EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A task force commissioned by the WFDF board has researched the anti-doping movement and the requirements posed to WFDF by our adoption of the WADA Code in 2004. The purpose of the research has been to gather sufficient factual information for WFDF and its membership to make well-informed decisions in relation to the anti-doping movement and the practical implementation of the WFDF Anti-doping Rules. This report presents the findings of the task force, which are:

- a significant amount of administrative resources and other costs will have to be committed in implementing a comprehensive anti-doping program
- WFDF is not the only small International Sports Federation that is in a difficult position due to lacking these resources
- WADA and GAISF are in search of finding alternative ways to help small sports federation implement their programs; IFADO is one such initiative
- failure to comply to the anti-doping requirements of the international sports movement in the medium term is likely to mean the removal of flying disc from the World Games and permanently end hopes of any future Olympic participation
- currently no internal pressure from flying disc events is compelling WFDF to run a comprehensive anti-doping program; at the same token WFDF is not in a position to definitely say, whether substances which are on the prohibited list have been used in flying disc competition
- the task force recommends that enough resources are committed to WFDF antidoping program administration so that we can continue to aim for participation in the World Games 2009, while reviewing our own participation in the Olympic movement and waiting until the overall requirements for compliance are clarified by the bigger players e.g. WADA, IOC, and GAISF.



The Anti-Doping Task Force submits this preliminary report for consideration by the membership. The Anti Doping Task Force was created in June of 2006 to consider the World Anti Doping Association ("WADA") Anti-doping Code (the "WADA Code") and its impact on WFDF.

The general mission of the ADTF as established by the WFDF board of directors is set forth below. As part of its mission, Todd Demetriades, chairperson of the task force was sent to a conference sponsored by the WADA in Lausanne, Switzerland. The conference was directed at smaller sports federations who lacked the institutional resources to comply with the "WADA Code".

The WADA Code

The Code requires that International Federations conduct in-competition tests and out-of-competition tests. The Code sets forth the procedure under which such tests are conducted and processed. Each IF is required to establish a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("TUE") Committee, a Results Management Committee, and an Appeals Committee.

The Prohibited Substances list identifies those substances that are illegal for WFDF athletes to take. The Code provides punishment for those athletes who are determined to have taken such substances.

Certain substances on this list are identified as "specified substances". These substances are those that are more likely to be taken for nonperformance enhancing reasons. Therefore, those who are determined to have taken a

ADTF Mission Statement

- 1. Compile a brief historical background of WFDF activities related to anti-doping. Summarize key facts. In addition, discuss the issue with other international sports federations and share information about their analysis of the situation.
- 2. Explain what we would have to do to comply with the requirements of WADA on different levels:
- 3. Consider the alternative that we decide that we are not capable of meeting the WADA requirements.
- 4. Provide an analysis and make a recommendation to the WFDF Board on how to proceed in the form of a task force report. Build a communication strategy and a member feedback loop into the recommendation.

Specified Substance may be subject to reduced sanctions if that athlete can demonstrate that the specified substance was taken for nonperformance enhancing reasons. Cannabinoids, for example is a "specified substance".

The TUE Committee reviews applications of those athletes who are taking or are seeking to take a prohibited or specified substance for medically justifiable reasons. A TUE application is, in essence, a request that the rules be waived for a particular athlete because the ingestion of the substance is medically necessary and no other non-prohibited substance can be taken for the same malady.

The Results Management Committee is charged with administering the drug testing process and informing the athletes of the results and making an initial determination.

The Appeals Committee hears all disputes of the results management process.

I. Historical Background

Acceptance and Implementation of the WADA Code is required by IOC to participate in the Olympics and by the International World Games Association to participate in the World Games.

On July 5, 2003, the following Motion passed through the WFDF Congress.

"The 2003 WFDF Congress in Santa Cruz, CA, USA acknowledges that doping in sport is against the spirit of sport and contrary to Article 102 in the WFDF Rules of Flying Disc Sports.

Furthermore the congress acknowledges that the fight against doping in sports require an international set of harmonized rules and the congress recognises the work done by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) setting up the World Anti-Doping Code. Following this the congress approves that WFDF sign the acceptance of the code and expect the board to put forward the relevant changes to the WFDF Statutes, Rules and Regulations for approval at the 2004 WFDF Congress in Finland."

Following the 2003 Congress but before the WUGC in Turku, Finland in 2004 a draft set of WFDF rules were created by an anti-doping committee (Todd Demetriades, Dan Engström, Juha Jalovaara, and Julia Jouhki). At the WFDF 2004 Congress held in conjunction with the WUGC, the WFDF membership voted to adopt the proposed WFDF Anti-doping rules. The WFDF Anti-doping rules are a modified version of the WADA Code.

WFDF athletes have been subject to in-competition doping testing during the 2001 and 2005 World Games. In addition to this, a number of our member organizations (at least Australia, Finland and Sweden) have adopted and implemented anti-doping rules.

In addition, for the 2004 WUGC, the UPA undertook a "dry run" of part of the Anti-doping rules: Therapeutic Use Exemption process.

Since the 2004 Congress, WFDF has not taken any further concrete steps toward implementing the WFDF Anti-doping rules.

One issue that has come up recently is the ability of smaller international sports federations (IFs) or those lacking resources to comply with the WADA Code. To aid small federations, WADA has currently proposed the creation of a small pilot project, the International Federation Anti-Doping Organization ("IFADO"). The general concept behind IFADO is that small federations would join the organization and through IFADO those IFs would pool resources. Thus, the members of IFADO would contribute volunteers who would serve on committees. While WADA has promised some funding initially in terms of one salaried position and two years free

rent, it does not make any further financial commitments in support thereof. Although the concept has been proposed by WADA, IFADO would not be a WADA organization. It would be run solely by its member federations. Presently the General Association of International Sports Federations ("GAISF") is opposed to IFADO on the grounds that it claims IFADO would add another layer of bureaucracy and that IFADO should be a part of WADA; rather than separate.

There appears to be some general rivalry between WADA and GAISF and this rivalry is anticipated to play out during the next few years as the anti-doping rules become further entrenched. One fundamental point of conflict appears to be with the models supported by the two organizations. WADA sees itself primarily as the creator of a rule set and perhaps as the ultimate supervisor of the various IFs in the area of anti-doping. Thus, the WADA model is that most of the "heavy work" in terms of testing should fall on the IFs, the national anti-doping federations, regional anti-doping organizations and the national federations. GAISF on the other hand, appears to a favor a model in which WADA does more of the work, rather than placing the burden on the IFs.

Where this conflict of models really plays out is with those federations that have limited resources. As noted, the WADA Code is relatively burdensome in terms of resources. GAISF's position is that WADA should assist those organizations. WADA's position is that those organizations should do it themselves, but that WADA may be able to lend some assistance. Thus, WADA proposed the IFADO concept. Attached as Exhibit A is a letter written to WADA from GAISF summarizing GAISF's position in the matter.



II. Compliance

In order to comply with the World Anti Doping Code, WFDF must: 1) adopt the WADA code in substantially the format provided by WADA; 2) establish a Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) committee; 3) establish a results management committee; 4) establish a appeals committee; 5) conduct in-competition tests; 6) conduct out-of-competition tests.

1. Adopt WADA Code.

With regard to this requirement, WFDF has already party complied by voting to adopt the WADA code. Still, mere adoption of the code is not enough. WFDF must also establish the necessary committees and test athletes.

2. Therapeutic Use Exemption Committee.

The purpose of this committee is to review application submitted by athletes who ingest substances on the WADA prohibited substances list. This committee must be comprised of one a chairperson and one at least one additional member. The panel should be composed of physicians. All decisions regarding TUE applications must be submitted to WADA for review and for an opportunity to appeal the decision.

3. Results Management Committee.

The purpose of this committee is to review results from positive tests and determine whether a TUE has been granted related to the detected substance or, if not, determine the punishment associated with the violation. The WFDF Anti-doping rules that were passed in 2004, refer to this committee as the Anti-Doping Committee. However, it would be permissible to amend the rules, delegating this function to one person.

All findings must be submitted to WADA for review.

4. Appeals Committee.

Under the current version of the WFDF Anti-doping rules, appeals are to be heard by an judiciary committee appointed of that athlete's National Federation. However, a possible alternative would be to have all appeals heard by a WFDF appellate committee. This would eliminate inconsistency of review of the various national federations and prevent "hometown" bias. To switch to a WFDF panel would require amendment of the WFDF Anti-doping rules. All decisions must be submitted to WADA for review and for an opportunity to appeal the decision.

5. In-competition Tests.

WADA only requires in-competition testing by WFDF at international championship events. At a minimum this would include WUGC and WUCC events. However, the pool of events could be increased to encompass other events that are sanctioned by WFDF. WADA does not require such testing at national events.

There is no minimum number of tests that must be performed, however WADA representatives at the Lausanne meeting suggested that 1-2 tests would be sufficient.

6. Out-of-competition Tests.

In addition to in-competition testing, WFDF is also required to establish an out-of-competition testing program. To do this WFDF must establish a registered testing pool. WADA representatives confirmed that this pool need only be made up of those athletes who will compete in international championship play.² For those athletes who are selected to be in the registered testing pool, they are required to provide information as to their location so, if they are chosen to be tested, they may be tested quickly. To miss a test is considered a code violation. It

¹ This was done initially because WFDF did not have the resources or the time to empanel an appeals committee prior to the 2004 WUGC.

² It should be noted that this determination is often very difficult since championship rosters are often not decided until a few months before championship events.

should be noted that for major sports, so called "whereabouts" information is required at all times. For WFDF, however, it is likely that such information would only need to be provided for specific periods (i.e. training camps, etc. . .).

Also, given that the WUGC and WUCC are not held every year, it is unclear whether such sporadic testing of international level athletes would be sufficient for WADA.

7. Other concerns.

Even with minimal compliance, implementation of the WADA Code will place administrative and financial burdens on WFDF. Although not expressly stated, it is understood that compliance with the rules would require the establishment of procedures for meetings, TUE applications, test results, providing notices etc. . . . In short, there would be additional administrative requirements imposed by the rules that do not appear at first blush.

WFDF presently lacks much in the way of any centralized administration. If WFDF is to comply with the anti-doping code on its own, it would most likely need to employ at least one person part-time to process paperwork, making sure particular information is forwarded to the appropriate committee and personnel. If a staff person is not hired to coordinate such activity, then significant volunteer resources would need to be dedicated to facilitate the process. Moreover, additional procedures would need to be drafted and approved by WFDF.

The expenses of such a program are unknown. In addition to salary for any contractor/ administrator there would also be overhead expense associated with processing and forwarding such paperwork. Additionally, the tests themselves (according to the WADA representatives) cost money, ranging between \$200 and \$500 a test.

WFDF Treasurer Nob Rauch has asked me to attempt to attach a dollar figure to the various procedures (i.e. TUE review, results management, appeals etc. . .) Given that these functions would be performed on a volunteer basis, such a calculation is difficult to make. The UPA attempted a dry run of the TUE process and although the cost impact was minimal this was due in large part to the fact that the UPA already had the infrastructure in place (i.e. staff, office location, telephones, etc. . .) to facilitate the process.

It is also likely that the more such a volunteer network of committees is tested, the more burn out they will experience, thus, slowing the process. In addition, given that such anti-doping activities would occur only less than routinely, these processes would likely not be handled efficiently since new people would have to relearn old procedures.

III. Negative Consequences if Anti-doping is abandoned

Olympics and World Games

Both the IOC and the IWGA require that participating IFs adopt and implement the WADA Code. However, the WADA Code is relatively new and there appears to be a certain degree of disparity between IFs and their implementation of the WADA Code. This disparity was initially acceptable and we know of no International Federation that has been prevented from participation due to its failure to either adopt or implement the WADA Code. In this regard, however,

it appears that the winds of change are upon us. WADA has signaled that it will step up its compliance assessment. It has, for example, required all IFs to fill out a compliance survey. The IOC has requested that WADA give a status report at the end of 2006 on the compliance of all IFs. Based on information from various sources, the ADTF expects many prominent IFs to be found non-compliant in this report.

It is unclear at this stage how aggressively the IOC and IWGA will react to the status report, but given the overwhelming publicity on the topic of anti-doping testing, it is safe to assume that all IF anti-doping efforts will be placed under greater scrutiny.

Thus, conservatively the ADTF assumes that should WFDF fail to implement the WADA Code, WFDF will not be allowed to participate in future IWGA events, although, this prohibition may not occur prior to the next World Games event.

Moreover, the failure to implement the WADA Code would likely imperil any chances (however remote) that WFDF has for participation in the Olympic Games even in the more remote future. Ultimate and Disc Golf have relatively little clout in the international sports arena. Media coverage is scant and sponsors are few. Thus, the failure to implement WADA Code, would provide sufficient pretext for condemning any future WFDF application for Olympic consideration without any countervailing interest that might force the IOC to look the other way.

It is unclear whether Olympic participation would even be a good thing for WFDF. While this topic is beyond the scope of the ADTF mission, it should be noted that Olympic participation would demand a very substantial amount of WFDF resources above and beyond mere anti-doping compliance.

GAISF

GAISF recognizes the difficulties some of its members have in adhering to the WADA Code. GAISF offers, however, no concrete solutions short of "This should be handled by WADA". Also, as mentioned above, there appears to be some institutional rivalry between the two organizations. Given the foregoing, it does not appear that WFDF's stature within GAISF would immediately be affected should it decide not to implement the WADA Code.

Host Countries

It may be a condition in some countries hosting WUGC WUCC events, that WFDF adopt and implement the WADA Code. However, such a requirement would likely only be tied to receiving additional aid or resources from that country. For example, a tournament director may have arranged with the host country for funding, the provision of emergency services, the use of facilities at no charge, etc. . . . It is these perks that would likely trigger the anti-doping requirement. In such event, WFDF/the tournament director could decline those benefits or WFDF could offer to conduct in-competition testing.³ Worst case scenario is that WFDF would need to select an alternative site for the event.

³ It is anticipated that only in-competition would actually be required by the host country.

WFDF member organizations

A number of WFDF member organizations (e.g. Finland, Japan, Singapore, Sweden) receive financial support from their governments. At least in Finland and Sweden this support is tied in with the National Association having accepted and incorporated the WADA Code in their organizational statutes and rules. If WFDF were to blatantly forego implementing the WADA Code and announce that it has no intention to do so, this would certainly convey a negative message to those governments considering or already funding flying disc sports.

IV. Concluding Statements

As noted above, the implementation of the WADA Code will place significant financial and/or administrative burdens on WFDF. WFDF's ability to adequately address such burdens is questionable. Given that its members are dispersed throughout the Globe and given WFDF's limited financial resources, meaningful compliance may not be attainable and even if it were, such compliance might divert resources from other priorities. Even were WFDF desired to participate in IFADO, the IFADO proposal is still only in the conceptual stage.

WADA Code acceptance and implementation, however, is required for participation in the World Games and would also be required for participation in the Olympics. Thus, the Olympic/World Games debate is inextricably intertwined with anti-doping and the pros and cons of an anti-doping program must be weighed as an important part within considering the part WFDF wishes to play in the entire Olympic movement.

The reality is that the World Games occur only once every four years and very few member athletes actually compete (less than 1%). Moreover the chances for Olympic acceptance are at best remote. Thus, the question that must be answered is whether participation in the World Games and the highly unlikely prospect of participating in the Olympics justify the resources that would by necessity need to be devoted to an anti-doping program. On the other hand, the decision to not implement an acceptable anti-doping program would probably cause flying disc sports to be removed from the IWGA program and close the door on any aspirations of Olympic participation permanently.

While most of the discussion within this ADTF report has focused on the practical implications of implementing the WADA Code and has treated the WADA Code as an outside requirement imposed on WFDF, it is also necessary for WFDF to consider the actual question of whether or



not doping is an issue in sport and whether it is an issue within flying disc sports. The ADTF is confident that while opinions on what substances need to be listed on the prohibited list may vary from WFDF member to member and player to player, a clear majority of our members and athletes agree on the basic principle that the use of performance enhancing substances is contrary to the spirit of sport. The ADTF cannot say that disc sports athletes have not used doping substances in the past especially considering the abundance of doping infractions in other sports. However, it should be noted that while the committee members disagreed as to the potential scale of such abuse within the disc sports community, all were of the opinion that banned performance enhancing substances had been used by some disc athletes in the past and would likely be used in the future. The ADTF has no factual statistical information available on whether or not flying disc athletes are actually using prohibited substances and the only real way to gather this information is to implement a testing program.

It is ADTF's recommendation that WFDF continue to adopt a stance that enables WFDF to maintain its position within IWGA and GAISF at the least possible financial cost. As the current situation between WADA, IOC, GAISF and IWGA is constantly evolving, it is hard to say what the exact requirements for maintaining the current status quo in 2007 will be. Accordingly no exact cost figure can be given for attaining these requirements. The ADTF recommends that WFDF budget between US \$5000-\$10000 p.a. for anti-doping related costs until 2009 (the next World Games) and that this figure be reviewed annually as more information becomes available or WFDF decides to remove itself entirely from the international Olympic movement. Furthermore a permanent WFDF Anti-Doping Committee should be established and manned to monitor the overall situation and make operative recommendations to the WFDF board when necessary. These recommendations could include conducting testing at WFDF sanctioned events and related arrangements.

Appendix A - WADA Conference Summary

The WADA conference was held in Lausanne, Switzterland this past summer. A number of smaller international federations were present. All had difficulties complying with and implementing th WADA Code due to limited resources and experience.

The solution put forward by WADA to develop a new organization that would be able to assist smaller sports and less experienced sports comply with the anti-doping rules, the premise being that such sports are having a difficult time complying with the rules. GAISF was also supposed to bring its own proposal to the meeting, but the GAISF representative informed the group that its executive committee had not yet voted on anything nor taken an official position. (This by the way, was pretty annoying since a GAISF proposal was on the agenda for some time). Thus, the only real proposal on the table was WADA's proposal. In attendance for WADA was Rob Koehler and Jean Pierre Moser.

The WADA proposal was to create an organization (the International Federation Anti Doping Organization, poetically named "IFADO") made up of several IFs to assist those organizations with rule compliance.

As noted above, the Anti-Doping rules require the establishment of a TUE committee, a results management committee and a judiciary appeals committee.

To assist these smaller or less experienced IFs, IFADO would pool resources. Accordingly, there would be an IFADO TUE committee, an IFADO results management committee, and an IFADO judiciary appeals committee. Each participating IF would contribute people to the various committees. The proposal also envisions IFADO arranging for testing and also paying for the testing. IFADO would not be a WADA organization, rather it would be an organization owned and run by the participating IFs. WADA is also willing to contribute money to hiring a full time staff for the first year.

Several federations in attendance were interested in IFADO, lacking either the organizational experience or capabilities to administer an anti-doping program. WFDF fell within this group. Some of the others were Sambo, ITU (triathalon), Table Tennis, Judo (I think) and a few others who had to leave early. These were the groups that had the most interest in establishing IFADO. I thought it was curious triathalon would want to be a part of the group, but apparently ITU has some real doping concerns and wanted to gain the organizational experience to administer its own program. One of the objectives of IFADO is that once an organization gains enough experience through its participation in IFADO, it will be able to establish its own anti-doping program.

IFADO Pros

If WFDF desires to go forward with WADA implementation, IFADO could alleviate much in the way of administrative burdens, although WFDF would need to help man the committees. WFDF would probably avoid having to hire someone specifically for the anti-doping. Moreover, as currently contemplated the IFADO administrator would also be responsible for seeking

funds from outside sources to fund the program. In addition, WADA has pledged to pay the administrator's salary for his/her first year and it has also negotiated office space that is rent free for two years, although rent must be paid during the remaining term.

IFADO CONS

Drafts of the charter documents are still be circulated among the federation members potentially interested in IFADO. In its current version IFADO would require an upfront payment of \$2,500 dollars. Testing would still be paid for by WFDF. Thus, it is possible that participation in IFADO will cost organizations more. Moreover, although WADA has made early commitments, the ability of IFADO to sustain itself after WADA stops its assistance remains to be seen. Also any joint enterprise would require careful review of all documentation by a lawyer who practices law in the applicable jurisdiction.



Appendix B - ADTF Mission Statement

WFDF Anti-Doping Task Force (ADTF) Mission Definition

Draft version 1.03

Author: Juha Jalovaara, commented by WFDF ExCom

Current suggested composition of ADTF

Todd Demetriades (Chair), WFDF Board Member, USA Dan Engström, WFDF Board Member, Sweden Juha Jalovaara, WFDF President, Finland Julia Jouhki, WFDF Ultimate Committee Member, Finland

ExCom recommends that after this mission definition is accepted by the Board, it is then circulated to our members and at the same time additional volunteers to the task force may be recruited.

Background

At the WFDF 2004 Congress in Turku our membership voted to adopt the proposed WFDF Anti-doping rules, which are a modified version of the WADA Code. WFDF athletes have been subject to doping testing during our participation in the World Games events in 2001 and 2005. In addition to this, a number of our member organizations (at least Australia, Finland and Sweden) have adopted and implemented anti-doping rules. After 2004 WFDF itself, however, has not taken any concrete steps in implementing the requirements of the adopted anti-doping rules.

Several issues are pressuring WFDF to determine an exact action plan for concrete implementation of the anti-doping rules. These are:

- our credibility in committing to the rules themselves
- defining the anti-doping requirements for upcoming WFDF sanctioned events and for competition sanctioned by our member organizations
- requirements from WADA to comply to the Code and their code monitoring program for which they request an upfront payment of US\$5,000 and annual payment of US\$ 2,000 thereafter from WFDF
- our potential continued participation in the IWGA and the World Games

Mission statement

The objective of the ADTF is to:

- 1. Compile a brief historical background of WFDF activities related to anti-doping. Summarize key facts. In addition, discuss the issue with other international sports federations and share information about their analysis of the situation.
- 2. Explain what we would have to do to comply with the requirements of WADA on different levels:
 - WFDF sanctioned competition
 - Member organized competitions
 - Testing outside of competition
 - Reporting to external entities

In the above context:

- What WFDF and/or member organization resources will it take?
- What outside resources will it take to comply?
- A recommendation on how to manage these activities and report on them.
- Estimated costs of those human resources per annum and estimated other costs related to these activities
- Identify whether there are minimum standards that can be met to comply with the letter of the regulations at minimum cost and disruption.

Reporting should be done on two levels: 1) to the ExCom and Board and 2) to WFDF membership.

- 3. Consider the alternative that we decide that we are not capable of meeting the WADA requirements and answer the following questions from that standpoint:
 - What would the ramifications be to WFDF within GAISF?
 - What would it mean for our membership in IWGA and our participation in the World Games?
 - What would it mean for our chances of being considered for the Olympic Games?
 - Would any of our member organizations suffer negative consequences? What could those be? Conversely, can we identify any member organizations that have benefited in a tangible way from their implementation of the anti-doping requirements and/or the WADA code?
 - Would it affect our options in organizing WFDF World Championship events in terms of potential hosting locations?
 - Can we characterize any image issues related to non-compliance? Are there any examples of other IFs in a similar situation not complying?
- 4. Provide an analysis and make a recommendation to the WFDF Board on how to proceed in the form of a task force report. Build a communication strategy and a member feedback loop into the recommendation.

- Describe the requirements of full compliance with WADA standards and outline the resource considerations of doing so. Consider the use of an outside consultant with expertise in working on WADA with organizations such as WFDF and try to identify that individual or firm.
- Outline the pros and cons of WADA compliance, including the impact on IWGA participation.
- Consider the necessity for WFDF to have an anti-doping code in the interest of fair play.
- Define whether there is a middle road that involves minimal compliance with WADA (if that is
 possible) while maintaining full or partial IWGA participation. This may be done in conjunction
 with similarly situated IFs.

The deliverable of the ADTF is a report to the WFDF Board covering these and any other closely related questions to the extent possible within the timeframe available to the task force. The time frame should target the delivery of a report no later than September 30, 2006.