

MARCA

El COI ocultó positivos de deportistas jamaicanos en los Juegos de Pekín.

3 abr 2017

El Comité Olímpico Internacional ocultó o no siguió investigando casos de dopaje de atletas jamaicanos, incluidos sprinters, según aseguró la televisión pública alemana ARD..

Según la cadena, unas pruebas B aparentemente positivas de clenbuterol tomadas durante los Juegos Olímpicos de Pekín 2008 fueron consideradas negativas pese a que se había detectado la sustancia prohibida. El clenbuterol es un broncodilatador que posee notables efectos anabolizantes, por lo que es una de las sustancias prohibidas en las disciplinas deportivas.

EL COI salió al paso de las acusaciones para aclarar que estos casos de valores mínimos de clenbuterol habían sido archivados de conformidad con la Agencia Mundial Antidopaje (AMA). "En el análisis de pruebas de orina de los Juegos de Pekín 2008 fueron analizados varios casos de atletas de distintos países y disciplinas con un nivel muy bajo de clenbuterol", reza el comunicado del COI.

En Pekín Jamaica acudió con una delegación de 50 deportistas, 23 hombres y 27 mujeres. Acabó con 11 medallas: seis oros, tres platas y dos bronce. Aunque participó en hípica, natación y ciclismo, todas las medallas las logró en atletismo.

Usain Bolt ganó tres oros: 100, 200 y 4x100 metros. En enero el COI quitó a Jamaica el oro del relevo masculino 4x100 por el dopaje de Nesta Carter. Shelly-Ann Fraser-Pryce fue oro en los 100, mientras que Sherone Simpson y Kerron Stewart compartieron la plata.

Veronica Campbell-Brown logró el oro en los 200, prueba que vio a Kerron Stewart con el bronce al cuello. Sherone Simpson fue plata en los 400 metros. Melaine Walker fue oro en los 400 metros vallas. El relevo femenino del 4x400 también se llevó el bronce.

El COI se excusó de dar detalles sobre el caso "para proteger a los atletas inocentes". La cadena ARD destapó en diciembre de 2014 un megaescándalo de dopaje en el deporte ruso que derivó en una profunda investigación de la AMA. Tras esas pesquisas, el COI llegó a deliberar si sancionaba o no a los deportistas rusos de los Juegos de Río de Janeiro 2016.

<http://www.marca.com/olimpismo/2017/04/03/58e20dfb468aebb7648b4589.html>

PALCO23

Ataque cibernético contra la base de datos sobre atletas de la IAAF

La IAAF vuelve a estar en el punto de mira, aunque en esta ocasión no es por los casos de dopaje. La Federación Internacional de Atletismo ha sufrido un ataque cibernético que, según informa, “ha comprometido” la información que posee el organismo sobre las exenciones en el consumo de sustancias que tienen autorizadas los atletas por motivos terapéuticos, más conocidos como TUEs.

“El ataque de Fancy Bear, también conocido como APT28, fue detectado durante una investigación proactiva llevada a cabo por la firma CIR (Context Information Security), contactada por la IAAF a principios de enero para realizar una investigación técnica”, explica.

La misma se inició después de que la organización deportiva detectara “el acceso remoto no autorizado” a sus servidores, de los que “se recogieron los meta datos de las TUE de los atletas de un servidor de archivos y se almacenaron en un archivo recién creado. No se sabe si esta información fue posteriormente robada”, añade en un comunicado. No obstante, el interrogante que aún no se ha resuelto es con qué finalidad se produjo el ataque.

Durante el último mes, la IAAF ha consultado al Centro Nacional de Seguridad Cibernética del Reino Unido (NCSC) y la Agencia Monegasca de Seguridad Numérica (Monaco AMSN), y ha trabajado con Context para “encontrar una solución compleja en todos los sistemas y servidores para eliminar el acceso de los *hackers* a nuestra red”. Los trabajos se han realizado este fin de semana.

Sebastian Coe, presidente de la federación, ha querido lanzar un mensaje de tranquilidad y ha recordado que “nuestra primera prioridad son los atletas que han proporcionado a la IAAF información que creían que sería segura y confidencial. Tienen nuestras más sinceras disculpas y nuestro compromiso total de seguir haciendo todo lo que esté a nuestro alcance para remediar la situación y trabajar con las mejores organizaciones del mundo para crear un entorno lo más seguro posible”.

<http://palco23.com/entorno/20170403/ataque-cibernetico-contra-la-base-de-datos-de-la-iaaf/>

SER CANTABRIA

La Fiscalía pide un año y tres meses de prisión para Iván Hierro.

3 abr 2017



La Fiscalía ha pedido **un año y tres meses de prisión** para el atleta cántabro **Iván Hierro**, al que acusa de un presunto delito contra la salud pública por **el suministro de sustancias dopantes y anabolizantes a deportistas de élite**.

El Ministerio Fiscal pide también para Hierro y los otros tres imputados una **multa de 3.600 euros** e inhabilitación para el ejercicio de profesión deportiva.

Así consta en el auto de apertura de juicio oral dictado por el Juzgado nº 4 de Santander el pasado 28 de marzo, después de que la Audiencia desestimara recientemente el recurso de los imputados y confirmara el auto que hace más de un año, en febrero de 2016, puso fin a la instrucción de la denominada operación 'Jimbo' contra el dopaje deportivo.

El auto de **apertura de juicio oral** impone a los acusados una **fianza de 4.788 euros**, y deja sin efecto las medidas cautelares impuestas a Hierro en marzo de 2014, que le obligaban a presentarse periódicamente en el juzgado.

Según se recoge en los autos, consultados por Europa Press, **las otras tres personas imputadas supuestamente suministraban al atleta cántabro**, desde Valencia, sustancias anabolizantes que Hierro redistribuía luego a deportistas de distintos puntos de España.

En ellos se señala que durante los años 2013 y 2014, Iván Hierro estuvo distribuyendo a diversos deportistas, sin la correspondiente prescripción facultativa, **sustancias anabolizantes** que mejoran el rendimiento de los mismos en las competiciones en las que participan, "poniendo al propio tiempo en riesgo la vida y salud de los mismos".

Según relatan los autos, el atleta cántabro recibía las sustancias anabolizantes por dos vías: **a través de farmacias**, sobre todo en Andorra; y **a través de personas que tienen acceso a esos productos**, en concreto un hombre de Valencia que a su vez lo obtiene de su hermana que padece una enfermedad que le da acceso a este tipo de sustancias y que es frecuentemente ingresada en el hospital, y un tercer 'suministrador' de Valencia.

El auto señala que **el atleta cántabro envió este tipo de sustancias a través de paquetería** desde Torrelavega, Santander y Maliaño, a deportistas de Coria del Rio, Sant Andreu de la Barca, Soria, Aranjuez, Valencia y Toledo.

Ello no ha podido suponer imputación para estos atletas porque el Código Penal, en la redacción en vigor al tiempo del hecho, solo sancionaba a los que "prescriban, proporcionen, dispensen, suministren, ofrezcan o faciliten a deportistas federados o no federados el consumo de sustancias prohibidas".

http://cadenaser.com/emisora/2017/03/31/radio_santander/1490955484_071476.html

LA VANGUARDIA

Los papeles de Salazar: la Agencia Antidopaje Estadounidense cuestiona los métodos del entrenador de Mo Farah.

1 abr 2017



- ‘La Vanguardia’ accede a los informes que demuestran que el técnico manipula elevadas dosis de testosterona
- La credibilidad de talentos como Farah, Centrowitz o Rupp está en juego

Alberto Salazar (58) no ha sido capaz de justificar por qué posee, usa y manipula **elevadas dosis de testosterona**, una **sustancia prohibida** por la **Agencia Mundial Antidopaje (AMA)**.

La noticia es comprometedor. Salazar, estadounidense de origen cubano, había sido un fondista de elevadas prestaciones en los años setenta y ochenta. Y hoy es uno de los técnicos más acreditados del mundo. A sus órdenes se entrenan los campeones olímpicos Mo Farah (5.000 y 10.000) y Matthew Centrowitz (1.500), o el fondista Galen Rupp. Todos forman parte del Nike Oregon Project.

La Vanguardia ha recibido un informe de Fancy Bears. Se trata de un grupo de espionaje cibernético ruso particularmente activo en la lucha contra el dopaje. Fancy Bears interceptó una comunicación del 8 de febrero del 2016 entre la Usada (Agencia Antidopaje Estadounidense) y el bufete Collins & Collins, con sede en Chicago, que defiende a Salazar.

En el documento, la Usada recordaba a Salazar que había tenido “el tiempo suficiente” como para justificar por qué poseía testosterona, una sustancia prohibida. Añadía que se trata de una “persona de acompañamiento al atleta sujeta a la reglas antidopaje de la Usada, de la IAAF y de la AMA”. “Como usted sabe –escribía la Usada a Collins & Collins–, Salazar ha admitido en numerosas ocasiones que él posee, usa y consume testosterona, un agente anabolizante incluido en la lista prohibida de la AMA”.



Preserving the integrity of competition. Inspiring true sport. Protecting the rights of U.S. athletes.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL TO JOHN.COLLINS@COLLINSANDCOLLINS.COM

February 8, 2016

Eliminator 1

John Collins
COLLINS AND COLLINS
8 South Michigan, Suite 1414
Chicago, IL 60603

Re: **Alberto Salazar**

Dear John:

Alberto Salazar has been given ample time to provide medical records which support his contention that as an athlete support person subject to the applicable anti-doping rules, (including the U.S. Anti-Doping Agency (USADA) Protocol for Olympic and Paralympic Movement Testing (the "USADA Protocol"), the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) Anti-Doping Rules ("IAAF ADR"), and the World Anti-Doping Code) that he has a valid justification to possess the prohibited substance, testosterone. As you know, Mr. Salazar has admitted on numerous occasions that he possesses, uses and regularly carries on his person synthetic testosterone which is a prohibited anabolic agent on the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) Prohibited List.

Eliminator: USADA

Eliminator 2

As you will recall, on June 8, 2015, the USADA requested in writing that Alberto Salazar provide the following documents:

Eliminator: U.S. Anti-Doping Agency ()

Eliminator ()

1. All records in the possession of, or under the control of, you and/or the Nike Oregon Project and/or any physician, contractor, employee, consultant of, or any person affiliated with you or the Nike Oregon Project listing "testosterone," "testoboost" or any other product containing the words "testo" in relation to use of such product(s) by you or by any athlete coached by you or who is affiliated with the Nike Oregon Project.
2. All medical records for you referring to, relating to, or resulting from, any diagnosis of a hormonal deficiency or other condition for which you have been prescribed testosterone or any other anabolic agent or hormone, including but not limited to prescriptions, chart notes, reports, evaluative documents, testing records and other such documents.

U.S. Anti-Doping Agency

5555 Tech Center Drive, Suite 200, Colorado Springs, CO 80919 | Tel: 719.785.2000 | Fax: 719.785.2028
usada@usada.org | www.usada.org

No era la primera vez que la Usada pedía explicaciones a Salazar. Tres meses antes, la agencia había reclamado los informes médicos que justificaban por qué Salazar, presuntamente enfermo de hipogonadismo (una disfunción en los testículos), podía tomar testosterona. Y por qué, en un control reciente, habían aparecido restos de testosterona en la sangre de Galen Rupp.

En enero del 2016, Salazar respondía por correo electrónico. Trataba de demostrar que sufría hipogonadismo. La Usada no había aceptado las alegaciones. "El señor Salazar no ha justificado unos niveles de hipogonadismo lo suficientemente elevados como para defender la posesión de testosterona", contestaba la agencia, exigiendo más informes médicos.

Salazar replicaba con una carta del doctor Jan Smulevitz: la misiva, del lejano 1995, intentaba justificar por qué Salazar poseía y tomaba testosterona entre los años 1992 y 1996, cuando aún competía y ya estaba entrenando a Mary Decker (Decker dio positivo por testosterona en los Trials olímpicos de 1996). La Usada desestimó la carta de Smulevitz: en su opinión, no se trataba de un informe médico. Dijo que era un documento incompleto: "Para demostrar una deficiencia andrógena consistente, la medición de la testosterona debe realizarse en diversas ocasiones, a diferentes horas y durante un periodo de cuatro semanas. Una única toma es insuficiente".

"Sabemos que Salazar estuvo entrenándose y disputando estresantes pruebas de resistencia durante aquellos años –añadía la Usada–. Salazar es conocido por haberse sobreentrenado y por haber llevado su organismo a niveles incluso superiores a su propia capacidad: la intensidad

de sus entrenamientos podría justificar sus bajos niveles de testosterona. Por lo tanto, si no se tiene acceso a los informes médicos de Salazar, la Usada no puede comprobar si Salazar sufría de hipogonadismo y, por lo tanto, si puede defender la posesión de testosterona”.

La Usada recordaba que, en 1994, Salazar se había impuesto en el prestigioso Comrades Marathon, un ultramaratón de 90 kilómetros que se disputaba en Sudáfrica, entre Durban y Pietermaritzburg. En aquel momento, Salazar no tenía el permiso para consumir testosterona. “Es evidente que un hombre de 48 años, aquejado de hipogonadismo, no podría disputar una prueba semejante. Por lo tanto, la mejor explicación a su bajo nivel de testosterona podía responder a sus altos niveles de entrenamiento, o a otros factores de vida. No al hipogonadismo”, concluía la Usada.

Como conclusión, la Usada ofrecía una última oportunidad a Salazar: “Debe aportar todos los informes médicos que puedan justificar la posesión y su consumo de testosterona”.

Hoy, Salazar no ha respondido.

Y de rebote, la credibilidad de sus talentosos atletas (Farah, Centrowitz, Rupp) se encuentra en un limbo.

<http://www.lavanguardia.com/deportes/20170401/421349549505/alberto-salazar-dopaje-testosterona.html>

PUNTOBREAK

Nastase vuelve a la carga



3 abr 2017

Ilie Nastase nunca se ha caracterizado por la prudencia o por medir al milímetro sus declaraciones. El rumano, actual capitán de Copa Federación de Rumanía, no se ha cortado cuando, preguntado por el caso de dopaje de Maria Sharapova, ha dirigido sus palabras hacia otro lado, concretamente hacia la norteamericana Serena Williams y su país, los Estados Unidos.

Nastase, siempre controvertido, no ha tenido reparo alguno en señalar a la número 2 del mundo como ejemplo de lo que sucede con el dopaje en el país de las barras y estrellas. Rusia, nación cuyas federaciones concretas han sido señaladas por doping sistemático, con la connivencia del Estado, no es para Nastase la única que ha actuado así.

El que fuera número 1 del mundo no ha dudado en señalar en global al deporte estadounidense a la hora de relacionar el dopaje con una asunción de todas las partes implicadas por "razones de negocios" tras ser preguntado por el caso Sharapova. "Rusia es un país afectado por el dopaje pero también sucede con Serena Williams, ¿no veis el físico que tiene? Nadie controla a los americanos en temas de dopaje, Si la verdad saliera a la luz, todos los grandes torneos desaparecerían, todos los patrocinadores se marcharían. Es inimaginable"

Las declaraciones, aparecidas en el [medio rumano Digisport](#), portal para el que Nastase ha concedido una entrevista, recogen también palabras del rumano hacia Sharapova y su vida privada, después de muchos meses de suspensión por doping. Preguntado por cómo lo habrá pasado la rusa en todo este tiempo, Nastase opina así. "Sharapova hace lo que quiere en su vida privada, como hacemos todos, pero creo que en este tiempo habrá pasado por una pequeña depresión".

MINISTERIO DE DEPORTES BOLIVIA

Viceministro de Deportes asistió a Seminario Legal Antidopaje en Lima.

3 abr 2017

El viceministro de deportes, Antonio Céspedes, junto a Joaquín Ortuño, encargado de antidopaje del Ministerio de Deportes, asistieron al VI Seminario Legal Antidopaje Sudamericano, que finalizó el pasado jueves en Lima (Perú).

Al evento asistieron 36 profesionales en representación de 15 países de Latinoamérica y en sus cuatro días de duración se hizo énfasis en la importancia que tiene cumplir el protocolo de los controles.

Esta actividad fue realizada con la presencia de Óscar Fernández, presidente del Instituto Peruano del Deporte (IPD); Giorgio Mautino, presidente de la Comisión Nacional Antidopaje de Perú (CONAD); y María José Pesce, directora para Latinoamérica y El Caribe de la Agencia Mundial Antidopaje, fueron los encargados de dar las palabras de apertura.

Según la página digital de la Comisión Nacional Antidopaje del Perú uno de los puntos trascendentales que se abordaron estuvo relacionado a la importancia de estos seminarios para fortalecer a las organizaciones antidopaje de cada país.

Durante su desarrollo se abordaron temas relacionados a cómo gestionar los procesos disciplinarios tras resultados analíticos adversos y los procesos de cumplimiento exigidos por la AMA.

María José Pesce, representante de la AMA, explicó el protocolo que se debe seguir para iniciar la notificación al deportista con un resultado analítico adverso, la importancia de la confidencialidad y privacidad de la información, los cumplimientos de los plazos y la garantía de un juicio justo fueron los temas abordados en esta primera parte.

El portal informa, además, que los doctores Emiliano Simonelli y Tharinda Puth guiaron a los asistentes sobre cómo lograr el cumplimiento de un buen programa antidopaje y de cómo ejecutar el correcto proceso disciplinario según lo dictado por el Código Mundial Antidopaje 2015.

[http://www.mindeportes.gob.bo/noticia/Viceministro de Deportes asistio a Seminario Legal Antidopaje en Lima](http://www.mindeportes.gob.bo/noticia/Viceministro_de_Deportes_asistio_a_Seminario_Legal_Antidopaje_en_Lima)

SPORTSCHAU

IOC Sweeps Test Results under the Carpet.



2 abr 2017

During re-analysis from the 2008 Olympic Games, several urine samples from Jamaican athletes drew the testers' attention – they contained clenbuterol, a highly effective doping substance. But the International Olympic Committee would not pursue the cases further and has dropped the investigations. And even admits: it's not only Jamaicans who are involved.

The Olympic Games, Beijing 2008: Little Jamaica elates the sporting world when it wins eleven medals, all of them in sprint disciplines. It would become the story of the games – and perfect PR for the International Olympic Committee (IOC): The super-fast runners from the tiny island in the Caribbean; a legend that would leave its mark on the Olympic sports for years to come. And which now, nine years later, could be exposed as a baseless fairy tale.

Clenbuterol for Jamaican sprinters?



Bottles with Urine

According to information from the ARD anti-doping editorial staff, in 2016 during the re-analysis for banned substances, clenbuterol was detected in several urine samples from the 2008 Jamaican Olympics team. And these also included samples from the Caribbean island's male sprinters, according to the ARD research team. Clenbuterol is a highly effective substance, which is on the list of banned drugs. It became known through prominent doping cases, such as the sprinter Katrin Krabbe or the former Tour-de-France winner Alberto Contador. Several sources have now verified that the IOC was aware of the explosive findings from the Jamaicans – but declined to pursue them further and instead has stopped all of the investigations.

What is more: IOC Medical Director Richard Budgett, on whose orders the re-analysis was conducted, did give the doping control lab in Lausanne concerned advance instructions to test samples for any banned substances. But the Briton also forbid the lab staff from formally confirming any potential positive tests without prior consultations. And after positive results were found in the lab screenings of the Jamaican samples, Budgett then refused to let these findings be confirmed.

WADA even knew the cases

However, confirmation is necessary before proceedings can even be commenced against potentially doped athletes. Meaning that the practice conducted by the IOC in relation to the Jamaican samples was not in compliance with the binding standards set for doping analytics. "It's hard to imagine that a prestigious internationally association would still do such a thing today, as it's quite clearly against the rules," Detlef Thieme from the doping control lab in Kreischa said, without knowing the specific case. "Suspicious facts and circumstances always have to be confirmed."

And: Even the World Anti-Doping Agency knew of the situation. "I am aware of the fact that [in some] cases from Jamaica, some [...] very low levels of clenbuterol were found," the WADA Director General Olivier Niggli admitted frankly to the ARD's anti-doping editorial staff in March. However, it could not be excluded that the banned substance entered the athletes' bodies through the consumption of contaminated meat. Furthermore, according to Niggli, the clenbuterol levels were potentially so minimal that any proceedings against athletes would have little prospect of success. For which reason, WADA agreed to the IOC's approach here not to pursue the positive tests further. Niggli did however acknowledge, "Of course this is not great. Because if you're cheating, if you are a cheater, you have a perfect excuse [with contaminated meat] if you get caught. But that's where we are."

Pound demands tracing

In response to inquiries by the ARD, the IOC too has now confirmed that the positive clenbuterol findings in 2008 were not disclosed. But there's more: The IOC states that the re-analysis has revealed that in "a number of cases of athletes from a number of countries and from a number of different sports very low levels of clenbuterol" were detected in their urine. But, the Committee says, the athletes are innocent. The IOC, however, does not provide any proof of this assertion in its response.

The fact of the matter is: WADA has not set any predefined threshold for the clenbuterol substance; any finding, no matter how low the amount, is regarded as a conspicuous doping test, which has to result in further investigation, according to the anti-doping rules. "It seems highly unusual to me that the correct procedures were not followed in this case," said WADA's first president, Richard Pound. The longtime sports functionary sees the focus placed especially on Jamaica. "Certainly Jamaica is known to have a problem. And it's known to have astonishing success. Particularly in athletics in short distances. So therefore if you're doing your job properly you should track down everything you possibly can. And do not leave any stone unturned."

Is contaminated meat the reason?

All that remains is the tip-off about potentially contaminated meat. In fact, warnings were issued prior to the Beijing Games about meat being contaminated with clenbuterol – at that time the substance was used in China as an animal fattening additive. For which reason the Olympic

organisers already laid down the highest safety measures in advance, intended to strictly monitor the quality of the food consumed in the Olympic Village; with athletes even forbidden from bringing their own foodstuffs into it. And the World Health Organisation officially confirmed the efforts undertaken by the Olympic organisers here afterwards: When it came to food safety at the Olympic Games, the measures taken were successful.

With the result that until now only one other athlete was suspected of having taken clenbuterol in Beijing: the Polish canoeist Adam Seroczynski, in whom the steroid was already found a few days after he had competed in the 2008 Beijing Games. An IOC commission promptly banned him for two years for the doping offence, and this was confirmed by the international CAS Court of Arbitration for Sport in 2009. The statement provided by the Polish athlete that clenbuterol entered his body through contaminated meat was viewed as implausible by the IOC. So the question is: Do other rules apply to those athletes who have now attracted attention?

Jamaica in focus of doping

Moreover, especially the Jamaican delegation exercised extreme vigilance in 2008. Jamaica arranged for food from home to be shipped directly to the pre-Olympic training camp in China, where it was prepared by the team's own cook. The probability that several athletes could become contaminated with clenbuterol under these circumstances would seem extremely low. Without referring to the specific case, the doping analyst Detlef Thieme commented, "If it's enough to just accept the claim of contamination, then you might as well close down the whole field of doping analysis. You really do have to have additional information and evidence that confirms that a scenario like that is plausible."

In the specific case of Jamaica, this is compounded by the fact that other incriminating evidence of doping cases with Jamaican athletes has been found repeatedly in the past, resulting in their being banned. At the same time, there was no proper, functioning anti-doping control system in place on the Caribbean island in 2008. With Jamaica long suspected at that time of being a hub for doping dealers.

Witness Heredia confirms contact

Angel Heredia was one of the best-known dealers in the business. The Mexican supplied top athletes with banned substances – including the sprinters from the Caribbean. Then he quit dealing and became a key witness for America's crime-fighting authorities. When he spoke to the ARD anti-doping editorial staff, Heredia recalled that in 2007 and 2008, in the period leading up to the Beijing Games, "There were plenty of questions from Jamaican coaches [contacting and] asking me [...] if clenbuterol was good for sprinting," Heredia said. "They have asked me since very long, even years before that, they asked me how clenbuterol was good for sprinters and they were asking me questions how to use it. And whether it was good for sprinting, for recovering and all this stuff. Basically clenbuterol, [...] they used it a lot for recovery, for increasing their oxygen intake, you know, for anti-asthmatic properties." When asked how high he thought the probability was that Jamaican athletes used clenbuterol for doping purposes at the 2008 Beijing Games, he reckoned it to be, "a hundred percent. A hundred percent."

Indignation in Germany

German athletes are stunned by the alleged doping incidents. "If it all really did happen like it now seems it did, this is something I truly do not understand," Julian Reus, the German 100-metre record holder, said. "If a doping sample proves positive during re-analysis, then everything

has to be done to clear up the facts and circumstances. And I'm deeply disappointed that it seems like the IOC and WADA are not fulfilling their duties here to the clean sportspeople."

Likewise Clemens Prokop, president of the German Athletics Federation, has a clear position, "A case like this causes terrible damage to the credibility of the IOC and WADA, who are really throwing away the fundamental trust in them here. The attitude and behaviour of the two organisations is absurd." In spite of their apparent "zero-tolerance policy" when it comes to doping, it seems that the IOC has no interest in clearing up the cases of clenbuterol in Beijing in accordance with the rules.

The Jamaica Athletics Administrative Association did not respond to enquiries made to them by ARD, nor did the Jamaica Olympic Association

<http://www.sportschau.de/doping/doping-testergebnisse-englisch-100.html>

INSIDE THE GAMES

3 abr 2017

IOC claim Jamaican sprinters not investigated at Beijing 2008 because traces of clenbuterol too small.

A new documentary from German broadcasters *ARD* has claimed minimal traces of the banned substance clenbuterol were found in samples provided by Jamaican sprinters at the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing.

In a statement released in response to the programme, which aired today, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) said the levels of the drug were not sufficient enough for action to be taken in each case.

Names of the athletes reportedly involved have not been released.

ARD claim in the programme made by Hajo Seppelt, who uncovered the allegations of state-sponsored doping in Russia, that the IOC were made aware of the discovery late last year.

Samples provided by athletes from an unnamed amount of countries were also found to have traces of the anabolic steroid.

China, however, has had a clear issue with clenbuterol in the past due to contaminated meat.

The "very low" levels of clenbuterol present in the athletes' samples were "in the range of contaminated meat cases", the IOC statement added.

"During the re-analysis of the stored urine samples from the Olympic Games Beijing 2008, the laboratory found in a number of cases of athletes from a number of countries and from a number of different sports, very low levels of clenbuterol," the IOC said.

"The IOC carefully deliberated whether or not to proceed with these cases.

"In particular, the IOC consulted with the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) who was fully involved in the decision-making process.

"All of the values were below 1ng/ml and therefore in the range of potential meat contamination cases."

The claims made in the *ARD* documentary suggested the cases involving the Jamaican sprinters, who initially won six gold medals at the Games in the Chinese capital before they were stripped of the 4x100 metres title after Nesta Carter failed a retrospective drugs test, were kept from the public domain.

The IOC have dismissed this, however, claiming they did not reveal the information because both they and WADA did not believe the levels of clenbuterol were high enough to investigate further.

"After careful consideration, WADA informed the IOC further to the pattern analysis that the IOC had conducted that WADA could not find any significant and consistent pattern of abuse of clenbuterol in these cases and that it would be appropriate not to take these cases any further," the IOC statement added.

WADA director general Olivier Niggli told *ARD* that the organisation "accepts" they were not announced for this reason.

"I am aware of the fact that there are Jamaican cases with very low levels of clenbuterol," he said.

"If the amounts found are relatively low compared to direct intake of the substance, WADA accepts that such cases are not announced."

German Athletics Federation President Clemens Prokop was highly critical of the IOC and WADA, claiming the two organisations had "lost credibility" as a result of the revelations.

WADA's President Sir Craig Reedie arrived here tonight for a crucial meeting tomorrow with IOC President Thomas Bach.

The two are in the Danish city to attend the annual SportAccord Convention.

China and Mexico are the main countries who have struggled with cases on clenbuterol.

One of the most high-profile cases concerning the drug involved Spanish cyclist Alberto Contador, stripped of the 2010 Tour de France and 2011 Giro D'Italia titles after failing for the steroid in September 2010.

<http://www.insidethegames.biz/articles/1048835/ioc-claim-jamaican-sprinters-not-investigated-at-beijing-2008-because-traces-of-clenbuterol-too-small>

WORLD ANTI-DOPING AGENCY

WADA Statement on ARD Documentary.

3 abr 2017

The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) is aware of the documentary and article released today by German broadcaster, ARD, titled *"Doping – Top Secret"*.

They focus on the International Olympic Committee's (IOC's) Re-Analysis Program for the 2008 Summer Olympic Games in Beijing; in particular, Results Management decisions taken in relation to low levels of the prohibited substance 'clenbuterol'.

It has been scientifically established that an athlete can test positive for clenbuterol at low levels following ingestion of contaminated meat. There have been hundreds of cases – limited to a number of countries where contamination is known to be an issue and where the athletes would have resided, trained and/or competed; and, these cases have been treated in the same way as those identified through the Beijing Re-Analysis Program.

This unsatisfactory situation related to meat contamination with clenbuterol has been widely acknowledged by the anti-doping community. Effectively, when the circumstances of a positive case indicate that the athlete has been in one of the identified countries where clenbuterol meat contamination is significant, the anti-doping community views it as unreasonable to put the burden of proof on the athlete, i.e. to prove that the meat, which he or she had consumed, was contaminated; in particular, eight years after the fact. However, before a case is closed on the basis of low clenbuterol levels consistent with contamination, WADA recommends investigating such things as meat intake and whether there was exposure to a geographical area where contaminated meat is known to be prevalent.

"We acknowledge that the clenbuterol meat contamination issue is unsatisfactory," said Olivier Niggli, Director General, WADA. "Accordingly, since 2011, the Agency has carried out several research studies aimed at providing analytical means to distinguish ingestion of clenbuterol by pharmacological origin versus that of meat contamination," he continued. "We will continue to invest in scientific research to try to solve this issue as quickly as possible,"

Niggli continued. “However, in the meantime, we maintain that disciplinary proceedings against athletes with low level urinary concentrations, from countries known for significant risk of exposure, would have little to no prospect of success; and, would be very unfair to the athletes concerned.”

In relation to ARD’s focus on the IOC’s Re-Analysis Program for the 2008 Beijing Games; in particular, Results Management decisions taken in relation to low levels of clenbuterol, WADA worked closely with the IOC; and, after long deliberation, and without knowing the identity of athletes involved, determined that the levels were consistent with meat contamination.

It is also worth noting that even more clenbuterol cases (in the hundreds) have been prosecuted and have led to sanctions since 2010. Pharmacological intake of clenbuterol for doping purposes does not go unpunished. Ultimately, reason must prevail when the circumstances of a positive case indicate that the athlete has been in one of the identified countries where clenbuterol meat contamination is significant. Until research provides the means to clearly and absolutely distinguish between contamination and pharmacological intake with low levels of clenbuterol, all cases must be managed fairly, in the interest of clean sport.

As this is a very complex topic, which is subject to misinterpretation, the Agency wishes to clarify more facts as outlined below.

Additional Facts

Clenbuterol

- Clenbuterol is a prohibited substance, classified under the category of Other Anabolic Agents on the Prohibited List because it promotes muscle growth through anabolic properties.
- Clenbuterol is sometimes used, as a performance enhancer, by athletes to increase lean muscle mass and reduce body fat.

- For many years, there have been reports of clenbuterol use in some countries to promote growth in livestock, including: cattle, lamb and swine.
- As far back as 2011, WADA issued [specific warnings](#) about this problem in China and Mexico, where the prevalence of meat contamination by clenbuterol is known to be high.
- There have been numerous reported cases in countries where ingestion of meat, originating from an animal that has received illicit administration of clenbuterol, has resulted in low level positive samples.
- Unfortunately, anti-doping authorities have no control over agricultural and food safety practices in these countries, and inadvertent ingestion is an ongoing issue for athletes. The matter has been raised with public authorities; however, in most cases, it is linked with black market activity in the meat production chain.
- Despite continuously improving analytical methods for testing, it still remains impossible, without taking into account other factors, to determine whether a positive sample stems from pharmacological intake of clenbuterol or unintentional ingestion through contaminated meat.
- Under the World Anti-Doping Code (Code), any amount of clenbuterol is reported by WADA-accredited laboratories.
- Pre-Beijing, athletes were warned of the clenbuterol food contamination issue in China. Since then, further information has confirmed the high prevalence in China.
- As it relates to the IOC's Re-Analysis Program for Beijing, it was determined that, eight years later, athletes could not reasonably be expected to recall where and what they ate, which may have led to their consuming the substance.
- There have been numerous, high profile, cases beyond the IOC Re-Analysis Program which have been managed the same way; such as, the over 100 players that tested positive for clenbuterol, due to contaminated meat, during the 2011 FIFA Under-17 World Cup in Mexico.
- In fairness to all athletes, WADA's approach for such cases has been consistent when the levels and the circumstances of the case are compatible with meat contamination.
- Since the issue of meat contamination was first exposed, WADA has been working closely with sports authorities in the countries concerned to address the root cause; and, has dedicated significant resources to research studies aimed at distinguishing pharmacological versus contamination origins of clenbuterol. This work is ongoing.

- It should be noted that athletes around the world are tested by WADA-accredited laboratories having very low level detection for clenbuterol. Cases are regularly reported and sanctioned when it is proven that the clenbuterol is of pharmacological origin. Hundreds of cases have been prosecuted since 2010.

The IOC Re-Analysis Program: 2008 Beijing Olympic Games

- The IOC Re-Analysis Program is carried out in accordance with Article 6 of the Code.
- All re-analyses from the 2008 Beijing Games were based on intelligence.
- Out of the 4,800 samples taken at the Games, 1,053 were re-analysed.
- Re-analysis is always performed with improved analytical methods, in order to possibly detect prohibited substances that could not be identified by the analysis performed at the time of Games.
- In April 2016, in connection with the IOC's re-analysis of stored urine samples from the 2008 Games, the Lausanne laboratory found a few cases of low levels of clenbuterol, from a number of countries and sports.
- As the Results Management Authority, the IOC reported these Provisional Analytical Findings (PAFs) to WADA in April 2016.
- All of the values were below 1ng/ml and therefore in the range of potential meat contamination cases.
- Before drawing conclusions, WADA advised the IOC to conduct pattern analyses on the cases and to report back. In other words, the Agency asked that they look to see whether there were common factors between the cases that could suggest whether it was more likely to be doping or meat contamination.
- In May 2016, after having reviewed the pattern analyses data provided by the IOC, WADA confirmed that they could not find any significant and consistent pattern of abuse of clenbuterol in these cases and that, therefore, it would not be reasonable to pursue these cases and ask the athlete to prove that it was the result of meat contamination, in particular eight years after the fact.
- The IOC informed WADA that the findings would be used for targeting purposes, i.e. all concerned athletes that competed at the 2016 Olympic Games in Rio were targeted for re-analysis.

<https://www.wada-ama.org/en/media/news/2017-04/wada-statement-on-ard-documentary>

IAAF

IAAF VICTIM OF CYBER ATTACK

3 abr 2017

The IAAF has been a victim of a cyber attack which it believes has compromised athletes' Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) applications stored on IAAF servers.

The attack by FANCY BEAR, also known as APT28, was detected during a proactive investigation carried out by cyber incident response (CIR) firm Context Information Security, who were contacted by IAAF at the beginning of January to undertake a technical investigation across IAAF systems.

The presence of unauthorised remote access to the IAAF network by the attackers was noted on 21 February where meta data on athlete TUEs was collected from a file server and stored in a newly created file. It is not known if this information was subsequently stolen from the network, but it does give a strong indication of the attackers' interest and intent, and shows they had access and means to obtain content from this file at will.

Over the past month the IAAF has consulted the UK National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC) and the Agence Monégasque de Sécurité Numérique (Monaco AMSN) and worked with Context to carry out a complex remediation across all systems and servers in order to remove the attackers' access to the network. This was carried out and completed over the weekend.

Athletes who have applied for TUEs since 2012 have today been contacted and provided with a dedicated email address to contact the IAAF if they have any questions. Any other athlete concerned about their TUE applications should go to askiaaf.org, complete and submit the form and we will respond, wherever possible, within 24 hours.

"Our first priority is to the athletes who have provided the IAAF with information that they believed would be secure and confidential," said IAAF President Sebastian Coe. "They have our sincerest apologies and our total commitment to continue to do everything in our power to remedy the situation and work with the world's best organisations to create as safe an environment as we can."

<https://www.iaaf.org/news/press-release/iaaf-cyber-attack>

THE SPORT INTEGRITY INITIATIVE

3 abr 2017

Open Letter highlights battle for future control of anti-doping.

An Open Letter critique of the two Independent Person (IP) Reports produced by Richard McLaren for the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), published in full by *The Sports Integrity Initiative* below, has provided further support to the argument for truly independent anti-doping in sport. The letter, which was sent to WADA and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) on 27 March, provides a counter-argument to the extraordinary [critique](#) of the IOC's failure to effectively sanction Russia, published by the Institute of National Anti-Doping Organisations (iNADO) last week.

The open letter, penned by investigative journalist Rick Sterling, perhaps provides insight into why the IOC did not sanction Russia with a blanket ban from the Rio 2016 Olympics, as [recommended](#) by WADA. It alleges:

- *That McLaren's investigation was uncertain as to the exact number of Russian athletes that may have benefited from the 'disappearing positive' methodology outlined.*
- *That evidence linking the findings of the report to athletes, as required by McLaren's [mandate](#), has often not been secure enough to bring forward anti-doping rule violations (ADRVs) against Russian athletes.*
- *That Russian State institutions, such as the Ministry of Sports, are implicated without evidence proving their involvement.*
- *That WADA and McLaren overstate the extent of Russian doping. For example, on page 74, McLaren refers to what the WADA Independent Commission referred to as the 'hijacking of the London 2012 Games'. It references retesting of 25 Russians by the IOC, eight of which were positive, plus 'an additional eight athletes' who were sanctioned by the IOC. However, as this [IOC statement](#) reveals, only three of these additional eight were Russian.*
- *That McLaren distorted the findings of the 'toolmarks expert' to suggest that they showed 'tampering'. The [evidence](#) supplied to McLaren concluded 'The marks on their own should not be considered to be conclusive evidence of opening the bottles or attempts to open the bottles but it should be interpreted in conjunction with other scientific evidence'.*

Criticism of the IOC

The IOC has recently been criticised for not banning Russia from the Olympics, as recommended by WADA following the findings of its two Independent Commission (IC) and two IP Reports. "The IOC did not do the right thing in Rio", USADA's General Counsel, Bill Bock, told *The Sports Integrity Initiative* at WADA's recent Symposium. "The world sees that. They were at the scene of a crime and, essentially in the form of the McLaren Report, the body's lying on the floor in front of them and they're looking the other way. They're covering their eyes. They're doing the wrong thing."

Bock's comments followed criticism of the the IOC's position on Russia by USADA's CEO, Travis Tygart, at a [hearing](#) held by the Energy and Commerce Committee of the US House of Representatives at the start of March. At that meeting, the IOC confirmed that it is committed to removing sport from the governance of WADA by the end of this year. WADA's current President, Sir Craig Reedie, has been an IOC member since 1994. Richard McLaren, who

compiled the two IP Reports for WADA, was also [part of the IC](#) and is an Arbitrator at the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), which the IOC funds.

It has been suggested that sport's involvement in anti-doping creates a conflict of interest, as sport must secure the commercial success of its events, which a major doping scandal could jeopardise. For example, the son of former International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) President Lamine Diack has [admitted](#) that it decided to delay the announcement of Russian doping positives due to commercial considerations.

"There are a lot of stakeholders that are concerned that the handling of the Russian doping situation – not just last year, but over the course of the issues that arose with whistleblowers coming forward in 2010 – reflects a broader problem in anti-doping which is the over involvement and excessive control, sometimes the excessive caution in anti-doping in worrying about politics or about money from sport or other issues that shouldn't cloud the picture when there's an investigation to be done or evidence to be followed up on", continues Bock. "So, it's clear that everybody involved recognises what has been termed the fox guarding the henhouse issue; and everybody involved – including the IOC – recognises the need for anti-doping to be independent from sport".

"But while the IOC has paid lip-service to that important principle of anti-doping, for months and months now, they haven't taken action. We've heard of Executive Board meetings, we've heard of Olympic Summits, listening tours...and the IOC has been summoned before governments to give testimony. There is only one thing that needs to happen for there to be independence, and that's for sport to withdraw from WADA. It's within the IOC's ability to do that immediately. They keep saying that they're interested in independence and we're waiting."

However, Sterling's Open Letter suggests that the IOC decision may not have been based on such an alleged 'conflict of interest', but on a lack of conclusive evidence. A fundamental principle of the Olympic Charter is to protect [clean athletes](#). 'All Russian athletes selected for the Olympic Games Rio 2016 have been tested over the last six months by foreign anti-doping agencies', reads the IOC's initial [decision](#) on Russian participation at Rio 2016. 'Samples were taken by foreign doping control officers and the samples analysed in foreign laboratories. Russian athletes who participated in different competitions in all sports have submitted more than 3,000 doping samples. The vast majority of the results were negative.'

'Russian athletes in any of the 28 Olympic summer sports have to assume the consequences of what amounts to a collective responsibility in order to protect the credibility of the Olympic competitions, and the 'presumption of innocence' cannot be applied to them', continued the IOC's decision. 'On the other hand, according to the rules of natural justice, individual justice, to which every human being is entitled, has to be applied. This means that each affected athlete must be given the opportunity to rebut the applicability of collective responsibility in his or her individual case.'

Article 59.2 of the Olympic Charter does allow the IOC to exclude 'teams' from the Olympics, however its terms are vague; it refers to violations of the Charter or the World Anti-Doping Code. As such, the decision on whether to exclude Russia or not comes down to a choice as to whether any violations of the Charter or Code are so egregious that all Russian athletes must be excluded without an opportunity to present their case. As shown above, WADA favoured this approach whilst the IOC did not. And, it appears that there is some merit in the argument that WADA's evidence in support of its argument was found to be lacking.

There is evidence that Russian athletes were unfairly excluded from the Games. To give one poignant example, consider the case of [Alexander Markin](#). He and his teammate, Maxwell Holt, were given meldonium by their team doctor prior to it becoming prohibited when the 2016 Prohibited List came into effect on 1 January 2016. Following the guidance of WADA, both were issued with an ADRV but were not banned, as the level meldonium in their samples was consistent with it being ingested prior to becoming prohibited.

‘The ROC [Russian Olympic Committee] is not allowed to enter any athlete for the Olympic Games Rio 2016 who has ever been sanctioned for doping, even if he or she has served the sanction’, read point three of the IOC’s [conditions](#) for the entry of Russian athletes to the Rio Olympics. This meant that Markin was not allowed to represent Russia at volleyball, whilst Holt was able to represent the USA, despite both being given meldonium when it was not prohibited by their team doctor. The Partnership for Clean Competition (PCC), which is funded by US professional sports that are not signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code, [commissioned research](#) which led to meldonium’s addition to the Prohibited List.

WADA’s failures

The IOC has also been criticised for not taking action to make anti-doping more independent. However, the same accusation could be levelled at WADA. At its Foundation Board meeting in November 2015, WADA [agreed](#) to set up a working group to explore the idea of an Independent Testing Agency (ITA), a concept initially suggested by the IOC. A year later, it did not appear to have got much further.

“The feeling was that it might suit international federations to have a completely independent agency”, [said](#) WADA President Reedie at the November 2016 Foundation Board meeting. “The original suggestion was that it should be established by WADA. Our governance partners have said that they are not sure we could do that – for two reasons. The first is that if you are a regulator, then you cannot be a testing agency as well. Secondly, there is always the question of finance.”

“As far as WADA is concerned, we have conducted the research and we know, technically, how it would work”, continued Sir Craig. “It may be that it is a separate agency from WADA. If the sports movement wants to fund it, then yes, it can be done. The issue is how many sports will want to sink their efforts into doing this themselves. From a WADA point of view, we are perfectly relaxed about that and we would then regulate it in the same way that we would regulate the IAAF.”

It does not appear to be within the [mandate](#) of either the IC or the [mandate](#) of the IP to examine WADA’s failures in dealing with the situation in Russia. A number of apparent failures warrant further investigation. These are:

- *Failing to follow up on whistleblower evidence submitted by Vitaly Stepanov in 2010 about attempts by Russian officials to extort money from athletes in return for covering up positive doping tests (WADA has [acknowledged](#) receiving such evidence).*
- *Failing to follow up on whistleblower [evidence](#) submitted by Darya Pishchalnikova in 2012 about attempts by Russian officials to extort money from athletes in return for covering up positive doping tests.*
- *Failing to follow up on similar evidence reported in a [newspaper exposé](#) in July 2013.*
- *Failing to investigate why Russia – the host country of the Sochi 2014 Winter Olympics – didn’t report a single adverse analytical finding.*

- *Failing to follow up on its own Independent Observer [Report](#) for the Sochi 2014 Olympics, which outlined interference in the anti-doping laboratory.*
- *[Failing to add](#) Dr. Grigory Rodchenkov, Dr. Sergei Portugalov, Vladimir Kazarin, Aleksey Melnikov or Vladimir Mokhnev to WADA's Prohibited Association List, which was one of the key recommendations of the first IC Report. There have been allegations that Dr. Portugalov, [Kazarin](#), and [Mokhnev](#) continued to work with Russian athletes and WADA's failure to add them to the Prohibited Association List could allow them to claim they have done nothing wrong.*
- *WADA wrote to Dr. Grigory Rodchenkov, Director of the Sochi 2014 laboratory, informing him that a 'surprise' inspection was due to take place (p42 of the [WADA IP Report](#)). This resulted in the destruction of 1,417 samples (Russia [claims](#) 1,437 samples were destroyed).*

Cold war

It appears that the IOC and WADA are engaged in a battle to take control of anti-doping, the history of which goes back to the creation of WADA. As has been attempted to be outlined above, both the IOC and WADA are guilty of failures in dealing with the situation in Russia. National Anti-Doping Agencies (NADOs) cannot be blamed for hitting out at the IOC when they were [blamed](#) for anti-doping failures by IOC President Thomas Bach.

The fact is that WADA was initially conceived as a subsidiary of the IOC. However, at the World Conference on Doping in Sport in 1999, governments were [understood](#) to have been unimpressed with the IOC's efforts to keep drugs out of sport in the wake of the doping scandal that hit the 1998 Tour de France. As the governments insisted on influence independent of the IOC, a WADA Foundation Board was formed consisting of 50% IOC representatives and 50% government representatives, with the IOC and governments providing 50% of the funding each from 2002.

What we are now seeing is a return to this original battle. As with most things, it comes down to money. WADA sets its budget, 50% of which must be provided by governments through NADOs. The IOC has a policy of only providing its 50% once contributions from governments are received.

Perhaps conveniently, this means that any budget increase must first be contested by governments, since they are the ones that will initially be providing the extra funding. "You should see the war dance they do on every half percent increase", WADA's Founding President Dick Pound [told](#) *The Sports Integrity Initiative*. "This is, for them, \$13 million spread over 205 countries. It's not even a rounding error. However, you'd think civilisation as we know it would disappear if we had to pay any more."

Since the governments have already performed the 'war dance' over funding increases, the sporting movement does not need to contest any increase in funding. However, the fact is that 50% of [WADA's US\\$30 million budget](#) only represents a very small percentage of the IOC's revenue.

However, what happens if the governments think that doping is not being tackled effectively or failures are identified? Harking back to 1999, the IOC perhaps fears that governments will attempt to wrest control of anti-doping from the Olympic movement, whereas WADA fears that governments will refuse to provide any money at all until changes are made. Consequently, each attempts to blame the other for the alleged failures.

Currently, nobody has oversight of WADA, but plenty manage to influence it. The Open Letter and evidence above show why truly independent anti-doping is necessary.

<http://www.sportsintegrityinitiative.com/open-letter-highlights-battle-control-anti-doping/>

Former Team Sky doctor Geert Leinders banned for life over doping violations

- US Anti-Doping Agency announces sanctions in statement
- Leinders committed offences when in pay of Rabobank team

[William Fotheringham](#)

Thursday 22 January 2015 13.39 GMT Last modified on Monday 4 April 2016 14.53 BST

Only 10 days after Sir Dave Brailsford revealed his vision for the next five years at [Team Sky](#) an unwelcome spectre from the past cropped up again when the team's former doctor Geert Leinders was given a life ban by anti-doping agencies for a hefty string of infringements relating to the period before he joined Sky.

There have never been any allegations of improper practice relating to Leinders's spell at Sky in 2011 and 2012, but the 42-page arbitration ruling on the doctor's time at the Dutch Rabobank team from 2002-09 was detailed and damning.

The case was based principally on the testimony of two former Rabobank riders, the Dane Michael Rasmussen and Levi Leipheimer of the US, who revealed Leinders's role in doping when questioned by the US anti-doping agency in connection with Lance Armstrong in 2012. Leipheimer and Rasmussen received reduced bans for co-operation with the inquiring agencies, Usada and the Danish and Dutch equivalents. Testimony from four unnamed cyclists at Rabobank was also cited.

Leinders, who had been a board member at the Rabobank team as well as their doctor, was charged by Usada and the others in 2013 with possession, trafficking and administering banned substances including the blood-booster erythropoietin, testosterone, insulin, DHEA and corticosteroids; with administering blood transfusions, and with covering up anti-doping violations. An arbitration hearing took place in August 2014 at which the doctor, who denied the claims, was not present.

Commenting on the decision, Usada's chief executive, Travis Tygart, said: "It shocks the conscience that a board member and team doctor would abuse his trusted position by overseeing and participating in this type of dangerous and fraudulent activity. As we said from the beginning of our cycling investigation, ridding those in the system who attempt to justify doping as a means to an end is the only way to truly clean up cycling for current and future generations of athletes."

Rasmussen – who was thrown off the Tour de France in 2007 because of disparities in the information he gave over his whereabouts for out-of-competition testing – claimed that Leinders assisted him with blood transfusions during the 2004 and 2005 Tours de

France and the 2007 Giro d'Italia, that Leinders wrote false medical certificates to enable him to use cortisone, and that the doctor helped him dope with insulin.

Leipheimer said that Leinders had helped him dope with EPO at the 2002 and 2003 Tours de France. Both athletes alleged that Leinders had recommended they attempt blood transfusions using the blood of family members.

Mark Cavendish hails Fernando Gaviria missing out at Tour de San Luis

Mark Cavendish signalled his admiration for the 20-year-old Fernando Gaviria after the Colombian outpaced him again to win stage three of the Tour de San Luis
[Read more](#)

Leinders worked for Sky on a consultancy basis in 2011 and 2012, having been hired in October 2010, after the team amended its publicly stated policy of not recruiting doctors with experience of professional cycling in an attempt to make a clean break with cycling's doping past. The policy was rethought, Sir Dave Brailsford later explained, after the death from a blood infection of a team carer, Txema González, during that year's Vuelta.

Leinders was given a contract for up to 80 days' work for Sky after being interviewed by the team's head of medical, the psychiatrist Dr Steve Peters. He put in 67 days at the team in 2011.

In 2012 he worked for Sky for 44 days before a former director at Rabobank told the press there had been a doping programme at Rabobank and Leinders had been part of it. Sky mounted an internal inquiry to assess Leinders and the doctor's contract at Sky was not renewed at the end of the year.

"We welcome this decision which relates to Dr Leinders' time at Rabobank," a Team Sky spokesman told the website cyclingnews.com. "As is well known Dr Leinders did work at Team Sky on a freelance basis for a short period.

"Although nothing improper happened during his time at Team Sky we have acknowledged many times that it was a mistake to hire him. We would never have done so had we had any suspicions or knowledge of his past and we have reviewed our recruitment processes and checks as a result."

Since you're here ...

... we've got a small favour to ask. More people are reading the Guardian than ever, but far fewer are paying for it. Advertising revenues across the media are falling fast. And unlike many news organisations, we haven't put up a paywall – we want to keep our journalism as open as we can. So you can see why we need to ask for your help. The

Guardian's independent, investigative journalism takes a lot of time, money and hard work to produce. But we do it because we believe our perspective matters – because it might well be your perspective, too.

If everyone who reads our reporting, who likes it, helps to support it, our future would be much more secure.

<https://www.theguardian.com/sport/2015/jan/22/geert-leinders-life-ban-team-sky-doctor>