WORLD ANTI- DOPING AGENCY INDEPENDENT OBSERVER REPORT

INDEPENDENT OBSERVER TEAM

- **STEVE KOEHLER**
- **UNA MAY**
- **ROLAND** MOLINARO

IO TRAINING CONDUCTED BY: ROB KOEHLER

EVENT: CYCLING ROAD WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS 2001

VENUE: LISBON, PORTUGAL

HOSTED: UNITED CYCLING INTERNATIONAL (UCI)

DATES: OCTOBER 9-14, 2001

OBSERVATIONS REPORTED ON

- DOPING CONTROL FACILITIES
- DOPING CONTROL EQUIPMENT
- DOPING CONTROL PERSONNEL
- SELECTION PROCESS
- RIDER NOTIFICATION/CHAPERONING
- SAMPLE COLLECTION PROCEDURES
- CHAIN OF CUSTODY

WADA INDEPENDENT OBSERVER REPORT

UCI CYCLING ROAD WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS 2001
LISBON, PORTUGAL, 9-14 OCTOBER

Doping Control Facilities

The Doping Control Station was basic but adequate. It consisted of 2 porta-cabins with a tented area joining them. The Station was located in a secure area (which also contained the press conference centre and the UCI offices) about 150m from the award podium. Signposting was adequate.

The station was divided into a waiting room and sample processing room with one toilet provided. This was smaller than that recommended in the UCI regulations but served its purpose adequately. Having only one sample processing area (+toilet) delayed the procedure at times when two would have been more appropriate.

There were a number of minor problems in the station which were rectified during the first day of testing. There were no rubbish bins – a small one was eventually found. There were no tissues or hand towels – toilet paper was used for drying hands and wiping the paperwork area. There was a window next to the processing table, the blind of which was not pulled down at first, making the process very visible from outside. There was another window at the far end of the cabin (with a view of the toilet) which was open for much of the week, though the blind was eventually closed.

The toilet itself was small which resulted in the door being left ajar on occasions – this retracted considerably from the riders privacy as there were often up to five persons in the processing area. The compromise arrangement between the UCI and Portuguese National Anti-Doping Agency relating to the testing procedures resulted in this large number of observers (in addition to ourselves). The UCI were represented by an Anti-Doping Inspector and Medical Inspector, while the Portuguese Agency provided the Doping Control Officer (who was also a doctor).

Security on the Doping Control Station varied considerably during the week. At the beginning of the week there were occasions when the tented waiting area became busy with persons not involved in the testing process. Following the elite races security was tightened considerably and for the second half of the week there was at least one security guard on duty during testing (at times there were two). The processing cabin was locked when testing was not taking place and access to the general area in which the doping control station was located was restricted.

There was no official in the waiting area or in the tented area. When riders arrived at the station there was no way to report their arrival until the processing of the sample underway was completed.

Doping Control Equipment

Equipment used by UCI was originally to be the Berlinger, unfortunately it was held in customs and they would not be able to get the supplies released in time for the competition. UCI was able to acquire

versapacs and used this system instead. UCI used partial sample kits from the versapac system to collect urine from the athletes.

Doping control paper work was developed by UCI. The paper work was straightforward and easy to use.

EPO urine samples were sealed with^the Berlinger system..

Doping Control Personnel

Doping control staff conducted themselves in a very professional manner at all times. They were conscious of all their duties and were very reliable. The staff of UCI made us feel welcome and were willing to share all aspects of the process.

Selection Process

In accordance with UCI regulations 6 riders were selected for testing in each race. The first 4 were automatically selected and 2 further rides were tested following a random selection. 2 reserves were also drawn at random with the order of their drawing being recorded. A total of 60 tests were carried out according to this procedure.

The UCI Anti-Doping Inspector carried out the draw with the assistance of a second person (whoever happened to be available at the time). The method of carrying out the draw varied a little but was always random. Usually the draw was made firstly according to Country (each country had a predetermined number) and then a second draw determined which rider from that country was selected. On some occasions a second draw didn't take place but the first rider listed from the selected country was chosen.

The draw took place before the start of the event for the time trials and for road races varied between being carried out before the start and in last hour of the race.

At least one rider presented himself for testing following an early morning blood test – this was not considered part of our remit as it was deemed to be an out of competition test.

Rider notification/chaperoning

Riders selected at random were notified via signs posted at the finish line, the doping control station and at the entrance off the race route to the team tents. It is the riders responsibility to check if they need to report for testing. (This is in accordance with UCI regulations). Consequently, the chaperoning was not always consistent. The first 3 riders are automatically directed to the doping control station after the press conference which occurs immediately after the award ceremony. The fourth rider appeared to be notified by the escort/chaperone.

For most of the week there was only one chaperone. We did not observe his training. .

Each rider appeared to be notified by the chaperone by way of a notification form (the chaperone spoke only Portuguese). A copy was not given to the riders. As there were many occasions when the selected riders finished in close succession they could not all be chaperoned to the doping control station and were left to show up themselves within the 30 minutes permitted.

The situation improved significantly in the latter part of the week when the chaperone recruited some additional assistance. There were at least 3 chaperones active in the final two elite races.

Once riders arrived at the doping control station there was no one to report to unless the sample processing was not in progress. There was no chaperoning within the waiting area until the single chaperone had completed all notifications at which time he spent some time in the waiting area. There was a toilet in the waiting area and one rider was observed entering this apparently for the purpose of changing out of his cycling clothes. At one point one rider left the station for a short time without notifying anyone and without a chaperone (prior to providing his sample). Riders were not guided on arrival – it was unclear whether testing was an a first come first served basis. Any queries from riders or their representatives had a wait until a test was completed and the DCO reappeared from the sample processing room.

Sample Collection Procedures

Once the athletes reported to the doping control station it was up to the athlete to knock on a door which often interrupted testing already in progress. Riders were then asked to produce their cycling identification cards. The elite riders are asked to show their medical card, which documents previous doping sessions, medications and dosages prescribed by physicians. Although riders are strongly advised to produce this booklet, it is not mandatory. The athlete was instructed to choose a Versapac and urine collection cup then asked to produce minimum requirement (75ml). The athlete and DCO would then go into the small lavatory.

Partial sample beakers were used to collect the urine sample. This seemed to work fine for the male riders but due to the fact that the lid is connected to the collection vessel, we questioned if this caused any difficulties for the women to produce their sample. After the sample was produced, many times the DCO would carry the sample back to the processing table.

Tables used by doping staff were not level. When sample amounts were borderline, the sample was easily manipulated by placing it at a certain area of the table to reveal the adequate amount of sample required (75ml).

The urine sample would then be processed. Due to language barriers with foreign athletes, the DCO had to handle the equipment to help the athlete process the sample, although there were times the athlete didn't need assistance, samples were still handled by DCO's, medical staff and other accompanying personnel. Many of these problems could have been avoided with the presence of interpreters.

No major problems to report during the actual splitting of the samples other than a few inconsistencies between DCO's.

During one day of competition athletes were given a sheet of paper which stated what UCI considered banned substances and if they would like to declare any of these substances. This letter was available in 3 different languages (English, Spanish and Portuguese). The letter was not used again.

DCO's began dropping litmus paper into the collection vessel; this made reading the ph levels difficult. We question the accuracy of the ph levels by using this method. A Refractometer was used to measure the sg. The Refractometer was cleaned improperly and was rinsed under a tap to remove urine residue. Refractometer was never cleaned with alcohol. We did not witness the spectrometer being calibrated either at the DCO station or the lab.

A unique way of sealing documents for transportation was used. DCOs would seal envelopes with melted wax and then press a seal across the seam to prevent any tampering.

All documentation seemed to be in order and paper work was done efficiently. DCOs were very comfortable with the paper work and very few errors were made in this area.

Chain of Custody

At the end of the testing day, samples were carefully packaged and sample codes were recorded. The chain of custody paper work was filled out, sealed in envelopes and sent with versapac transportation bags. A DCO drove the samples directly to the lab. The samples were booked in by a security guard and carried to the labs' booking room. Here technicians validated sample code numbers and entered them into the computer logging system.

The chain of custody of the samples from doping control to the laboratory was very efficient. It was done in a timely manner and samples were very secure at all times.

Laboratory

The Laboratory was an IOC lab with ISO Guide 25 and ISO 2001 accreditation. The Office validated the security and chain of custody. The procedures within the laboratory were of the highest standard.

Results Management

All results were made available to us for full scrutiny. Results which were not available during the week of the competition were forwarded after the event.

Results were received from the laboratory 48 hours after sample collection. On some occasions this time was a little longer.

Summary

All doping control activities sufficiently protected the rights of the athletes and their samples. The UCI representatives were very cooperative and provided regular updates to ensure an open and transparent process.