

**MONITORING GROUP (T-DO)**

ANTI-DOPING CONVENTION

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 18 June 2020

T-DO (2020) 19rev

**Summary of the key findings from the T-DO Survey  
on the impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on anti-doping  
policy and practice**

**For information and publication**

*Prepared by Michael Petrou (Chair of the Monitoring Group) and Margarita Pakhnotskaya (Co-ordination group member) with the support from the Secretariat*

## Contents

Introduction.....	2
1. Measures and restrictions imposed in countries due to COVID-19 Pandemic .....	3
2. Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on the sporting activity.....	4
3. In-competition testing during the COVID-19 Pandemic .....	4
4. Out-of-competition testing during the COVID-19 Pandemic .....	5
5. Education .....	7
6. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on anti-doping programmes .....	9
7. Impact on the operation of WADA-accredited, or WADA-approved Laboratories .....	15
8. Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on operational activities of NADOs and the implementation of the 2021 Code and International Standards .....	16
Appendix – List of respondents .....	20

## Introduction

The Monitoring Group of the Council of Europe Anti-Doping Convention (T-DO), in accordance with Article 9 of the Convention, has prepared a short questionnaire with the aim to examine the current and potential impact of the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Pandemic on anti-doping programmes within States Parties. The survey is also intended to facilitate the exchange of good practices and experiences regarding the measures taken to respond to the current unprecedented situation by the authorities responsible for the development and implementation of the anti-doping policies at national level.

The summary is based on the replies received from 48 States Parties to the Anti-Doping Convention. The list of countries that submitted their responses is reproduced in Appendix.

The survey was intended to provide an overview of the current situation and identify critical shortcomings. This is not a study based on scientific or statistical methodology. The results are only indicative and cannot be used to measure compliance with the Anti-Doping Convention.

The data collection period was from 27 April until 4 May 2020 (with the exception of 4 countries who replied later). This summary reflects the situation in this period only (the situation may have already changed since then).

The T-DO considers carrying out a follow-up survey in September-October 2020.

## 1. Measures and restrictions imposed in countries due to COVID-19 Pandemic

The first set of questions aimed to explore the measures and restrictions imposed by governments in response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Restriction measures were applied in almost all countries as shown in table 1. All State Parties implemented social distancing and public gatherings restrictions. There were slight exceptions regarding border closures, where six (13%) States Parties answered that they had no restrictions and four (9 %) that had no quarantine (although this may be explained by different interpretation of the question). Flight cancellation was also reported as occurring almost in all countries (however, it is known that repatriation, chartered or cargo flights were still operating).






To better understand how NADOs and public authorities organise day-to-day business, a clarifying question about the models of work used was asked to all countries that reported isolation and quarantine restrictions. All countries introduced teleworking, 50% of the responders organised duty staff work, or reorganised the office hours. Details are presented in table 2.

Table 1. Measures and restrictions imposed due to the COVID-19 Pandemic

	Yes		No	Other
Border closures/ restrictions	<b>42</b>	87%	6 - Belarus, Iceland, Ireland, Monaco, Sweden, United Kingdom	
Social distancing	<b>48</b>	100%		
Quarantine	<b>43</b>	85%	4 - Belarus, Ireland, Russian Federation	Estonia, Andorra (only for people with symptoms, people who arrived from abroad and people who had given a positive COVID test or they were in contact with the people with a positive COVID test)
Isolations	<b>46</b>	87%		2 countries didn't reply
Cancellations of flights	<b>46</b>	87%	1 - Ireland	Andorra (no airport)
Public gathering restrictions	<b>48</b>	100%		

Table 2. Models of work used by NADOs and public authorities during the COVID-19 Pandemic






*What models of work are being used by the NADOs and public authorities in your country? Modes of work (choose all that apply)*

		Answers	Ratio
Telework		47	98%
Duty staff		24	50%
1-day per week (or similar restriction)		13	27%
No restrictions		1	2%
No work at all is allowed		1	2%
No Answer		0	0%

## 2. Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on the sporting activity

The survey examined the impact of the Pandemic on the sporting activity in each country. Training centres and gyms were closed in 45 out of the 48 States Parties that replied (with the exemption of Belarus, Hungary and Sweden). A limited number of training camps were allowed during the Pandemic in only 11 States Parties (Austria, Belarus, Belgium, France, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Luxemburg, Russian Federation and Sweden). Moreover, indoor and outdoor competitions were postponed or cancelled in all States Parties that replied, except in Belarus (see table 3 for more details).


Table 3. *How COVID-19 Pandemic impacted the sporting activity in your country? (choose all that apply)*

		Answers	Ratio
a) Training centres, and gyms are closed		45	94%
b) All training camps are cancelled		41	85%
c) Only a limited number of training camps is allowed		11	23%
d) Indoor competitions are postponed or cancelled		47	98%
e) Outdoor competitions are postponed or cancelled		47	98%
f) No change		0	0%
No Answer		0	0%

## 3. In-competition testing during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Based on the replies to the questionnaire, no in-competition testing was conducted during the Pandemic in any of the 48 States that replied to this question (including Belarus, the only country that indicated that athletic competitions were allowed in the country). Details are available in table 4.

Table 4. *Since introduction of restrictions related to the COVID-19 Pandemic until today, did your NADO conduct in-competition testing?*

		Answers	Ratio
a) No		48	100%
b) Yes, as planned (explain below)		0	0%
c) Yes, but only a part from planned (give an estimate in % below)		0	0%
No Answer		0	0%




#### 4. Out-of-competition testing during the COVID-19 Pandemic

The survey asked about situation with out-of-competition testing during the Pandemic differs among the State Parties. The majority of those who responded to the questionnaire (31 State Parties out of 48) indicated that they did not conduct any testing during the Pandemic. Two other States Parties replied that they conducted out-of-competition testing up to a certain date before suspending their testing activities (that can be explained by the fact that the Pandemic reached these countries at different moment in time).

From those States Parties that have conducted out-of-competition testing during the Pandemic, one State Party (Russian Federation) indicated that has fully implemented its testing plan up to a specific date but testing was later suspended. Sixteen other States Parties replied that they conducted only part of their planned out-of-competition testing (ranging from 5% in Sweden to 90% in Georgia). The responses are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Out-of-competition testing during the COVID-19 Pandemic

*Since introduction of restrictions related to the COVID-19 Pandemic until today, did your NADO conduct out-of-competition testing?*

		Answers	Ratio
a) No		31	65%
b) Yes, as planned (explain below)		1	2%
c) Yes, but only a part from planned (give an estimate in % below)		16	33%
No Answer		0	0%

Those States Parties who continued testing during the Pandemic indicated the approach and measures taken by their NADOs during the sample collection session. The measures ranged from providing gloves, face masks, cleansing and disinfecting products, and instructions on hand washing and physical distancing (in all countries) to the use of a Motor Home as a Doping Control Station (in Norway) and temporary amended sample collection procedure (in Denmark). All the comments are provided in table 6 below:

Table 6. Comments on out-of-competition testing during the COVID-19 Pandemic

State Party	During COVID-19 Pandemic NADO conducted part of out-of-competition testing - explanation and an estimate in %
Australia	Only critical testing missions
Belarus	30%
Czech Republic	only a few tests with high safety measures (gloves, disinfection, 2m distance, veil over the face
Denmark	We have introduced a modified temporary testing scheme, but only for athletes who are part of the registered testing pool. The DCO contacts the athlete at his/hers residence. The athlete received a box with the well-known testing kit and a thorough explanation on how to do the testing alone. While the athlete delivers the sample, the DCO waits outside nearby. When the athlete has delivered the sample and done the paperwork, he/she contacts the DCO who collects the box with the sample and the filled forms. In the kit there is a thermometer, which registers and locks the temperature. Furthermore, the DCO measures the temperature of the urine sample with a laserpistol the DCO measures the temperature of the sample, and by comparing with the temperature logger, it can almost with 100 % certainty be concluded that the sample has been delivered "on the spot". In addition, the laboratory conducts a DNA test to ensure the sample is delivered by the right person. In conclusion: the temporary system is not bulletproof, but in our opinion is as good as it gets without living up to the WADA standard for testing (ISTI).

Estonia	Around 17% of the tests were done. Only 3DCOs, instead of the usual 12 were working. All the tests were done in the training centers where with a special governmental permission the top athletes preparing for the Olympic Games could practice Under severe regulations. DCOs, like athletes, underwent special health checks when entering the training ground. Testing was performed using protective equipment and procedures according to the latest WADA guidelines.
Finland	estimate 10-20% from planned
France	Precautionary measures (masks, distancing, etc.) in line with WADA's guidance. The procedure is still fully compliant with the ISTI (no "virtual testing").
Georgia	Due to the imposed measures, GADA could conduct 90% of planned testing.
Latvia	Approximately 40% of planned testing missions have been conducted. Yes, we introduced modifications that are based on WADA and Ministry of Health of Republic of Latvia advice. Full text of these modifications is available upon request
Norway	Use of Motor Home for DC testing. All RTP Athletes been tested. However, program is reduced
Poland	Only about 10% of planned out –of competition testing were conducted. NADO had to provide medical masks and gloves, hand sanitizer, alcohol wipes, etc., along with instructions on how to properly use and dispose of the materials, to sample collection personnel.
Russian Federation	RUSADA did OOC till 28 of March and fulfilled 100% of a plan, since then no testing till now
Slovakia	We have introduced safety measures in accordance with government and WADA recommendations.
Sweden	< 5 %. No modifications other than strict infection control measures
Switzerland	Yes, introduction of strict health and safety measures
Tunisia	Only until end of February 20

## 5. Education

The survey examined whether any anti-doping education took place during the Pandemic. Twelve State Parties (Albania, Croatia, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Georgia, Iceland, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Serbia, Slovakia) reported that they did not conduct any education activities. At the same time Croatia, Estonia, Georgia and Slovakia commented that they used different online tools. Therefore, in reality, only eight States Parties did not have any education.

Most States Parties continue their anti-doping education activities. Five State Parties (Andorra, Germany, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, and Spain) managed to retain their education activity to the planned level and five (Hungary, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Tunisia and Ukraine) indicated that it was increased. However, the majority of those who responded to the questionnaire (26 out of 48 States Parties) indicated that their education activities were reduced during the Pandemic. The replies to this question are presented in table 7 below. Examples of increased anti-doping activity are shown in table 8.

Table 7. Anti-doping education during the COVID-19 Pandemic

*Did you conduct any education activities since introduction of restrictions related to the COVID-19 Pandemic?*





		Answers	Ratio
Yes, as planned		5	10%
Yes, more than planned (please provide examples below)		5	10%
Yes, but less than planned		26	55%
No		12	25%
No Answer		0	0%

Table 8. Examples of increased anti-doping education activity during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Hungary	presentations via zoom app; e-learning; newsletter for athletes
Russian Federation	Special on-line programmes with tests at the end for children, young athletes, parents, NFs, coaches
Slovenia	E-Learning "Values in every classroom" were available for all primary and high schools in coordination with School authorities; Alpha and Coach True Campaign were delivered thru NSF's to all registered athletes in Slovenia and personally to all testing pools athletes.
Tunisia	E-education during quarantine to all olympic-paralympic level athletes, program extended to international level athletes in target sport disciplines including testing pools athletes.
Ukraine	Extra round table with National Athletics Federation

Those who replied that they continued providing anti-doping education during the Pandemic, indicated that they did so utilising online training courses, webinars, social media and other means. Some State Parties indicated that anti-doping education was provided to athletes in their NADO's Registered Testing Pool, athletes preparing for Olympic and Paralympic Games, children, young athletes, parents, national federations, coaches etc., while others were only delivering education upon request, including personal requests from athletes as an opportunity to keep their anti-doping education up to date. Some interesting experiences are available from the comments in the Table 9 below.

Table 9. Comments on anti-doping education during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Armenia	ADAMS online training
Australia	Webinars with athletes and sports - Online eLearning

Austria	No in-person lectures, development of webinars and online lectures
Belgium	Preparing e-learning platform
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Campaign
Finland	Webinars
Italy	Only on-line activities
Latvia	Instead of lectures and seminars, we have prepared videos and a news story was prepared for national television's sport's broadcast ("Sport's Studio")
Malta	encouraged registered athletes to complete online training
Moldova	Seminars and trainings via telework, e-Learning
Norway	All is online and is now increasing
Poland	Only e-learning has been carried out as additional education activity.
Romania	Education was conducted via email, teleconferences , e-learning and website posts
Sweden	All education activities are carried out digitally
Switzerland	No additional education activities have been carried out, however some of the planned education activities were transformed from on site trainings into online webinars.
United Kingdom	We had a number of face to face workshops, and a National Governing Body conference planned before COVID 19, these of course were cancelled and at the early onset of restrictions we were able to successfully deliver the normal physical workshop via a number of webinars. We continue to support the sports and their athlete's, but we are only delivering education upon request and this will be via webinar only. We have received some personal requests from some athletes as an opportunity to keep their anti-doping education up to date.



## 6. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on anti-doping programmes

This question examined how COVID-19 pandemic affected the countries' anti-doping programmes on general strategic matters (Budget and Staff) as well as the following NADO's activities:

- Therapeutic Use Exemption Applications
- Whereabouts monitoring
- Conducting investigations of possible anti-doping rule violations
- Transportation of samples to WADA-accredited/approved laboratories (e.g., dispatching with courier, flights delays/ cancelations, customs controls)
- Disciplinary procedures of possible anti-doping rule violations
- Cooperation between the NADO and law enforcement agencies
- Cooperation between the NADO and sport organisations
- Cooperation between the NADO and other key national stakeholders (Ministries, public authorities, etc)
- Participation in international cooperation (meetings; conferences)
- Other NADO activities.

The respondents could choose between four options: *heavily impacted*, *minimum impacted*, *no impact at all* and *not applicable* and they also had the option to provide additional comments, details and/or examples.

### 6.1 Budget for anti-doping programmes

The questionnaire examined whether the COVID-19 Pandemic has impacted the budget for anti-doping. Thirteen States Parties that replied to this question indicated that the COVID-19 Pandemic has had heavy impact on the budget for anti-doping in their countries, whereas seven (7) States Parties indicated only minimal impact. The majority (27 out of the 48 States Parties that have replied), indicated that the Pandemic had no impact on the budget. One State Party replied 'Not Applicable'. The replies to this question are breakdown in the table 10 below.

Table 10. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the budget for anti-doping programmes

Yes, heavy impact (13)	28%	Albania, Australia, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine
Yes, minimal impact (7)	17%	Andorra, Czech Republic, Georgia, Luxemburg, Moldova, , Russian Federation, United Kingdom
No impact (27)	52%	Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Lichtenstein, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Germany, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey
Not applicable (1)	2%	, Montenegro

### 6.2 Staff working on anti-doping

The questionnaire examined whether the COVID-19 Pandemic has impacted the staff working on anti-doping. Eleven States Parties that replied to this question indicated that the Pandemic has had minimal impact on the staff allocated for anti-doping in their countries, and six State parties indicated heavy impact for reasons such as staff in quarantine, or staff required to be redeployed to other agencies to assist with Pandemic response, etc. The majority (29 out of the 48 States Parties that have replied), indicated that the Pandemic had no impact on their staff working on anti-doping. Two State Parties replied 'Not Applicable'. The replies to this question are presented in the table 11 below.

Table 11. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the staff working on anti-doping

Yes, heavy impact (6)	11%	Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Luxemburg
Yes, minimal impact (11)	23%	Cyprus, Czech Republic, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Montenegro, Russian Federation, San Marino, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Kingdom
No impact (29)	62%	Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine
Not applicable (2)	4%	Lichtenstein (as Liechtenstein has outsourced the implementation of controls to NADO Switzerland, no information on the staff can be given here), Monaco.

### 6.3 *NADO's day-to-day activities*

With a series of questions, the impact of the Pandemic on day-to-day activities of NADOs was examined.

#### (a) *Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE)*

Among those that have replied to the questionnaire, no State Party indicated that the Pandemic had a heavy impact on the work of their NADO in relation to TUEs whereas nine States Parties indicated it had minimal impact. Interestingly, the United Kingdom reported that the TUE processes remained the same but applications and enquiries had significantly reduced. The majority (34 out of the 47 of States Parties that have replied), indicated that the Pandemic had no impact at all. Four States Parties replied 'not applicable'. The replies are breakdown in table 12.

Table 12. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Therapeutic Use Exemption

Yes, heavy impact (0)	0%	-
Yes, minimal impact (9)	19%	Bosnia & Herzegovina, France, Iceland, Italy, Montenegro, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom
No impact (34)	70%	Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine
Not applicable (4)	9%	Cyprus, Lichtenstein, Moldova, Monaco
No reply (1)	2%	Albania

#### (b) *Monitoring of whereabouts*

Among those that have replied to the questionnaire, one State Party indicated that the Pandemic had heavy impact and five States Parties indicated that it had minimal impact on the monitoring of whereabouts. The majority (38 out of the 46 of States Parties that have replied), indicated that the Pandemic had no impact at all. Two State Parties replied 'not applicable'. The replies are breakdown in table 13.

Table 13. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the monitoring of whereabouts

Yes, heavy impact (1)	2%	Georgia
Yes, minimal impact (5)	11%	Andorra, France, Denmark, Italy, Montenegro
No impact (37)	79%	Armenia, Australia, Austria Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Luxemburg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom
Not applicable (2)	4%	Cyprus, Lichtenstein
No reply (2)	4%	Albania, Lithuania

*(c) Investigations of possible anti-doping rule violations*

The questionnaire asked explicitly about the impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on conducting investigations of possible anti-doping rule violations. Among those that have replied, six States Parties indicated that the Pandemic had a heavy impact, and 11 States Parties a minimal impact. These States advised that the Pandemic has caused difficulties to conduct follow-up testing of athletes, delayed critical in-person interviews, delayed physical evidence recovery or reduced ability for investigators to conduct physical lines of enquiry. The majority (24 out of the 47 of States Parties that have replied) indicated that the Pandemic had no impact at all. Six States Parties replied ‘not applicable’. The replies are breakdown in table 14.

Table 14. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the investigation of anti-doping rule violations

Yes, heavy impact (6)	15%	Georgia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Russian Federation, United Kingdom
Yes, minimal impact (11)	21%	Australia, Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Estonia, France, Italy, Latvia, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Romania, Turkey
No impact (24)	49%	Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Malta, Moldova, Norway, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine
Not applicable (6)	13%	Cyprus, Lichtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, San Marino, Tunisia
No reply (1)	2%	Albania

*(d) Transportation of samples to laboratories*

The questionnaire examined the impact of the Pandemic on the transportation of samples to WADA-accredited or WADA-approved laboratories. By comparing the replies in question 4 about testing during the Pandemic, it is obvious that some of the respondents referred to the period of the Pandemic (for which they reported minimal or no testing at all) while others referred to the period right before the pandemic (when they were able and/or conducted testing).

Nevertheless, the majority of State Parties indicated that the transportation of samples during the Pandemic was heavily or minimally impacted (17 and 7 States, respectively) and explained that this was the result of flight restrictions, courier companies closed but also to laboratories being not operational. Seventeen State Parties indicated that the Pandemic had no impact at all and six States Parties replied ‘not applicable’. The replies are breakdown in table 15.

Table 15. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the transportation of samples

Yes, heavy impact (17)	36%	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Turkey
Yes, minimal impact (7)	15%	Andorra, Denmark, France, Luxemburg, Malta, Norway, Tunisia
No impact (17)	34%	Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, the Netherlands, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom
Not applicable (6)	13%	Cyprus, Germany, Lichtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, San Marino
No reply (1)	2%	Albania

*(e) Disciplinary procedures of possible anti-doping rule violations*

The majority of State Parties indicated that, during the Pandemic, the disciplinary procedures of possible anti-doping rule violations were either heavily or minimally impacted (10 and 13 States, respectively) whereas 17 States Parties indicated no impact at all and six State Parties replied ‘not applicable’. The replies are presented in table 16.

It is worth mentioning that some countries reported that hearings were postponed or cancelled for reasons like social distancing and safety measures or other reasons while in other countries, hearings were conducted via teleconference.

Table 16. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the disciplinary procedures of possible anti-doping rule violations

Yes, heavy impact (10)	19%	Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, France, Georgia, Italy, the Netherlands, Romania,
Yes, minimal impact (13)	28%	Australia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Russian Federation, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom
No impact (17)	36%	Andorra, Armenia, Belarus, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Luxemburg, Norway, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
Not applicable (7)	15%	Cyprus, Lichtenstein, Iceland, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, San Marino
No reply (1)	2%	Albania

*(f) Cooperation between the NADO and law enforcement agencies*

The questionnaire examined the impact of the Pandemic on the cooperation between the NADOs and law enforcement agencies. One State Party reported that the cooperation was heavily impacted and 14 States Parties indicated that the cooperation was only minimally impacted. As it was explained in the replies, the cooperation was impacted since law enforcement agencies were occupied with dealing with the Pandemic. The majority (29 out of the 47 States Parties that have replied) indicated that the Pandemic had no impact and three States Parties replied ‘not applicable’. The replies are breakdown in Table 17.

Table 17. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the cooperation between the NADOs and law enforcement agencies

Yes, heavy impact (1)	2%	Denmark
Yes, minimal impact (14)	28%	Andorra, Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cyprus, France, Italy, Moldova, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Tunisia, United Kingdom
No impact (29)	62%	Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Luxemburg, Malta, Monaco, Poland, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine
Not applicable (3)	6%	Iceland, Lichtenstein, Lithuania
No reply (1)	2%	Albania

***(g) Cooperation between the NADO and sport organisations***

The questionnaire also examined the impact of the Pandemic on the cooperation between the NADOs and sport organisations. Two States Parties reported that the cooperation was heavily impacted and 19 that the cooperation was only minimally impacted. As it was explained in their replies, NADOs and sport organisations were still engaging but many sport organisations were either working from home or even furloughing staff, so the usual points of contact were not working during the Pandemic, while others indicated that due to the fact that no competitions and no trainings took place, there was no demand for any activities. The majority (26 out of the 47 States Parties that have replied) indicated that the Pandemic had no impact and one State Party replied ‘not applicable’. The replies are breakdown in table 18.

Table 18. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the cooperation between the NADOs and sport organisations

Yes, heavy impact (2)	4%	Austria, Tunisia
Yes, minimal impact (19)	36%	Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Moldova, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey, United Kingdom
No impact (26)	58%	Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, Monaco, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine
Not applicable (1)	2%	Lichtenstein

***(h) Cooperation between the NADO and other key national stakeholders***

The questionnaire examined the cooperation between the NADOs and their national stakeholders (Ministries, public authorities, etc.) during the Pandemic. Three States Parties reported that the cooperation was heavily impacted and 12 that the cooperation was only minimally impacted. Some of the responders indicated that they felt anti-doping was of low priority, and that it was impossible to get in contact with the health authorities to discuss even for the guidelines for testing etc. The majority (31

out of the 47 States Parties that have replied) indicated that the Pandemic had no impact and one State Party replied ‘not applicable’. The replies are breakdown in table 19.

Table 19. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the cooperation between the NADOs and other key stakeholders

Yes, heavy impact (3)	6%	Croatia, Denmark, Romania
Yes, minimal impact (12)	23%	Austria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Tunisia
No impact (31)	66%	Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Poland, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine
Not applicable (1)	2%	Lichtenstein
No reply (1)	2%	United Kingdom

#### (i) Participation in international cooperation

As expected, the majority of State Parties indicated that participation in international conferences was heavily or minimally impacted (30 and 10 States, respectively) as a result of travel and flight restrictions that were applied and/or the cancellation of international events. Five States Parties replied - ‘no impact’ and two ‘not applicable’. Several States Parties indicated that in-person meetings were cancelled; and that communication was possible via Skype, Zoom or other teleconference software applications. The replies are breakdown in table 20.

Table 20. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the participation in international cooperation

Yes, heavy impact (30)	62%	Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Moldova, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom
Yes, minimal impact (10)	23%	Andorra, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cyprus, France, Georgia, Iceland, Latvia, Malta, Russian Federation, Sweden
No impact (5)	8%	Armenia, Germany, Ireland, Serbia, Slovenia
Not applicable (2)	4%	Lichtenstein, Montenegro
No reply (1)	2%	Albania

#### (j) Other NADO activities

The responders to the survey were given the opportunity to provide information on the impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic to other NADO activities in their countries. However, most of those who responded to this question repeated the points that were already mentioned under previous questions.

## 7. Impact on the operation of WADA-accredited, or WADA-approved Laboratories

The survey examined whether, as a result of COVID-19 pandemic, WADA-accredited or WADA-approved Laboratories in States Parties to the Convention have suspended their operations.

Fourteen State Parties with WADA-accredited Laboratory in their territory have replied indicating full suspension (4 State Parties), partial suspension (4 State Parties) or no suspension at all (6 State Parties).

The replies to this question are breakdown in table 21.

Table 21. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the operation of anti-doping laboratories

Full suspension	4	France, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom
Partial suspension	4	Belgium, Germany, Norway, and Romania
No suspension	6	Austria Australia, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey

## 8. Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on operational activities of NADOs and the implementation of the 2021 Code and International Standards

With a series of questions, the survey examined whether those who responded to the survey were expecting the COVID-19 pandemic to have an impact on the anti-doping programmes or the implementation of the 2021 World Anti-Doping Code and International Standards in their countries.

### (a) Budget for anti-doping

When asked about the impact they expect the pandemic to have on the budget for the anti-doping programme, the majority of States Parties indicated that they were expecting the Pandemic to have an impact on their budget: Nine States to have a heavy impact and 15 States to have minimal impact. Although many of the responders advised that the budget for 2021 has not been decided yet, some States Parties already indicated what the expected reduction could be, while others simply referred to the priorities of their governments that is the economic recovery and support of the health sector. Interestingly France pointed out that the pandemic may affect their revenue because of the limited testing for third parties.

Twenty-three (23) State Parties replied that they do not expect any impact and one State did not reply to this question.

The replies to this question are breakdown in table 22.

Table 22. Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the budget for anti-doping

Yes, heavy impact (9)	19%	Albania, Croatia, Hungary, Moldova, Monaco, Poland, Portugal*, Romania, Spain
Yes, minimal impact (15)	34%	Azerbaijan, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Georgia, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, Montenegro, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia and Tunisia
No impact (23)	45%	Austria, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark Estonia., Finland, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, San Marino, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and Ukraine.
No reply (1)	2%	United Kingdom

\* Portugal requested to include the following comment: "Taking into account the constraints that the COVID-19 Pandemic is causing in the economy of the countries it is possible that Portugal NADO (AdoP) may undergo changes in its budget."

### (b) Staff for anti-doping

When asked about the impact they expect the pandemic could have on the staff working on anti-doping, five (5) States replied that they expect the pandemic to have a heavy impact and eight (8) States a minimal impact. The majority (32 out of the 44 States Parties that have replied) indicated that they do not expect any impact whereas three (3) States did not reply. The replies are breakdown in table 23.

Table 23. Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the staff for anti-doping

Yes, heavy impact (5)	11%	Belgium, Croatia, Poland, Portugal*, Spain
Yes, minimal impact (8)	15%	Austria, Cyprus, Hungary, Luxemburg, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, and Turkey
No impact (32)	68%	Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany,



		Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine
No reply (3)	6%	Albania, Liechtenstein, the United Kingdom

\* Portugal requested to include the following comment: “Regarding the staff, it is guaranteed that no one will leave NADO Portugal (ADoP) current structure. However, the hiring of more employees can be made unfeasible; everything will depend on the economic recovery of our country, as well as the countries that were affected by this pandemic.”

*(c) Implementation of the 2021 Code*

With a series of questions, the survey examined whether those who responded to the survey were expecting the COVID-19 pandemic to have an impact to the various tasks that States Parties and their NADOs should fulfil for the implementation of the 2021 World Anti-Doping Code and International Standards. In particular, the survey examined the expected impact on the following:

- New Anti-Doping Rule Violations
- Contractual Policies to enforce the binding nature of the Code
- NADO independence
- Reporting Doping
- Education Standard
- Results Management Standard

Although the majority replied that they expected the Pandemic to have no impact on the implementation of the 2021 Code and International Standard, several States Parties (e.g., Azerbaijan, Belgium, Slovakia, Turkey) pointed out the need to amend their legislation and acknowledged that the process may be delayed. Likewise, France stated that the process of transposing the new rules of the World Anti-Doping Code into domestic law will be delayed and will be difficult to do by 1 January 2021. Similar concerns were expressed by Latvia who advised that, if the Cabinet of Ministers has a high load of tasks the adoption of national anti-doping rules will not be their priority. Denmark, although they replied that they expect no impact, they explained that it could be difficult to get everything in place, since meetings with stakeholders are hampered. Austria indicated that amendments to the Federal law will be required. Moreover, the Netherlands reported that there might be some impact on the ability of national federations to implement new rules, because of cancellations of meetings.

The replies for each of the abovementioned tasks related to the implementation of the 2021 Code and International Standards are breakdown in tables 24-29.

Table 24: Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the implementation of the new Anti-Doping Rule Violations

Yes, heavy impact (1)	2%	France
Yes, minimal impact (4)	6%	Austria, Cyprus, Lithuania, Romania
No impact (41)	88%	Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.
No reply (2)	4%	Liechtenstein, Moldova

Table 25: Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the adoption of contractual policies to enforce the binding nature of the Code

Yes, heavy impact (1)	2%	Spain
Yes, minimal impact (8)	17%	Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cyprus, Lithuania, Moldova, the Netherlands, Romania, Russian Federation
No impact (36)	77%	Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.
Other (1)	2%	France (not applicable)
No reply (2)	2%	Austria, Liechtenstein

Table 26: Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the implementation of NADO independence

Yes, heavy impact (1)	2%	France
Yes, minimal impact (2)	4%	Cyprus, Turkey
No impact (44)	92%	Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Moldova, Montenegro, Norway, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom.
No reply (1)	2%	Liechtenstein

Table 27: Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the adoption of policies for the reporting of doping

Yes, heavy impact (1)	2%	France
Yes, minimal impact (1)	2%	Romania
No impact (45)	94%	Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Moldova, Montenegro, Norway, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.
No reply (1)	2%	Liechtenstein

Table 28: Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the implementation of the International Standard for Education

Yes, heavy impact (6)	15%	Albania, Croatia, France, Hungary, Moldova, Monaco,
-----------------------	-----	---

Yes, minimal impact (5)	9%	Austria, Cyprus, Romania, Spain, Tunisia
No impact (36)	74%	Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.
No reply (1)	2%	Liechtenstein

Table 29: Expected impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the implementation of the International Standard for Results Management

Yes, heavy impact (2)	4%	France, Hungary
Yes, minimal impact (8)	15%	Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cyprus, Lithuania, Moldova, the Netherlands, Romania, Tunisia
No impact (35)	74%	Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.
No reply (3)	7%	Albania, Liechtenstein, Montenegro

## Appendix – List of respondents

<b>State Party to the Anti-Doping Convention</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Albania	Ministry and NADO
Andorra	Ministry and NADO
Armenia	NADO
Australia	NADO
Austria	Ministry
Azerbaijan	NADO
Belarus	NADO
Belgium	Ministry and NADO
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NADO
Bulgaria, Republic of	Ministry
Croatia	NADO
Cyprus	NADO
Czech Republic	NADO
Denmark	NADO
Estonia	Ministry and NADO
Finland	Ministry and NADO
France	Ministry
Georgia	Ministry
Germany	Ministry
Hungary	Ministry
Iceland	NADO
Ireland	NADO
Italy	Ministry
Latvia	NADO
Liechtenstein	NADO
Lithuania	NADO
Luxembourg	NADO
Malta	NADO
Moldova	NADO
Monaco, Principality of	NADO
Montenegro	NADO
Netherlands, The	Ministry
Norway	NADO
Poland	Ministry
Portugal	NADO
Romania	NADO
Russian Federation	NADO
San Marino	NADO
Serbia	NADO
Slovakia	NADO
Slovenia	NADO
Spain	NADO
Sweden	NADO
Switzerland	NADO
Tunisia	NADO
Turkey	NADO
Ukraine	NADO
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	NADO

