



BULL'S EYE THE ISSF IPOD ON DOPING

THE 2013 WADA PROHIBITED LIST OF SUBSTANCES AND METHODS: A LOOK AT SOME OF THE CHANGES EXPECTED IN 2012

THE 2013 WADA PROHIBITED LIST

The ISSF would like to bring to the attention of the shooting-sport community the release of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) **2013 Prohibited List**. The following provides details on some of the major changes that have been brought to the 2012 Prohibited List, all of which will be coming into effect **January 1, 2013**. All the other changes made to the List are explained and can be downloaded off the WADA website. www.wada-ama.org

BETA-BLOCKERS (SECTION P2)

At the request of the Confédération mondiale des sports de boules (CMSB), Fédération Internationale des Quilleurs (FIQ), and Union Internationale Motonautique (UIM), beta-blockers are no longer prohibited in the following sports: aeronautics, boules, bridge, ninepin and tenpin bowling, and powerboating. They remain prohibited in seven sports, including shooting, archery, golf, ski jumping, and some freestyle ski and snowboard disciplines.

> Please be aware and reminded that the ISSF maintains its zero tolerance approach with regards to the use of beta blockers in all ISSF events. Beta Blockers are Prohibited Substances and ISSF shall not, under any circumstances, grant TUE's to its athletes for their use.

BETA-2 AGONISTS (SECTION S3)

Under the Beta-2 agonists section of the List, the maximum permitted dosage of formoterol has increased to 54 micrograms over 24 hours, based on the delivered dose of the drug and not the metered dose. The urinary threshold has been increased to 40 nanograms per milliliter. All beta-2 agonists,

excluding sub-threshold levels of formoterol, salbutamol and salmeterol when administered by inhalation, are still prohibited and continue to require a medical exemption.

> All shooters are reminded to apply for a proper Therapeutic Use Exemption when using any Beta-2-agonists in accordance with health and medical requirements.

REWORDING OF SECTION ON PROHIBITED METHODS (SECTION M)

Section M deals with Prohibited Methods, as opposed to Prohibited Substances. This section currently lists enhancement of Oxygen Transfer (M1), Chemical and Physical Manipulation (M2) and Gene Doping (M3) as prohibited methods. But, in order to make this ever-growing section more encompassing WADA has reworded it so it includes all kinds of manipulation of blood and blood components. Accordingly, the title and body of Section M1 has been changed and now reads: Manipulation of Blood and Blood Components. Section M3, focusing on Gene Doping, has also been reworded to provide a more precise definition of this prohibited method.

> Because technology and science are constantly evolving, ADRV's related to prohibited methods, (as opposed to the actual use of performance enhancing substance) are increasing, ISSF encourages all IPOD readers to get better acquainted with the list of Prohibited Methods.

METHYLHEXANEAMINE (MHA)

Methylhexaneamine (MHA), sometimes presented as dimethylpentylamine (DMPA), is prohibited in competition as a specified stimulant under section S6.b of the 2013 List of Prohibited Substances and Methods.

There has been a multitude of positive doping cases involving MHA in various sports in the last few years. In many of the cases, the athlete had consumed the MHA inadvertently through supplement use. Under the strict liability provisions of the Rules, these athletes were still held responsible for these anti-doping rule violations and sanctioned accordingly.

Although, Methylhexaneamine (MHA) is a pharmacological substance that was commercialized up to the beginning of the seventies, it reappeared a few years ago as a constituent of various dietary supplements that are sold freely in some markets or on the Internet.

Therefore, athletes and their support personnel should once again be reminded of the risks involved with supplement use. They should also be warned that some stimulants, like many drugs, have several alternate names. Therefore, athletes should be aware that Methylhexaneamine (MHA) has been made available under several names, one being geranium oil. It can also be listed under a variety of other names, including 1,3-dimethylpentylamine, pentylamine, geranamine, floradrene, forthane, DMPA and DMAA. The use of MHA and all its variant names must be avoided altogether.

> Athletes are to be reminded to carefully read the ingredients of anything they ingest. Athletes who elect to take a supplement must remember the risks involved and always verify its ingredients are safe to use, and always declare its use on the doping control form in the event of a doping control.

CLENBUTEROL

As a follow up to the many cases where athletes' defences rested on the allegation that levels of clenbuterol found in urine samples were the results of the consumption

of tainted meat, WADA has confirmed its current position on Clenbuterol. Under the 2013 Prohibited List, Clenbuterol remains a prohibited substance. There is no threshold under which Clenbuterol is not prohibited, and based on expert opinion there is no plan to introduce a threshold level under which clenbuterol would be permitted.

However, after having clearly established the foregoing, WADA has said that it is possible that under certain specific circumstances the presence of a low level of clenbuterol in an athlete's sample can be the result of food contamination, WADA'S position remains that each case is different and that each case should be given due process in order to confirm whether or not the adverse analytical finding is in-fact and anti-doping rule violation.

> The results management provisions of all Code-compliant Doping Rules, including those of the ISSF, foresee the opportunity for an athlete to explain how a prohibited substance entered his/her body. Therefore, where athletes claim food contamination is the cause of an adverse analytical finding involving clenbuterol, the decision-making body will need to take any and all elements and submitted evidence into account, along with the context of the case, when deliberating on the facts and rendering a reasoned decision.

SPECIFIED SUBSTANCES BETTER DEFINED

WADA'S purpose of creating a list of specified substances (as opposed to Prohibited Substances) was to recognize that it is possible for a substance to enter an athlete's body inadvertently, and therefore allow a Jury more flexibility when deciding on an appropriate sanction.

A specified substance is a substance which allows, under clearly defined conditions, for a greater reduction of the mandatory two-year sanction when an athlete tests positive for that particular substance.

For the purpose of doping, specified substances are not necessarily less serious agents than other prohibited substances. Specified substances do not relieve athletes of the strict liability rule that makes them responsible for all substances that enter his or her body.

However, there is a greater likelihood that these substances could be susceptible to a credible non-doping explanation, as outlined in section 10.4 of the World Anti-Doping Code as well as article 5.11.4 of the 2012 ISSF Anti-Doping Rules. The greater likelihood that a credible non-doping explanation exists is simply not credible for certain substances – such as steroids and

human growth hormone – and this is why these are not classified as specified.

> The same applies to beta-blockers as Prohibited Substances in shooting. Because they are highly performance enhancing, they are banned. Therefore, the likelihood of an athlete providing a credible non-doping explanation for the finding of a beta-blocker in his or her system is minute. Shooters beware:

Beta blockers are prohibited substances – not specified – under the ISSF Anti-Doping Rules.

The ISSF community is invited to download a copy of the 2013 Prohibited List on the WADA Website at http://www.wada-ama.org/Documents/World_Anti-Doping_Program/WADP-Prohibited-list/2013/WADA-Prohibited-List-2013-EN.pdf.

UNCOVERING THE LIES AND VALUING THE TRUTH: WHAT WE CAN ALL LEARN FROM THE LANCE ARMSTRONG CASE.

On Wednesday October 10th, 2012, the United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA) issued its Reasoned Decision in the case it successfully made against no-longer 7-time Tour de France Champion Lance Armstrong and his USPS Cycling Team.

It is an unflinching and revealing portrayal of the real Lance Armstrong, as opposed to the orchestrated and deceitful image that has been marketed to the world for years. The decision's detailed evidence, compelling facts and candid testimonies dispel any lingering doubts as to what many have suspected all along: that a corrupt and arrogant Armstrong had systematic recourse to the use of various performance enhancing substances in order to win his seven Tour de France titles. But what more, the decision shows that Armstrong and his team implemented a myriad of coercive methods to ensure that his goals were met.

Prior to the release of the decision, Armstrong, who has continuously and quite convincingly lied to the public and denied all doping allegations against him, defied the U.S. Anti-Doping Agency to provide hard facts as well as the names of all his accusers. Needless to say - USADA met his challenge: Events starting in 1998 and running through 2009 are laid in chronological order and offer convincing evidence including numerous examples of Armstrong using multiple drugs, including testosterone and the blood-boosting hormone EPO, substantiation of the pressure Armstrong put on many other riders to go along with the doping program, as well as damning testimony from former teammates of Armstrong, all of whom say

they received EPO from Armstrong. These teammates who testified under oath of their own free choice also offer eyewitness accounts of seeing Armstrong use EPO, testosterone and blood doping as he won his seven Tour De France titles. They offer names and dates and recount conversations and dynamics.

USADA calls Armstrong's and the USPS Team's actions and cover-up "the most sophisticated, professionalized and successful doping program that sport has ever seen." And "a program organized by individuals who thought they were above the rules and who still play a major and active role in sport today."

In short, the evidence provided, or "the hard facts" if you will, paints a resounding picture of Armstrong not only as an active participant, but as the corrupt leader of the entire USPS doping operation.

AN ERA OF DOPING IN CYCLING

The initial paragraphs of the reasoned decision include an utterly damning passage about the Omerta era of cycling in which Armstrong competed. "Twenty of the twenty-one podium finishers in the Tour de France from 1999 through 2005 have been directly tied to likely doping through admissions, sanctions, public investigations or exceeding the UCI hematocrit threshold. Of the forty-five (45) podium finishes during the time period between 1996 and 2010, thirty-six (36) were by riders similarly tainted by doping."

That was the era Lance Armstrong won the Tour de France seven times without – according still and now only to him – doping.

According to USADA, "the USPS Team doping conspiracy was professionally designed to groom and pressure athletes to use dangerous drugs, to evade detection, to ensure its secrecy and ultimately gain an unfair competitive advantage through superior doping practices."

Clearly presented is the matter-of-fact reality that winning and doping went hand-in-hand in cycling and that Armstrong was the focal point of a big operation, running teams that were the best at getting it done without getting caught. USADA said the path Armstrong chose to pursue his goals "ran far outside the rules."

USADA accuses him of depending on performance-enhancing drugs to fuel his victories and "more ruthlessly, to expect and to require that his teammates" do the same. There is no reason to believe otherwise: it was the Omerta era of doping in cycling.

THE MERITS OF THE DECISION

Many believe the merit of this decision was exposing that whole era of cycling, including Lance Armstrong, as fraudulent. Yet, upon reading the several honest statements of former Armstrong team members published in the decision and in the media since it was made public, there can be little doubt that its long-term impact will outweigh the present magnitude of taking down Lance Armstrong. That may be its most important merit: the decision represents a significant step forward in the fight against doping in sport. It has exposed the culture of doping in cycling and will encourage all cyclists and athletes alike to stay away from having recourse to drug use.

It has shed light on the many negative repercussions that succumbing to the use of performance enhancing drugs can have

"EVERY TRUTH MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY SOME CORRESPONDING ACT".

George McDonald

on an individual's career and life in general. It demonstrates the need for anti-doping agencies to not just carry out testing, but to gather intelligence, conduct investigations, share information with other agencies and prosecute violators, regardless of their individual profile, when the evidence supports it. (Paul Melia, CCES)

It has emphasized the importance of maintaining transparency, which underlies credible anti-doping efforts around the world. It has sent clear message to all cheaters

that they can run but they can't hide. And, it has shown the world that sport has no enduring worth unless it is attached to a higher set of values. (William C Rhoden New York Times)

"Every truth must be accompanied by some corresponding act". (George McDonald) Still, perhaps the most important and hopefully lasting significance of this decision is the unveiling of the truth. The courage that many cyclists have showed by finally coming forward and speaking truthfully was instrumental.

Levi Leipheimer, who was Armstrong's team-mate from 2000-2001 and 2009-2011, wrote in *The Wall Street Journal* that the reason he went on record for the USADA case was that the USADA told him that "my admission could be part of a bigger plan that would make the positive changes we've seen in recent years permanent ... I said, 'I need to be involved.' " He did get involved.

David Zabriskie who joined Armstrong's United States Postal Service team in 2001 echoed that statement and said " I accept full responsibility and was happy to come forward and tell USADA my whole story; I want to do my share to help bring this entire issue to the forefront and ensure a safe, healthy, and clean future for cycling." That is the future sought out for all sports.

Michael Barry who rode with Armstrong for years admitted: "Those of us who doped and lied and those who were accomplices and witnesses remained silent for a long time in a misguided attempt to protect our jobs, our reputations our team sponsorships and the image of sport. It was wrong. We followed a code of silence regarding an unhealthy culture... I agreed to participate in the USADA case as it allowed me to explain my experiences, which I believe will help improve the sport for today's youth who aspire to be tomorrow's champions." Tomorrow's champions have surely taken note.

Jonathan Vaughters, one of Armstrong long-time team-mates called the USADA case a necessary process for lasting culture change and the health of the sport. It certainly will prove to be. The unveiling of the truth and the positive actions and lasting changes that will flow from it, now and in the future, are certainly significant.

Athletes, staff and officials in cycling, yes, but in all other sports as well, must not fear speaking the truth. We must all speak the truth, seek the truth and value the truth. Only then will cheaters will be exposed, will the real values of sport be purified, will potential cheating athletes be deterred to do so, and will real reforms to the culture of doping in sport come to pass.

A CHANGE FOR THE BETTER

What should non-cyclists learn from this decision, this scandal; this Lance Armstrong charade?

All individuals involved in the fight against doping in sport must seize this opportunity to reinforce their commitment to working collaboratively in activating a principle-driven sport system; in protecting the integrity of sport from the negative forces of doping and other unethical threats; and in advocating for sport that is fair, safe and healthy.

TRUTH MUST BE AT THE CORE OF ANY REFORM OF ALL EFFORTS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST DOPING IN SPORT.

All individuals involved in the fight against doping in sport must understand that one of the most important ways of changing the doping culture that remains prevalent in sport is to focus on closely monitoring, developing and educating all athletes on clean, healthy and value-based athletic habits. All individuals must renew their acknowledgement that the fight against doping in sport is a fight of great importance and consequence. It may be arduous as times. But truth, courage and resolve to keep focused for the sake of all athletes and the integrity of sport will eventually render all sports, including shooting, cleaner and healthier.

But, the singular most important lesson to take away from the Lance Armstrong case is that truth must be at the core of any reform of all efforts in the fight against doping in sport.

TRUTH MUST BE VALUED

Athletes who lie, who cheat and who use any means available to them to beat the system should not be placed on pedestals. They plague the system and dilute its values and its efforts. Lance Armstrong got away with his lies for many years. In so doing, he made a mockery of the anti-doping system and of sports enthusiasts alike. For years he made people think that it was possible to bully, to cheat and to lie and to still be revered and loved. No more. In the end, Armstrong's lies were uncovered. He has been cast aside. He has faced, and continues to face, the dire consequences of his various transgressions. In the end, the truth was sought out, and the truth prevailed.

Janie Soublière BSS, LL.M., LL.B.
ISSF Anti-Doping Consultant