

Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport
CADP Symposium, May 12-13, 2014, Ottawa

*Protecting the integrity of sport in Canada:
Moving towards a concerted and collaborative effort
in the fight against doping*

Summary Report

“We really have to step up to the plate, all of us, to not only deter the cheaters but to protect the innocent, and that’s an opportunity for us.”

—*delegate, CADP Symposium*

A single doping violation can have a massive, long-lasting impact on athletes, on sport, and on a country as a whole. The integrity of sport suffers a blow. Sponsors and funders flee. And, perhaps worst of all, when one athlete cheats, there is a tendency to tar all others with the same brush: just ask members of the Canadian Olympic team who competed at the 1988 Summer Olympics in Seoul, South Korea.

While Canada has come a long way since the Ben Johnson scandal and is now renowned as a global leader in the anti-doping field, the world of sport has changed too. Doping has become more sophisticated, with the science of testing in an ongoing race to uncover the latest innovations in cheating. Many athletes continue to fall victim to inadvertent violations through their use of supplements containing banned ingredients marketed by unscrupulous providers.

It is more important than ever that Canada maintain a meaningful and effective anti-doping program in the face of these challenges. The new Canadian Anti-Doping Policy (CADP), developed in accordance with the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code and currently in draft form, will help us accomplish that goal.

The CADP Symposium, held May 12-13, 2014 in Ottawa, was part of an ongoing consultation process initiated by the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES) around the implementation of the 2015 World-Anti-Doping Code, which will come into effect on January 1 next year. The purpose of the Symposium was to introduce the draft CADP and its various elements, and to stimulate discussion and dialogue around implementation of the new anti-doping code in order to capture feedback from the Canadian sport community. This feedback will guide the development of the next draft of the CADP.

This report represents a summary of the participatory elements of the Symposium.

May 12: Table Discussions

Element 1—The CADP Value Proposition

The CADP Value Proposition will ensure a meaningful and effective anti-doping program in Canada, which will address the actual risk of doping in a particular sport. As such, each sport organization adopting the CADP will benefit from the identical value proposition associated with the adoption of the CADP. The value proposition is as follows:

Every adopting sport organization shall have in place a Code-compliant anti-doping program that is meaningful and effective. The anti-doping program shall be administered by the CCES and shall be specifically designed to protect designated athletes within that sport from the risk of doping. The anti-doping program shall include the delivery of appropriate anti-doping education. Further, adopting sport organizations shall be permitted to use the name and logo of the CADP for their promotional and marketing purposes associated with being, in all respects, Code-compliant.

Therefore, sports that adopt the CADP can be assured that effective and meaningful steps to address doping in that sport are being taken by CCES—commensurate with the assessed risk.

Question 1: Do you agree with the value proposition associated with the CADP?

(12 responses)

Most participants agreed with the value proposition in principle. Protecting clean athletes and preserving the integrity of sport as a whole through an effective national system were cited as key reasons. However, several respondents expressed concern over National Sport Organization's (NSO) capacity to implement the CADP, particularly at the community level. Engaging provincial and territorial sport organizations, clubs, coaches, and parents will be key.

"It's difficult to disagree [with the value proposition]. However, operationally, this becomes more difficult as we try to envision how we will have the means to deliver, especially at the grassroots community level. For small sports for whom doping is not an issue it is not clear that the value proposition is worth the minimum buy-in "fee". However, we believe that investing in the system as a whole is important."

Most participants consider effective education programs for athletes, coaches and other support personnel to be a crucial component of the CADP value proposition. Several expressed a desire for more information about how early these education programs should start, and who would be responsible for their implementation and ongoing evaluation.

“At what level will CCES be involved in ensuring that education is being delivered, in tracking the implementation of the program? What measures are in place to ensure that the education being delivered is adequate and being properly received (i.e., the challenges of online learning versus in-person learning)?”

Question 2: Will you use the CADP logo?

(9 responses)

All respondents indicated they would use the CADP logo. However, one group suggested that the logo is too “general” and would be more beneficial if it were more recognizable by athletes, parents and sponsors. Another expressed concern about the demands for space on NSO websites, many of which are already cluttered with the logos of sponsors, partners and international federations, as well as emblems representing specific events, while a third believed the electronic version of the logo should ideally include a link to more information.

Question 3: How will you define your national athlete pool (when, will it be difficult, what strategies will you use)?

(10 responses)

The consensus among participants was that the definition of the National Athlete Pool (NAP) will have to be sport-specific, due to differences in development pathways for high-performance athletes from NSO to NSO, the range of rules and testing protocols within the various professional tours, international and regional bodies, and the degree of risk associated with each sport. It was suggested that the CCES partner with NSOs to help them define criteria for their NAP, and in cases where this wouldn't apply, that the means to obtain a waiver be offered so that a particular sport could be exempt.

Options for defining the NAP included:

- That athletes be added to the NAP once they make it to a national team;
- That carded athletes be added to the NAP;
- That the NAP be revised annually;
- One NSO may incorporate CADP alerts into the annual athlete agreement process or institute a declaration process, because athletes who have signed an agreement are typically on the path towards a national team; and
- The ‘Own the Podium’ tiered system may also be used to identify national-level athletes.

One group offered the following comments, which underline the need for sport-specific criteria:

- Sport A: would identify athletes at trials for junior and 13-15. These are athletes who would compete internationally the following year at juniors but would not go directly to the national team.
- Sport B: it would be difficult to identify the potential pool because it would be too large.
- Sport C: The province could identify potential high-performance athletes and those on the list could be taken for the pool.
- Sport D: Because so many athletes participate in open trials, the pool of athletes cannot be identified until the national team is selected.

“Given [that] we haven’t had a testing pool of athletes, this will be new territory for us to figure out who should be identified. As the NSO was not perceived or educated to be accountable for a testing pool, there was no identification of athletes for testing in this area. It is interesting that the NSO will now be a partner and understand their role in this area; more resources will need to be put into this.”

Some groups also expressed concern that identifying athletes who should be added to the NAP far enough in advance of national team selection may be difficult. Depending on the qualifying processes at work in a given sport, an NSO might not know until quite late that an athlete has qualified for a major competition and needs to be added to their NAP.

This strongly suggests the need to identify up-and-coming athletes and add them to the NAP earlier in their careers (i.e., prior to selection for a national team), and also to ensure they receive adequate education about the CADP when they are young. However, given that a majority of symposium participants view education as a key component of the CADP value proposition, many respondents, not surprisingly, also expressed concern that reaching young athletes at the grassroots level with the right information and messaging can pose a challenge for national sport bodies.

“Our likely approach will be to identify athletes on the national depth chart—to capture future and aspiring elite athletes. Question: how far down the depth chart would we have to go in terms of age? It gets more difficult to conduct meaningful education and compliance as an NSO, the younger the athletes are (less direct contact with the NSO).”

Element 2—Education and Athlete Services

Feedback from participants on Element 1 highlighted education as one of the most important characteristics of the CADP value proposition. This is reflected throughout the discussions around Element 2, which generated a wide range of comments and ideas—particularly around the need to educate coaches and other support personnel, in addition to athletes—that the CCES can take into consideration going forward.

Question 1: Do you have any feedback for improving CCES E-Learning?

(8 responses)

The notion that the completion of E-Learning modules should be mandatory for athletes and/or support staff—perhaps as a condition of participation in championships or multi-sport games, or as part of the contractual agreement for support staff—was cited repeatedly as a means of ensuring at least some level of CADP knowledge among targeted groups. Alternatively, it was suggested that incentives could be provided by Sport Canada, CCES or NSOs to participate in E-Learning, and that CCES could work with NSOs to track completion of the required modules by targeted individuals.

However, most participants also questioned the efficacy of E-Learning on its own, and felt it should be supplemented by face-to-face delivery of learning whenever possible, whether through direct outreach at Games, mentoring, or in-person sessions run by trained facilitators from individual NSOs. Training NSO staff as CADP educators (i.e., someone from within that particular sport community) would result in greater buy-in from athletes and support personnel. It would also allow for the immediate gathering of feedback from participants and an assessment of their level of engagement in the program.

“The challenges of E-Learning:

- *Participants do not pay attention and simply play the video or do the reading, then walk away and come back to answer the questions.*
- *Participants are a wide variety of ages in some instances and the training can seem patronizing to some athletes.”*

Some participants stressed the need for CCES to work towards streamlining E-Learning to avoid duplicating the education efforts of international federations and other stakeholders. It was also suggested that CCES correspond with NSOs to build a plan for E-Learning delivery (perhaps with sport-specific content, or content tailored to specific groups, such as coaches) prior to competitions. It is also clear that

E-Learning modules must be updated on a regular basis in order to remain relevant as the science around doping evolves.

“Consider how long the education is good for. Should athletes repeat the course annually? Does the information management system allow athletes to repeat the course? Possibly consider regular (quarterly) mini-quizzes the athlete should complete to keep informed and strengthen the knowledge they learned during the E-Learning module.”

One group recommended that easy-to-follow resources be made available to athletes outside of E-Learning so they can access information about roles, responsibilities, and the testing process. There may also be a need for follow-up testing to prove the athlete completed and understood the training as intended. This way, they would be less able to blame lack of knowledge/education for a positive result.

Other suggestions for improving CCES E-Learning included:

- The creation of a complementary mobile app;
- The use of shorter videos, and more video intros/segments to break up written text;
- More interactivity;
- Splitting the E-Learning into parts that can be completed at different times throughout the year instead of all at once, in order to encourage follow-up discussion;
- For CCES to develop more of a presence at the national and grassroots levels so athletes have a greater awareness;
- For CCES to work with the Coaching Association of Canada (CAC) to ensure grassroots coaches are receiving the information they need, and perhaps enlisting these coaches to help educate young athletes; and
- Testing athletes’ knowledge to determine whether they need to re-do E-Learning every year (particularly for senior athletes).

Question 2: What strategies will your sport implement to educate grassroots, development level athletes?

(7 responses)

A majority of respondents agreed that it is unrealistic to rely solely on NSOs for grassroots education. However, it was suggested that CCES could partner with NSOs, clubs, and other organizations to build fun and practical multi-sport E-Learning modules targeted around provincial/summer/winter competitions. Secondly, respondents suggested face-to-face seminars for athletes and/or parents that could be delivered at age grade national festivals and championships. Anti-doping

education could also become part of provincial and territorial health and physical education curricula.

These grassroots education sessions, particularly for younger groups, could be designed as a fun experience built around True Sport values, but could also include “cheaters” devoting volunteer hours to speaking about the consequences of doping. Individual sports would have to decide when this information ought to be introduced to young athletes, and for those under 18, it was recommended that parents complete the course as well.

“Partner with other organizations in education [and] territorial and provincial governments... Develop an overall E-Learning targeted to youth that is fun and interactive, delivered through Phys. Ed classes in the health curriculum. [We] need to partner with organizations related to the sport [and learn] from those who have done it—Hockey Canada, CAC (concussion awareness). Get parents involved—E-Learning and other resources targeted to parents of young athletes.”

One group stated that it would ensure all athletes participating in senior national championships have completed the E-Learning course, while also encouraging all key PSO personnel to do so, although it was unclear how far below the “senior” level this should be extended. Another group suggested education could be incorporated into any or all of the following:

- Event-specific selection criteria (i.e., athletes and coaches would be required to attend education sessions at regional, provincial and/or national events);
- Coach education (NCCP);
- Long term athlete development (LTAD) education pieces; and
- Annual registration procedures.

The CCES could also make use of social media and mobile technology to make education more accessible for younger athletes, for example:

- By “pushing” out brief, impactful videos via YouTube, Twitter and Instagram about the consequences of doping (having “spokesperson” athletes from each individual sport talking to their own communities); or
- By using a mobile app to allow athletes to check the banned list and receive a 10-second anti-doping message at the same time.

Question 3: Do you need additional resources from CCES’ athlete services?

(6 responses)

While one group described the resources currently available as “excellent,” others would like to see:

- Targeted messaging for user groups, particularly for coaches and support staff, who will be more accountable under the new CADP. E-Learning needs

- to be adapted for coaches and athlete support personnel, as well as grassroots audiences.
- Slide materials in pdf format that can be forwarded in English or French.
 - More interactive and engaging orientation sessions that can be shortened or lengthened depending on time available with different NSOs.
 - A train-the-trainers system (similar to that of CAC), to ensure that team or league contacts are knowledgeable about CADP.
 - A tie-in back to the CCES website from NSOs, PSOs and associations to create a standard message across all levels of jurisdiction.
 - The ability to customize E-Learning content.
 - A testing-of-knowledge option for senior athletes to determine whether they need to re-do learning modules on an annual basis.

Element 4—Testing Program

Question 1: What has been your experience with the testing program?

(5 responses)

Participants reported having various levels of experience with the testing program, depending on their sport. For example, Sport E and Sport F have had almost none, while a representative from Sport G has had significant involvement in testing, which regularly occurs during practices and events—although the respondent was unclear whether it is CCES or the international federation doing the testing. A participant from Sport H expressed concern that testing is not adapted to athletes with a disability, but emphasized that this is their only concern with the program.

One group stated that CCES and IF testing are not very well coordinated (sometimes athletes must do two tests on the same day) and that some athletes find it too invasive to give their sample. The same group also inquired whether the list of medications on the doping-control form can be added to post-testing, since it's difficult to list them all on the spot. Another group reported that some athletes feel awkward the first time they are tested, but that education will help alleviate some of these issues.

Question 2: While still being effective, how can we minimize the testing program's impact on athletes?

(4 responses)

One group stated that with unannounced testing, there is a lot of pressure on athletes to be where they say they are going to be at all times—but this doesn't account for unavoidable absences, such as a missed flight or traffic. Back-to-back testing can also be overwhelming. Another group of respondents expressed concern about multiple blood samples being taken in a short period of time, and described the whereabouts system as “a big headache.”

Other suggestions included:

- Ongoing coordination with various testing bodies.
- The creation of a user-friendly, GPS-based mobile app for whereabouts compliance.
- Testing the right things: narrowing the probability of the types of doping an athlete may use based on their sport.
- Providing specific information for clubs at the grassroots level.
- Offering incentives to clean athletes as part of a commitment to ensuring drug-free sport.

Question 3: How can the testing program be more effective at catching the cheaters?

(6 responses)

A clear reporting policy that encourages “speaking up” about suspicious activity and includes protection for whistleblowers is a necessary component of an effective testing program. When CCES is able to gather information more effectively about who may be involved in doping, this will eventually lead to more selective, intelligence-based testing.

Participants disagreed, however, about whether or not reporting suspected doping should be made mandatory: One group suggested that an obligation to report be included in athlete agreements and behavior codes, and that coaches and support staff also be required to report spikes in basic physiological training data. Other respondents, however, recommended that an avenue be provided to coaches wherein they could express concern without disclosing any information. Better cooperation between government agencies would also enhance intelligence-based testing.

In addition, testing protocols and timing need to be matched with sport-specific annual planning and training cycles, and participants agreed that biological passports are a must for high-risk sports. One group suggested that specific performance metrics from NSOs could also be used to identify unusual leaps that may fall outside statistical norms.

May 13: Plenary Discussion

After a brief presentation by CCES Director Jeremy Luke, wherein he emphasized that there is no “one size fits all” and that CCES would work with NSOs to ensure testing plans make sense for them, participants had the opportunity to offer insights on what they’d heard so far. Following is a summary of some of the key points raised:

Capacity concerns: Many NSOs feel that they are only able to get about 5% of their jobs done, and are concerned about how to manage the integration of the new CADP within their organizations. How much responsibility will be downloaded to the NSOs?

“How do we maintain our core business and not allow this to become a monster that takes over all capacity and takes away from other areas? There’s a lot of will to get it done, but we want to keep that in mind.”

Reducing burdens on the system: Athlete whereabouts issues, TUEs and inadvertent doping cause 70% to 80% of the demands on the system, and this will only become worse with implementation of the new code. Possible solutions:

- Make sure that athletes have the correct information by tying E-Learning to funding.
- Hire a joint athlete services manager/coordinator to “babysit” the system.
- Seek sponsorships from pharmaceutical companies for “safe” drugs or supplements that don’t include banned substances.
- Put together a small group comprised of reps from both summer and winter sports to look at ways of relieving pressure on the system.

Increased costs for athletes: Most national team athletes “pay to play,” and already spend far more than they earn. The new requirement to pay a \$1,500 to \$3,000 to pursue a hearing, regardless of the violation, is prohibitive, and may actually violate the WADA code as it effectively imposes a financial penalty on athletes who may not have committed the most serious code violation.

The need for a customized approach: The CADP must be customizable for each sport, because of all the different issues, challenges and needs within their relationships with CCES.

Clarity of information: It’s difficult to figure out what is and is not allowed under the new code. Information should be simplified in order to facilitate compliance. In particular, we have to distinguish between the responsibilities and contributions of NSOs, PSOs, sport centres and other stakeholders.

The need for better alignment: Like-minded partners must do a better job coordinating their efforts throughout the system. The role of the athlete “entourage” (their support system, coaches, family, etc.) must also be considered as more than just a fringe element when implementing the new code.

Proposed funding model

Participants generally agreed that there is a minimum price to pay for clean sport, but many also expressed concern that even a \$3,000 adoption fee may be prohibitive for some NSOs. It was suggested that an across-the-board minimal compliance fee makes sense, but that a tiered approach could be taken to calculate costs above and beyond the minimum, based on criteria such as the size of the organization and the risk of doping. However, another respondent pointed out that discussions around the fee structure should remain hypothetical until WADA publishes its new technical document, and NSOs have a better sense of the requirements.

Thirteen separate sets of comments were collected in regards to the CCES's proposed funding model. Each one is summarized below, in the order they were reviewed:

1. A base fee needs to be in place, but it must be determined based on the size of an NSO's membership, its annual budget, the risk of doping, or the number of infractions within that sport in previous years. More educational opportunities could be offered to sports with a high number of violations, and instituting a charge for the E-Learning may be a way to offset costs.
2. The proposed adoption fee is not welcome. If Canada wants to have the best NADO in the world, then let Canada pay for it—not individual organizations, NSOs and athletes. The cost per organization should reflect the services received, with fees weighted towards a sport's risk of doping and event schedule—i.e., user fees for testing.
3. Adoption fees could be an approach but CCES must undertake further conversations with specific NSOs. A tiered approach should be applied based on size and risk of doping, and we need to have a clear understanding of what the funding model will look like over the longer term. (Sport I, for example, has a 4-year fee so that partners know what the cost will be over a set period of time.) Education must also be ramped up, and CCES must explore creative ways to engage athletes and others.
4. Further revenue is needed. A tiered approach seems more reasonable to most sports due to the doping risks and size of individual NSOs. Have other avenues, such as foundations and sponsorships, been explored to help cover education expenses?
5. Adoption fees are precedent setting. Once they start, they will never go away, and costs will only rise. What happens if some universities and colleges choose not to participate? Does the base price for low risk sports increase? Is this an eligible Sport Canada expense, and, if not, what quantitative value does being

part of this program bring to the members who are funding it outside of the elite group that actually receives testing? A tiered approach makes sense for size and risk, but how often would this be reassessed? How would the risk of doping itself be assessed? Lastly, CCES needs to do a better job of developing its brand, and bring in True Sport to be part of the funding solution.

6. We understand why the adoption fee approach is preferred—it's equitable and non-discriminatory. The tiered approach also has merit, but would need to be based on very simple criteria (i.e., sports with historical doping offenses should bear a higher proportion of the cost). We need to be cautious about not incentivizing the wrong behaviours (i.e., if a tiered approach was based on the number of athletes in the national athlete pool, it may encourage sports to minimize the size of those groups). Perhaps CCES could start with a blanket adoption fee, with add-ons that are sport-specific, and also seek commercial sponsorships.
7. Most sports will not be able to afford the fee and it will come down to charging the athletes directly: "Robbed by Peter to pay Paul."
8. Sport Canada should cover core services for NSOs (there's no need to send this money to an NSO and then have the NSO send it to CCES). Core services must be clearly defined, but should include education and some degree of testing. CCES could generate more revenue by outsourcing—taking on clients to assist with the implementation of the new code in other countries. Cost savings may also be realized by training people in other organizations (i.e., Sport J) to provide services.
9. Is this not just recycling Sport Canada funding? Take out the middle man.
10. (From Sport K, Sport L, Sport M, Sport N) Why wouldn't the costs be proportional to the number of athletes in the testing pool? It will very difficult to separate "fee for service" from the value proposition; we need to clearly itemize services that result from this fee so that NSOs can clearly communicate this to their stakeholders. It could start with a very minimal (\$500) base fee for the value proposition, and then a sliding scale could be developed based on the outcome of the WADA technical document. We also need to align the various organizations that an athlete may come into contact with multiple times (i.e., university programs, NSOs and MSOs) to avoid duplication.
11. More effective investigations may result in lower costs by decreasing the number of analytical tests. Further cost savings could be realized by investing in activities around TUEs, whereabouts violations and preventing inadvertent doping. Provincial and territorial governments could be brought on board as new funding partners. And if an adoption fee is put in place for 2015 based on risk, it could be revisited in the future based on savings vs. actual costs.

12. How does Sport Canada view the costs of compliance? Do they feel it appropriate that CCES reach out to NSOs to fund the mandate? And where is health-sector funding if this is a public health issue? A tiered approach based on risk is necessary, but if we pay a fee are we then a partner and can we advise on how funds are spent? More effective education—ideally with contributions by provinces and territories—will mean less need for testing, and less inadvertent doping. And if our international federation initiates a test, the NSO is taking on costs that don't go through CCES. Will that be considered in the risk assessment?
13. Has Sport Canada committed the \$400,000? What if all sports said “no”? Where is plan B? A tiered approach should be taken. And for those sports that are low-risk, is there an option to pay on a case-by-case basis? NSOs should be involved in the development of the risk assessment model. Would there be a menu of services with an adoption fee? And is this budget based on “meeting” or “exceeding” compliance? If it's the latter, what is plan B?

Next steps:

Collectively, as a sport community, we must develop and agree to a 2015 CADP that reflects the new World Anti-Doping Code, which all countries and international sport federations must implement by January 1, 2015. We recognize that one of the challenges of doing so in Canada will be to make sure the new CADP is implemented in a meaningful and effective way for each and every one of the 80 federally funded sport organizations in this country.

With this in mind, the CCES consultation process will continue throughout the summer and into the fall. We thank you for your active participation in the Symposium, and we welcome your ongoing comments and feedback as we work to determine the best way to implement the 2015 World Anti-Doping Code in Canada.

Upcoming CADP dates:

September 1, 2014:	Second draft
October 1, 2014:	Final draft
October-December 2014:	Adoption
January 1, 2015:	New World Anti-Doping Code and Canadian Anti-Doping Program in effect

For further information and to share additional feedback: cadp2015@cces.ca.

Prepared by: Face Value Communications Inc.