not strictly followed. This was never timed or noted. In any event, since this is only necessary if parameters such as Hgb and Hct are being measured (for a blood profile or passport program), we query whether it would have any bearing on the analysis for blood transfusions, hGH or HBOC's.

We also observed an instance of a blood collection officer releasing a tourniquet too soon resulting in a second venipuncture required to fill four blood tubes (and causing some distress to the athlete). Removing the tourniquet will cause the blood to stop flowing into the tubes.

Finally, we observed that some blood sample collection kits had butterfly needles and some had straight needles but none appeared to have both. Sections 5.1.1 and 7.1 of the WADA Guidelines for Blood Sample Collection indicate that both must be available. Some blood collection equipment bags were not sealed but only zip-locked.

Recommendations

- *Require Games organizing committees to train the DCOs to work more as a team in the processing room (for example, by working on the paperwork while the athlete was providing the urine sample) to accelerate the procedure.*
- *In the case of a dilute sample, section 6.4.6 of the IST provides that the DCO ought to continue to collect samples until one meets the specific gravity requirements (in this case a*

minimum reading of 1.005). At these Games only a second sample was collected; no third sample was collected if the second was also dilute. The OCA ought to give further consideration to collecting additional samples, at least when to do so would not compromise an athlete's preparations for competition the next day, and also to having a plan to monitor dilute samples and possibly conduct follow up target tests as appropriate.

- *All samples must be sent to the laboratory even if very dilute or potentially compromised. The laboratory analysis and the results management process will determine what conclusions can be drawn from the analytical results on such samples.*
- *Prepare more detailed multilingual photographic aids to demonstrate all steps in the sample collection procedure.*
- *Specify the detailed procedure regarding the volume of additional urine to require when an athlete initially provides a partial sample.*
- *The OCA should require organizing committees to ensure that blood sample collection equipment conforms to the WADA Guidelines for Blood Sample Collection and come in sealed bags.*
- *WADA should review its Guidelines for Blood Sample Collection Section 7.1.18 concerning removal of the tourniquet in circumstances where two or more blood tubes have to be collected.*

Post-collection

The post collection process conducted at the Doping Control Stations was efficient and no major departures or inconsistencies were observed. Doping Control documentation was very well-organized and sent to the Command Centre at the end of each day with the collected samples.

OCA DC Guide, Appendix 1, Section 5, Step 43 makes it clear that all those signing the Doping Control form must have witnessed the entire process. We did observe several cases of Doping Control personnel and OCA MCADC members signing the form when they had not been present for the entire testing procedure.

Universal safety precautions were not always observed for blood sample collection. Nor were appropriate practices for the disposal of biomedical waste always followed. In some cases, left-over urine or material with blood went into the normal garbage containers.

Recommendation

- *The OCA ought to insist on appropriate procedures and equipment for the disposal of biomedical waste.*

Other

At some venues there was very good communication with the media and medal ceremony functions (for example at Athletics, Swimming, Fencing, Judo, and Cycling). In other cases the communication was not so effective (as at Baseball and Cricket). Unfortunately, one athlete

from a gold medal Dragon Boat team missed the gold medal ceremony being in Doping Control. This was only realized when the athlete heard the national anthem being played (at some distance from the Station).

We observed numerous cases of poor control of media (with lengthy and crowded media scrums developing after the finish of the official media conference) which unnecessarily delayed Doping Control.

Recommendation

- *The OCA should have games organizing committees ensure that their Doping Control Station Managers have excellent communication with the managers of other venue functions, that Managers clearly brief their chaperones on the post-competition schedule and coordination of medal ceremonies and media conferences, and that Managers empower their chaperones to insist athletes report (or report back) to the Doping Control Station promptly. Full venue test events would greatly enhance games-time coordination between Doping Control and other functions.*

Doping Control Documentation

Re-writes of notification forms and Doping Control forms were frequent during the first half of the Games. They were due in part to communications issues, the recording of unnecessary information such as an athlete's home address and phone number, and the translation of that information into English on the forms. There were few supplementary reports in the early days of the Games, particularly those filled by the Doping Control Station Managers regarding anomalous issues or deviation from standard operations. These were not always linked to the relevant Doping Control forms. This improved as the Games progressed.

Recommendations

- *Doping Control forms for the Games ought to be adjusted to eliminate the collection of athlete home addresses, home phone numbers and e-mails. This information serves no purpose at, or for, the Games, especially given the fact that the accreditation number is recorded on the Doping Control form and the OCA should be able to access this information easily.*
- *Doping Control personnel should be encouraged to use supplementary reports to record issues even if apparently trivial. This is important for operational improvements and can be critical in the results management process.*
- *The OCA should actively participate in and support WADA's "paperless" Doping Control project (to replace completing Doping Control documentation manually, but rather using bar codes and scanners, or other sources of data) and offer its future Asian Games for implementation of such a system.*

Sample Transport and Lab Reporting

The IO Team observed the packing of the samples and the transport from the Doping Control Stations to the Doping Control Command Centre, including the organizing of the documentation. We observed the early morning packing of the samples and the transport from the Command Centre to the airport. This was done efficiently and securely through a detailed and well thought out system.

The Command Centre was located in a secure hotel where the Doping Control personnel lived during the Games. Samples were transported directly to Command Centre at the end of each day by Doping Control Station Managers where they were logged and securely stored. The samples were packed each morning at 05h30 in the Command Centre and the documentation checked. The urine samples were packed in special-built suitcases; the blood samples in special-built hand-held coolers packed with ice. There were no temperature tracking devices in the blood coolers. The suitcases and coolers were sealed and taken by dedicated Doping Control personnel to the airport to fly them to Beijing. There was a special GAGOC check-in. Arrangements had been negotiated with airport security for special procedures: the urine suitcases were tagged and checked at the oversized baggage counter; the blood coolers were carried on board as carry-on bags; they were carried through the metal detector but not put through the carry-on baggage x-ray screening. The IO Team was informed (but this was not observed) that the dedicated Doping Control personnel would pick up the urine suitcases at a special GAGOC counter in Beijing and be driven directly to the Beijing accredited laboratory where all samples were analyzed. Those same individuals would return to Guangzhou the same day with the empty urine suitcases and blood coolers. The IO Team did not visit the laboratory.

Negative results were reported to the OCA MCADC Chair within 24 hours, negative EPO and IRMS analysis within 48 hours and positive results within 36 hours. All results were reported in a timely manner and properly matched and accounted for by the OCA (through ADAMS).

Recommendation

- *The GAGOC procedures related to the shipping of samples should be made available to future event organizers where the laboratory is located in a different city.*

Results Management

Results management is handled by the MCADC. The hearing is conducted by a Disciplinary Committee. It makes a recommendation whether there is an ADRV to the OCA President and Executive Board for decision.

There were two ADRVs determined while the IO Team was present at these Games. Laboratory results were communicated to the Chair of the OCA MCADC. Initial reviews were conducted by the MCADC in accordance with OCA Anti-Doping Rules. The notification of the AAF and the

results of the initial review was adequate but could have been more informative. The two hearings we observed were conducted clearly, carefully and methodically. They were fair and the athlete's rights were protected at all times. In both cases, the President and Executive Board (through the Working Committee) accepted the recommendations of an ADRV and the athletes were disqualified from the Games (in one instance a silver medalist).

The IO Chair met with the OCA MCADC Chair and based on IO Team observations of the first hearing, the presentation of the case against the athlete at the second hearing was improved by outlining at the outset (a) the Disciplinary Committee mandate to conduct a hearing and to make a recommendation, (b) all of the options available to the athlete (including the B sample analysis) and (c) the consequences of an ADRV. Only then was the athlete called upon to present his case.

The multiple roles of the Chair of the MCADC in the results management and hearing processes were discussed after the first hearing. According to Rule 7.2 (Procedures) of the OCA Anti-Doping Rules, the Chair is to play the central role in receiving the lab certificate setting out the AAF and conducted the initial review. The Chair then signs the notification to the Chef de Mission. Then according to Rule 7.2.5, the Chair may also sit on the Disciplinary Committee. At these Games, by a written instrument of delegation dated October 18, 2010, the President of the OCA had named the Chair of the MCADC to be the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee. This gave rise to a perception of the Chair conducting a hearing which includes a review of his own work in the initial review. Furthermore, the same instrument of delegation established a Working Committee of seven members to exercise the functions of the President and Executive Committee on anti-doping matters. The Chair of the MCADC also sits as a member of the Working Committee (although not as its Chair). This also gives rise to an appearance of the Chair making a recommendation – at least in part – to himself.

In response to IO Team observations after the first hearing, the initial review was delegated to three other members of the MCADC. The Chair also recused himself from the decision-making of the Working Committee when considering any further recommendations coming from his Disciplinary Committee on anti-doping matters.

Recommendations

- *The notification of the AAF to the Chef de Mission could be more detailed. It should set out the consequences for the ADRV asserted against the athlete. It should suggest that the athlete and his representatives review the results management and hearing procedures set out in the OCA Anti-Doping Rules prior to the hearing. While participating countries and their athletes are deemed to know the OCA Anti-Doping Rules, given the speed with which a hearing takes place, the notification could be more user-friendly and sensitive to the possible lack of familiarity of NOCs with these rules (and the likelihood that few if any athletes will know them).*

- *The OCA Anti-Doping Rules ought to be revised to reflect the practices adopted during the Games to avoid multiple and potentially conflicting roles of the Chair of the MCADC.*

ADAMS

ADAMS was only used in part at these Games. For example, laboratory results were not reported through ADAMS. Assistance from the IO Team was provided to the OCA in order to learn how to generate the required reports and avoid parallel and duplicate data input and spreadsheet tracking.

Recommendations

- *The OCA should use ADAMS for submission and processing of TUEs.*
- *The OCA should require the contract between organizing committees and laboratories to require the use for ADAMS for lab reporting.*
- *The OCA should ensure adequate ADAMS training for staff in preparation for its various games.*

Appendix - IO Team Members

Joseph de Pencier, Member, IPC Anti-Doping Committee and UCI Anti-Doping Commission (Canada) – *Chair*

Tom May, Senior Manager, Program Development, WADA (Canada) – *Team Manager*

Dr. Stuart Miller, Head of Science & Technical, International Tennis Federation (UK)

Dr. Jane Moran, Chair, Medical Commission, International Skating Union (Canada)

Graeme Turnbull, Doping Control Officer, Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority (Australia)

Ying Cui, Manager, Standards and Harmonization, WADA (China/Canada)