

2027 CODE & IS UPDATE PROCESS

Second Draft: Summary of Major Changes

World Anti-Doping Code

Executive Summary

Following the careful review and consideration of stakeholder comments provided during the [Stakeholder Consultation Phase](#) and through extensive consultations with the anti-doping community during the [Second Drafting Phase](#), the Code Drafting Team has proposed further changes in a second draft of the 2027 World Anti-Doping Code (Code) as part of the ongoing [2027 Code & IS Update Process](#).

The purpose of this document is to summarize the major changes proposed in the second draft of the 2027 Code, which predominantly build on those proposed in the [first draft of the 2027 Code](#) and as summarized in the corresponding [first draft Summary of Major Changes](#). The first draft Summary of Major Changes is repeated below in black text while the second draft Summary of Major Changes is provided in green text.

Some of the changes in the second draft which merit particular attention include:

- More specific references to human rights.
- The inclusion of Minors who are not Protected Persons in a number of the provisions where Protected Persons receive special consideration.
- An increased focus on the responsibility of Athlete Support Personnel for ensuring that their Athletes do not commit anti-doping rule violations either intentionally or inadvertently.
- Clarification on when Athlete consent is required for research on their anonymized samples.
- Introduction of a new Article creating an Independent Review Expert to implement a key recommendation in the Cottier Report.
- Establishment of a uniform appeal deadline for all parties other than WADA.
- An expanded definition of NADO Operational Independence which will affect the current practices of some stakeholders.
- An invitation for further discussion regarding exceptions to the mandatory Public Disclosure of anti-doping rule violation decisions.

The following section offers a concise article-by-article summary of the more significant changes in this second draft of the 2027 Code.

Purpose, Scope And Organization Of The World Anti-Doping Program

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

Fundamental Rationale For The World Anti-Doping Code

These provisions have been updated based on recommendations from the WADA education and ethics teams with additional input from WADA's human rights consultant. Also, the importance of human rights has been given additional prominence in the Code.

Article 2 Anti-Doping Rule Violations

Comments numbered 7 and 10 to Articles 2.1.1 and 2.2.2 clarify two points. First, an Athlete cannot be charged with use of a Prohibited Substance before they became subject to anti-doping rule violations – although that could be a legitimate basis for denying the Athlete membership in the organization. However, once an Athlete becomes subject to anti-doping rules, the presence of a Prohibited Substance in their Sample is an anti-doping rule violation notwithstanding the fact that the Adverse Analytical Finding came from the substance having been used before the Athlete became subject to the rules.

Article 4.3 Criteria for Including Substances and Methods on the Prohibited List

A substance or method must meet two of the following three criteria in order to be put on the Prohibited List: (1) potential to enhance sport performance; (2) potential health risk to the Athlete and (3) violation of the spirit of sport. It has always been the case that WADA's determination of whether or not to put a substance or method on the list is not subject to challenge. A change has been made to clarify that whether a substance or method meets any of these criteria is also based on WADA's determination.

Article 4.4 Therapeutic Use Exemptions

Much of the detail in this Article of the Code has been moved to the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions. There is one substantive aspect of the TUE process which has generated considerable discussion, but which has not yet been resolved. The question is whether there should be greater flexibility, particularly in the imposition of Consequences, in connection with retroactive TUEs. Based on the stakeholder feedback received, the Code Drafting Team is continuing to consider appropriate sanctioning flexibility in anti-doping rule violation cases where the criteria for obtaining a TUE in Article 4.2 of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions are met (but the athlete has not met the criteria for a retroactive TUE).

While there was strong stakeholder support for a more lenient and flexible sanctioning regime in such cases, the Code Drafting Team is seeking further feedback on what such a regime might look like. In particular:

1. Applying a standard "fault" analysis to impose a period of Ineligibility between a reprimand to two years does not appear to work well in such cases. In particular, the fault of the Athlete can often be assessed as high in that context/using such definition, as the Athlete has not met the criteria for a retroactive TUE and often has simply failed to apply for a TUE in advance.
2. One potential option would be to have a specific, standalone sanctioning regime for such therapeutic use cases (similar to the regime for Substances of Abuse). For example, a provision such as the following:
"Notwithstanding any other provision in Article 10.2, if the Athlete can establish that the presence, Use or Attempted Use or Possession met the criteria in Article 4.2 of the *International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions*, then the period of *Ineligibility* shall be between three (3) and six (6) months depending on the *Athlete's* degree of *Fault*. The period of *Ineligibility* established in this Article [x] is not subject to any reduction based on any provision in Article 10.6."

3. Another option would be to simply have a fixed 3-month sanction in such cases (which also has the benefit of simplicity and not requiring an ADO/hearing panel to have to spend time trying to assess fault.)
4. If no sanction at all were to be imposed, there is a concern that this would be granting a retroactive TUE in all but name (albeit through a different process to the TUE process). This may risk disincentivising Athletes to apply for a TUE in advance, and other potential consequences would also need to be carefully considered, e.g., would this approach risk putting ADOs/hearing panels under undue pressure when trying to retroactively determine if the Article 4.2 criteria are met? There is also concern that this would be setting up a highly complex and time-intensive retroactive TUE process and accompanying Code sanctioning process only to ultimately get to the exact same outcome. If this is the desired policy approach from stakeholders, query if it would be more straightforward to just remove the need to apply for a TUE in advance and state that if an Athlete meets the criteria in Article 4.2 they will get a TUE (whether prospective or retroactive)?

After extensive discussion and consideration of stakeholder feedback, the WADA TUE group has recommended the following solution to address the issues discussed above: A new Article 10.2.4 has been added which imposes a flat two-month period of Ineligibility (not subject to further reduction) where the Athlete can establish that when they used the Prohibited Substance or Method, that use would have met the TUE criteria set forth in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (except for the requirement to show that there was no reasonable permitted therapeutic alternative available).

Article 6.3 Research on Samples

Research on Athlete samples shall always be anonymized in a way that prevents tracing the Sample back to a particular Athlete. Even then, Athlete consent for research using their Samples is required in certain limited circumstances. Changes to this Article better define and provide examples of those circumstances.

Article 6.5 Further Analysis of Samples Prior to or During Results Management

This Article has been revised to make clear that a laboratory may conduct repeat or additional analysis on a sample prior to the time a RMA notifies an Athlete that the sample is the basis for an anti-doping rule violation charge, or after that case has been finally resolved. Between the time that the Athlete has been charged and completion of the case, additional analysis on the sample may only be performed with the consent of the Athlete or the approval of the hearing panel.

Article 7.5 Provisional Suspensions

Under the current Code, stakeholders have noted the difficulty of conducting the results management process and imposing a Provisional Suspension for Substance of Abuse when the period of Ineligibility (with treatment) is only one month. In this draft, the mandatory Provisional Suspension applicable to Adverse Analytical Findings and Adverse Passport Finding for Non-Specified Substances will not be applicable to Substances of Abuse.

When a Provisional Suspension imposed by a Major Event Organization does not extend beyond the completion of the Event or is not binding on other Signatories under Article 15.1.4, a revision to Article 15.2 provides that the RMA shall promptly make its own determination on whether a Provisional Suspension should be imposed.

As revised, Article 7.4.1 now provides that a mandatory Provisional Suspension shall be imposed by the RMA when the person is first notified of the potential anti-doping rule violation. It may be lifted by the same RMA based on the person's well-founded assertion that the violation involved a Contaminated Source or other relevant factors, for example, when the time already served under the Provisional Suspension would exceed the period of Ineligibility likely to be imposed for the anti-doping rule violation. After a hearing body has decided not to lift a Provisional Suspension, only that hearing body may subsequently decide, based on new information, to lift it. As an exception to the above, when a Provisional Suspension imposed by a Major Event Organization remains in place through the end of the Event, the Provisional Suspension shall continue in force beyond the Event, and an

application to lift the Provisional Suspension may be submitted to, or considered by, the applicable International Federation or its hearing body.

Article 7.8 Cases Subject To Review By Independent Review Expert

This is a completely new Article based on the [recommendations of the Independent Prosecutor Eric Cottier](#), and which has been approved in concept by the WADA Executive Committee. In summary, this Article makes clear that when an ADO receives the report of an Adverse Analytical Finding and there are no apparent departures from the International Standard for Testing or International Standard for Laboratories, and the Athlete does not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption, an ADO cannot simply close the case without notifying the Athlete and following through with the Results Management process. In these circumstances: 1) the Athlete must be notified; 2) before closing the case the ADO must submit a request for an opinion from the Independent Review Expert with a copy to WADA; 3) after reviewing the file and any other information deemed necessary, the independent Review Expert shall issue a written opinion and recommendation to the ADO with a copy to WADA advising whether a departure from the normal Results Management process is justified in the particular circumstances of the case; 4) after receiving the Independent Review Expert's opinion and recommendation, the ADO shall issue a written decision on whether it will proceed with normal Results Management or dismiss the Adverse Analytical Finding; 5) copies of the ADO's decision along with the Independent Review Expert's opinion and recommendation will be provided to each of the other parties entitled to appeal the decision, which appeal will be directly to CAS; and 6) where an ADO dismisses an Adverse Analytical Finding case without seeking an opinion and recommendation from the Independent Review Expert or fails to go forward with the normal Results Management process in contravention of the Independent Review Expert's opinion and recommendation, and where it is ultimately determined on appeal that an anti-doping rule violation did occur, then under Article 24 of the Code and the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories, the ADO may be subject to non-compliance outcomes and also will be required to reimburse the appealing parties for costs and reasonable legal fees incurred in connection with the appellate process. This Article must be incorporated without change into each Signatory's rules (Article 23.2.2). Further detail on the Independent Review Expert process is provided in the International Standard for Results Management.

Article 10.2 Sanctioning Scheme for Presence, Use or Attempted Use or Possession Under Article 10.2

The basic scheme under the current Code is as follows:

- Non-Specified Substances and Methods:
 - 4-year period of Ineligibility unless the Athlete can prove that the use was not intentional. (Intentional was defined as the Athlete knew that the conduct constituted an anti-doping rule violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the conduct would constitute an anti-doping rule violation.)
 - 2-year period of Ineligibility if the Athlete can prove that the use was not intentional.
- Specified Substances or Methods. (Except for special rules for Substances of Abuse and substances which are only prohibited in-competition).
 - 4-years if the RMA can prove that the use was intentional.
 - 2-years if the RMA cannot prove that the use was intentional.

To go below a 2-year period of Ineligibility the Athlete was, and still is, required to demonstrate No Fault or Negligence, or No Significant Fault or Negligence. Both require the Athlete to establish the source of the prohibited substance in their system with exception for Protected Persons and Recreational Athletes.

A number of questions have been raised since the implementation of the 2021 Code. Should the period of Ineligibility be different when the Athlete is simply reckless as opposed to knowingly committing a violation? Can the Athlete prove that the use was not intentional without establishing the source of the prohibited substance in their system? What facts should be considered in establishing the source of the prohibited substance? In analyzing the facts of a particular case, in what order should the Athletes degree of fault be considered in determining whether the use was intentional, reckless, involved No Significant Fault or No Fault? These issues are particularly prominent when the case involves the Athlete's attempts to establish that the Adverse Analytical Finding came from a Contaminated Source.

In this first draft of the 2027 Code, the difference between who has the burden to prove that the use was not intentional for non-Specified and Specified Substances and Methods remains the same. The exceptions for Substances of Abuse and substances which are only prohibited in-competition remain the same. The special treatment of Protected Persons and Recreational Athletes not being required to establish the source of the prohibited substance in their system also remains the same. Two new distinctions are introduced in this draft: first, whether the violation was reckless as opposed to intentional; second, whether the Athlete can establish how the prohibited substance entered their system. The new sanctions scheme is as follows:

10.2.1. Non-Specified Substances or Methods & the Athlete can establish how the Prohibited Substances Entered their System

- 4-year period of Ineligibility unless the Athlete can prove that the use was not intentional.
- 3-year period of Ineligibility where the Athlete can establish that the use was reckless but not intentional.
- 2-year period of Ineligibility where the Athlete can establish that the use was neither reckless nor intentional.
- 0-2-year period Ineligibility if the Athlete can establish No Significant Fault or Negligence.
- No Ineligibility if the Athlete can establish No Fault.

10.2.2 Non-Specified Substance or Method and the Athlete CANNOT establish how the Prohibited Substance Entered their System

- 4-year period of Ineligibility is the default sanction.
- 3-year period of Ineligibility where, in exceptional cases, the Athletes can establish to the comfortable satisfaction of the decision-making body that based on reliable analytical evidence, the anti-doping rule violation was not compatible with the intentional use of a prohibited substance. Comment 63 provides examples of what would, and would not, be considered reliable analytical evidence.
- Reduction of sanction is not available based on No Significant Fault or Negligence or No Fault or Negligence when the Athlete is not able to establish the source of the Prohibited Substance.

In applying the above, Comment 60 provides that before considering whether No Significant Fault or Negligence or No Fault or Negligence apply the decision-making body must first determine whether, in the case of a non-specified substance, the Athlete has satisfied their burden of establishing that the violation was not intentional.

10.2.3 Specified Substances or Methods & the Athlete can establish how the Prohibited Substance Entered their System

- 4-year period of Ineligibility if the RMA can establish that the use was intentional.
- 3-year period of Ineligibility if the RMA can establish that the use was reckless.
- 2-year period of Ineligibility if the RMA cannot establish that the use was either intentional or reckless.
- Burden remains on the Athlete to obtain a further reduction based on No Significant Fault or Negligence or No Fault or Negligence.

The more flexible approach to Article 10.2 violations as described above was positively received by the majority of stakeholders and therefore no significant substantive changes have been made in the second draft. However, many found the actual Code text setting forth these principles to be quite complicated. To remedy that, the text of the Article has been substantially revised to deal with each of the different types of factual circumstances separately.

Three additional sub-Articles have been added to Article 10.2:

Article 10.2.4 addresses unique TUE situations discussed above under Article 4.4.

Article 10.2.5 addresses the different burdens of proof and periods of Ineligibility for Possession involving non-Specified Substances and Specified Substances.

Article 10.2.6 re-introduces the special definition of “intentional” from the 2021 Code, which is used in determining periods of Ineligibility under the various provisions of Article 10.2.

Article 10.2.4 Substances of Abuse

While stakeholder feedback on the 2021 Code’s treatment of Substances of Abuse has generally been favorable, questions were raised in the following areas:

- The potential one-month period of Ineligibility does not give the RMA sufficient time to evaluate and process a case.
- It is logistically impractical to require that the Athlete “complete” a Substance of Abuse program to have their period of Ineligibility reduced from 3 months to 1 month.
- Requiring enrollment in a Substance of Abuse program is overkill for many first time violators.
- There are some circumstances, like the inadvertent ingestion of coca tea, where requiring rehabilitation to reduce the period of Ineligibility is simply not appropriate.
- A number of stakeholders continue to argue that having to deal with rehabilitation at all is outside their area of expertise.

Taking these concerns into consideration the first draft of the new Code takes the following approach:

- A flat two-month period of Ineligibility for a first violation. There is no requirement for rehabilitation or opportunity for reduction on a first violation.
- For a second violation involving the same Substance of Abuse, the period of Ineligibility is four months which may be reduced to two months if the Athlete “enters” a Substance of Abuse program. The RMA may also, at its discretion, impose the two-month period of Ineligibility where it determines that a treatment program is not necessary (e.g. the ingestion of coca tea).

Redrafted and now Article 10.2.3, but no substantive change.

Article 10.3.2 Sanctions and Results Management for Whereabouts Failures

The sanction for a Whereabouts Failure violation under Article 2.4 is two years subject to reduction down to a minimum of one year, depending on whether the Athlete can establish circumstances mitigating the Athletes degree of fault. The changes to this Article make clear that fault shall be assessed equally against all three Whereabouts Failures with the expectation that the Athlete should be on heightened alert after the first and second failures.

Article 7.1.6 clarifies which ADO has responsibility for initiating an anti-doping rule violation rising out of a filing failure or missed test. Where an individual filing failure causes a potential anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.4, results management for the violation shall be administered by the ADO with whom the athlete in question files whereabouts information at the time of the failure. Where an individual missed test causes a potential anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.4, the anti-doping rule violation will be administered by the ADO that ordered the test.

Article 10.6.1.2. Contaminated Source

The previous Code Article with this number addressed a potential reduction in the period of Ineligibility for anti-doping rule violations involving “Contaminated Products.” The new “Contaminated Source” definition is broader and includes sources of contamination such as food or drink, environmental contamination, or exposure through contact with a third person or object touched by a third person.

The definition of Contaminated Source has been further clarified to provide that in contamination through physical contact cases, there must have been no basis for the Athlete to suspect that the third person who contaminated them have used or possessed or been exposed to the Prohibited Substance.

Article 10.7.1 Substantial Assistance

There was widespread stakeholder support, particularly those stakeholders with investigation units, to expand the scope of Article 10.7.1. It was pointed out that the utility of 10.7.1 was limited by the requirement that the substantial assistance had to “result” in criminal or disciplinary action. That requirement has been eliminated. A provision has also been added allowing the RMA to suspend a smaller portion of the period of Ineligibility in an initial decision and, based on later reconsideration of the value of the information received, increase the amount of the period of Ineligibility suspended.

The triggering criteria for the application of this Article has been tightened up somewhat by requiring the production of information “which results in” the ADO discovering facts constituting, or bringing forward a case involving, an anti-doping rule violation. The language in the first revised Code draft “is likely to result in”, was thought to be susceptible to abuse and unnecessary. Still, the ADO’s “discovering facts constituting [e.g. an anti-doping rule violation],” as opposed to actually bringing forward a case, is sufficient.

NEW ARTICLE: 10.7.2 Other Valuable Information and Assistance in the Effort to Eliminate Doping in Sport

This new provision allows an RMA to suspend up to 15% of the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility based on receipt of valuable information which does not otherwise meet the criteria for Substantial Assistance under Article 10.7.1. (Article 10.7.1 permits a suspension of up to 75% of the period of ineligibility.) For example, an Athlete provides information on how he has doped and avoided detection, but without identifying any third-party with culpability as required by Article 10.7.1.

No significant changes other than the emphasis on preventing the doping of Protected Persons or Minors.

Article 10.8.1 Result Management Agreements

Article 10.8.1 of the current Code allows an Athlete charged with an anti-doping rule violation which would result in a four-year period of an eligibility to admit the violation no later than 20 days after receiving notice of the charge and have the period of Ineligibility reduced by one year. Stakeholders have reported that this has been a very useful tool to quickly resolve cases and have requested that the scope of Article 10.8.1 be expanded. Accordingly, this provision has been expanded to apply to anti-doping rule violations with the charged period of Ineligibility of less than 4 years providing for a reduction of 25%.

Revisions to the Article clarify that the 25% reduction of sanction for early admission and acceptance of sanction is calculated from the period of Ineligibility stated in the charging letter, not the potential period of Ineligibility stated in the first notice of a potential anti-doping rule violation.

Article 10.9 Multiple Violations

New article 10.9.3.4. This article clarifies the outcome in the unique situation where an Athlete can establish that a second Adverse Analytical Finding resulted solely from the residual presence of the Prohibited Substance in their system from the same ingestion or use that resulted in the Athlete's first Adverse Analytical Finding. In this situation, the Athlete would have any competitive results associated with the second Adverse Analytical Finding disqualified, but would have no increased period of Ineligibility and the multiple violation rule (Article 10.9) would not be applicable.

Article 10.14.1 Status During Ineligibility or Provisional Suspension

This Article describes what a person serving a Provisional Suspension or period of Ineligibility can or cannot do. Multiple stakeholders have asked that the language in this Article be expanded and examples provided. That has been done in this draft.

Participation during Ineligibility or Provisional Suspension results in Consequences but is not by itself an independent anti-doping rule violation. Numerous Code provisions related to anti-doping rule violations have been expanded to include violations of Article 10.14.1.

Articles 13 and 14.2.2 Changes Related to Appeals

- Article 13.2. The list of appealable decisions has been expanded to include: decision not to bring forward an Adverse Passport Finding or an Atypical Passport Finding after review; a decision not to impose a Provisional Suspension; a decision by the RMA that the requirements for recording a whereabouts failure are not met; and a decision under Article 27.3 (retroactive application of the new Code to the period of an eligibility still being served by an Athlete based on a pre-new Code decision); and a decision by an ADO to disqualify or not to disqualify results under Article 5.6.1 (Retired Athletes Returning to Competition).
- Article 13.2.3.2. In the interest of fairness, the right to appeal from national level hearing body decisions has been expanded from the IOC, IPC, IF and WADA to include the Athlete, the Athlete's NADO and any other party to the case in which the decision was rendered.
- Article 13.2.5. Under the current Code, decisions or approvals made by WADA under Articles 10.7 (Substantial Assistance) and 10.7.2 (Other Valuable Information) were not appealable. In this draft those decisions are appealable subject to an arbitrary standard of review. The arbitrary standard of review also applies to WADA decisions under 5.6.1 (exemption from the 6-month notice rule for retired Athletes returning to competition).

Article 13.1.2. Proceedings before CAS involving WADA, an International Federation and/or a Major Event Organization as a party shall be conducted in French or English unless the above parties agree otherwise.

New Article 13.1.4 clarifies that appeals from decisions made by WADA shall be evaluated on whether WADA's decision was arbitrary.

Article 14.2.2. Parties with a right to appeal a decision shall be provided with a machine-readable case file produced in French or English and, to the extent practical, in electronic digital and word searchable format.

There was considerable stakeholder pushback to the requirement found in the first draft that the case files must be produced in machine readable French or English. The second draft only requires that documents be produced in machine readable form, and that if the case file contains documents in a language other than French or English, a case file index shall be provided in French or English with a short description of each document.

Article 13.2.3.4 (Appeal Deadline for Parties Other than WADA) has been revised to establish a uniform time to appeal for parties other than WADA. That deadline shall be the later of: (a) twenty-one days after the receipt of the decision or (b) where the appealing party makes a timely request for the complete file under Article 14.2.2, twenty-one days after receipt of the complete file relating to the decision.

Articles 14.3.2 & 14.3.4 Mandatory Public Disclosure After the Final Decision in a Case

The general requirement under Article 14.3.2 is that after a final decision in a case, the RMA must publicly disclose the result. Current Article 14.3.4 makes an exception to that general principle and requires consent of the Athlete where the Athlete has been found not to have committed and anti-doping rule violation. The first draft of the new Code makes another exception to mandatory publication where the Athlete has been found to have had No Fault or Negligence.

Request for Comment: There has been considerable debate over whether these exceptions are a good idea which provide fairness and respect the rights of Athletes who have been found to have No Fault or Negligence or a bad idea considering the importance of transparency to the credibility of the anti-doping system. Further comments on this issue are welcome.

Articles 23.2.2 & 6.2(iv). Use of Anti-Doping Samples for Sport Regulation Purposes Other Than Anti-Doping

The current Code contains a reference in Comment 114 under Article 23.2.2 to the permitted use of Doping Control Samples for other sport regulation purposes. In this draft, the principle of that Comment has been incorporated into the text of Articles 23.2.2 and 6.2(iv). The applicable conditions for such use have been expanded to address potential data privacy concerns.

The text of 23.2.2 has been shortened but the substantive effect remains the same.

NEW DEFINITION: NADO OPERATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Article 20.5.1 of both the current Code and proposed first draft of the new Code require NADO's to be independent in their operational decisions and activities from sport and government. This draft adds a new definition of "NADO Operational Independence" which further clarifies that requirement.

The definition of National Anti-Doping Organization Operational Independence has been substantially expanded to include activities which may have not previously been prohibited or which were overlooked including, for example, prohibiting the delegation of any Doping Control responsibility to a sport organization or government.

PART TWO: EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Both of these Articles have been significantly updated by their WADA committees and associated interest groups.

PART THREE: Additional Roles and Responsibilities of Signatories and WADA

The following three requirements have been added to the roles and responsibilities of each of the Signatory Groups identified in Article 20:

- To conduct an automatic investigation of Athlete Support Personnel in the case of an anti-doping rule violation involving a Protected Person or Minor who they support and to conduct an automatic investigation of any Athlete Support Personnel who have provided support to more than one Athlete found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation (e.g., 20.1.10)
- To adopt and implement Code of Conduct provisions, allowing the imposition of disciplinary action against any Athlete Support Personnel who violate their obligations under Article 21.2 (to attend anti-doping education and provide accurate information to Athletes who they support) where such violation would not otherwise constitute an anti-doping rule violation (e.g., 20.1.17).
- To respect the autonomy and independence of National Anti-doping Organizations as well as the requirements of National Anti-doping Organization Operational Independence (e.g., 20.1.18).

A new Article 20.7 has been added to address the roles and responsibilities of other Signatories not identified in Articles 21.1-21.6. Basically, the roles and responsibilities of these other Signatories shall be as described in Annex A to the WADA Policy for Acceptance of New World Anti-Doping Code Signatories.

Article 22 Involvement of Governments

Two new provisions have been added to this Article. New Article 22.2 sets forth each government's commitment to the principles of the Code as set forth until the UNESCO Convention. New Article 22.11 addresses government support for anti-doping education and training programs.

Article 24 Monitoring and Evaluating Compliance with the Code and UNESCO Convention.

The proposed amendments to Code Article 24 aim to align its content with the changes which are suggested in the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories, notably the procedural steps to dispute a formal notice of non-compliance or a determination by WADA that the conditions for reinstatement have not been met, as well as the list of Signatory consequences which may apply in a given case.

PROTECTED PERSONS, MINORS AND RECREATIONAL ATHLETES

The special protections provided to Protected Persons and Recreational Athletes in the current Code have not been changed. However, a new comment has been added to the definitions of Protected Persons and Recreational Athletes, which makes clear that those circumstances in which special treatment should be given to Protected Persons and Recreational Athletes are specifically set forth in the Code and it should not be assumed that special treatment was intended with respect to other parts of the Code where it is not expressly stated.

New provisions have been added expanding the special treatment afforded Protected Persons and/or Recreational Athletes. In addition, some, but not all, of the special treatment afforded Protected Persons and/or Recreational Athletes has now been extended to Minors who are not Protected Persons (elite 16 and 17-year-olds). For example:

- Violations of Article 2.7 (Trafficking), 2.8 (Administration) or 2.9 (Complicity) involving Protected Persons or Minors are particularly serious and may lead to longer periods of Ineligibility. (Articles 13.3.3 and 13.3.4).
- Substantial Assistance: information and assistance related to doping of Protected Persons and Minors is particularly valuable. (Articles 10.7.1(iv) and 10.7.2.)

- Mandatory Public Disclosure of anti-doping rule violations is not required in cases where the violator is a Protected Person, Minor or Recreational Athlete, and any optional Public Disclosure shall take into consideration the best interests of the individual. (Article 14.3.6).
- Required investigation of Athlete Support Personnel where a Protected Person or Minor who they support has committed an anti-doping rule violation (e.g., 20.1.10). Requirement that Athlete Support Personnel attend anti-doping education presentations and provide accurate information to Athletes who they support, particularly Protected Persons and Minors. (Article 21.2.2)
- Government commitment to support anti-doping education and training programs focused on Protected Persons and Minors (Article 22.11).