

## CCES Submission to International Standards First Review Phase International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS)

In response to WADA's request for comments as part of Phase 1 of the International Standards review process, the CCES submitted the following comments with respect to the **International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS)**.

---

### General Comments

For clarity and consistency, consider using the CRC acronym in every instance after its first mention as it has been specifically defined (as opposed to using "Compliance Review Committee" sporadically.)

The CCES remains concerned that there is a potential for deadlock. For example, what happens if the Executive Committee doesn't follow a CRC recommendation and the CRC is not prepared to change their recommendation. How does the situation get resolved?

As a general comment for the final version of this Standard, CCES recommends providing hyperlinks to references within the Code, Annexes and other Articles within the Standard.

As a general comment to this Standard, CCES recommends using "their" in place of "his/her" to comply with gender inclusivity norms.

### 4.3 Defined terms specific to the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories

CCES recommends expanding the scope of Aggravating Factors to include the other categories of non-compliance, especially requirements that are High Priority. The current definition only attributes Aggravating Factors to requirements that are Critical. CCES believes that "bad faith" can be demonstrated in association with all levels of Code and ISCCS non-compliance.

### General Comments to Part Two

CCES remains concerned that, outside of the fast track process, the entire compliance process can theoretically take two years to complete from start to end. This lengthy timeframe for compliance resolution allows ample time for transgressions to continue to occur, athletes to continue competing despite potentially compromised procedures thus creating the probable situation of having to manage consequences retroactively.

## **8.2 Prioritization Between Different Signatories**

CCES recommends including private companies and International Federation integrity units providing anti-doping services into the scope of the ISCCS as their processes and procedures should be held to the same oversight and discipline as Signatories to the Code. That being said, ADOs that choose to use third-party service providers would continue to be held accountable and responsible for the actions of those parties.

## **9.5 Fast Track Procedure**

CCES recommends further specification of the triggers for non-conformity identified in 9.5.1.1. This article would be best served by including wording that describes the initiation of this process in practical terms. This would include further defining when WADA Management would trigger the fast track process and highlighting how political decisions and implications might come into play.

## **11.2 Principles Relevant to the Determination of the Signatory Consequences to be applied in a Particular Case**

CCES would like to recommend the removal of the provisions within the ISCCS to protect the ongoing participation in sport by 'neutral' athletes. CCES has concerns that creating a single global system for validating the rights of 'neutral' athletes may further complicate an already complex ISCCS document. CCES agrees that while there will be inevitable collateral consequences for athletes when a Signatory is finally determined to be non-compliant, this could effectively be sorted out on a sport by sport basis as the IAAF has done. Alternatively, should it be determined that these provisions be left in the ISCCS with the intention of suggesting that the IAAF model be adopted for all sports as the way to approve participation by neutral athletes, then the CCES recommends that further details be added to best define this process.