

USADA’s Detailed Correction to: Can Boxing Trust USADA?

Questions Surround Drug Testing for Mayweather-Pacquiao and Other Bouts

By Thomas Hauser online for SB Nation

Note: On September 9, 2015, SB Nation published an article by Thomas Hauser entitled “Can Boxing Trust USADA?” This article is riddled with factual errors, unfounded speculation and disturbingly inaccurate accusations. In order to set the record straight USADA is publishing this Correction which is a side by side comparison of the claims in Mr. Hauser’s article to the truth. Proceeding in order from the first paragraph of Mr. Hauser’s article (¶ 1) through the last, USADA has provided a detailed comparison of the true facts to Mr. Hauser’s claims. As this Correction makes clear, USADA has been viciously and unjustifiably maligned by Mr. Hauser whose claims do not stand up in the light of the truth.

<i>HAUSER Statement</i>	USADA Response
<p><i>Shortly after 3 p.m. on Friday, May 1, Floyd Mayweather and Manny Pacquiao weighed in for their historic encounter that would be contested the following night at the MGM Grand Garden Arena in Las Vegas. Later on Friday afternoon, collection agents for the United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA), which had been contracted to oversee drug testing for the Mayweather-Pacquiao fight, went to Mayweather’s Las Vegas home to conduct a random unannounced drug test. (¶ 1)</i></p>	<p>This statement contains multiple inaccuracies. Mr. Mayweather was notified by the Doping Control Officer (DCO) at his home around 1:45 pm, prior to Mr. Mayweather relocating to MGM Grand Garden Arena for the weigh-in. From the time of notification, Mr. Mayweather was continuously monitored by the USADA DCO until the sample collection was completed at approximately 8:15 pm.</p> <p>Also, USADA does not conduct “random” testing. Rather, in accordance with the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) International Standard for Testing and Investigations (ISTI), testing is carried out pursuant to a strategic testing plan to maximize deterrence and detection.</p>

<p><i>The collection agents found evidence of an IV being administered to Mayweather. (¶ 2)</i></p>	<p>This claim is also inaccurate. The IV was administered after the athlete had already been notified by the USADA DCO and in the presence of the USADA DCO. In addition, Mr. Mayweather declared the infusion in advance to the USADA DCO, who was made aware of the need for the IV due to Mr. Mayweather’s physical condition and who continued to monitor Mr. Mayweather throughout the administration of the IV by the paramedic and thereafter until a full sample was collected from Mr. Mayweather. Mr. Mayweather was never outside the physical presence of the USADA DCO from long before the IV was administered until well after administration when the urine sample collection process was complete.</p>
<p><i>Bob Bennett, the executive director of the Nevada State Athletic Commission, which had jurisdiction over the fight, says that USADA did not tell the commission whether the IV was actually being administered when the agents arrived. (¶ 2)</i></p>	<p>In a letter from USADA to the Nevada State Athletic Commission (NSAC) on May 21, 2015, the NSAC was informed of Mr. Mayweather’s approved Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) and advised that “Mr. Mayweather declared the infusion in advance to a USADA doping control officer who was at his home for collection of a sample. Mr. Mayweather provided partial urine samples to USADA both prior to and following the infusion. The urine provided by Mr. Mayweather on May 1, 2015, was subsequently tested and has been reported by the World Anti-Doping Agency accredited laboratory as negative.”</p>
<p><i>“Intravenous infusions and/or injections of more than 50 ml per 6 hour period are prohibited except for those legitimately received in the course of hospital admissions, surgical procedures, or clinical investigations.” (¶ 5)</i></p>	<p>Like most substances and methods on the WADA Prohibited List, the use of IVs in this manner is prohibited without a TUE. When an athlete has an approved TUE, as in the case of Mr. Mayweather, who received a retroactive TUE for his use of an IV containing saline and vitamins, it is not a violation of the WADA rules to use the substance or method.</p> <p>Retroactive TUEs are a standard part of the WADA International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUE).</p>

<p><i>Victor Conte was the founder and president of BALCO and at the vortex of several well-publicized PED scandals. (¶ 16)</i></p>	<p>Mr. Hauser fails to mention that USADA was involved in the BALCO case which ended with more than 25 people involved with the doping schemes of Mr. Conte and his co-conspirators being held accountable for their actions, including the forfeiture of numerous Olympic medals won by U.S athletes, as well as Mr. Conte being convicted of a felony and sentenced to prison.</p>
<p><i>Indeed, former federal prosecutor Jeff Novitzky, who was instrumental in putting Conte behind bars, acknowledged in a recent interview on “The Joe Rogan Experience” that Conte now has “an anti-doping platform” and has come “over to the good side.” (¶ 16)</i></p>	<p>Mr. Hauser has cherry picked Jeff Novitzky’s response to the questions posed to him by Mr. Rogan regarding Victor Conte. In order to fully and accurately reference Mr. Novitzky’s characterization of Mr. Conte it is necessary to consider the context in which Mr. Novitzky’s statement was made. The full interview may be viewed at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rR7lqzwgGeU. The precise timestamps for the statements below are provided at the end of the respective statement.</p> <p>Prior to the statement regarding Mr. Conte’s “anti-doping platform” Mr. Novtizky had the following to say about Mr. Conte: “I’m asked about him often and I always say, hey, I welcome anybody over to the good side. I’m a firm believer in second chances. I think... you know... you have to take everything he says with a little bit a grain of salt – I read something the other day that he still keeps a hand in kind of the dark world and that’s where he learns about all this stuff. And if you’re truly – if you’re truly an anti-doping advocate and you know about things going on in the dark world, and you’re not, you know, exposing who those people are, then you’re really not truly an anti-doping advocate. But, the guy is a character. I mean, I enjoy... he’s one of those guys, in my former career you would run in to a lot of characters like that... I enjoy everything about those people. You know, living life, running in to characters like that, in a good or bad way, it makes life fun.” (1:08:07-1:08:57)</p> <p>After a brief topical diversion, Mr. Novitzky continued by stating, “You know, I just hope I hope that at some point... because he does, he has</p>

	<p>a bit of platform...hell, you had him in here (Mr. Rogan interjects). I'm waiting for... You know he's been a bit critical of me, but I'm waiting for a thank you from him for bringing him over to the good side." (1:09:30-1:09:51)</p>
<p><i>USADA was created in 1999 pursuant to the recommendation of a United States Olympic Committee task force that recognized the need for credible PED testing of all Olympic and Paralympic athletes representing the United States. (¶ 19)</i></p>	<p>USADA began operations on October 1, 2000.</p>
<p><i>It is an independent "not-for-profit" corporation headquartered in Colorado Springs that offers drug-testing services for a fee. (¶ 20)</i></p>	<p>Mr. Hauser unnaturally places this term in quotes, apparently to infer to the reader some malfeasance by USADA. That is inappropriate.</p> <p>USADA is recognized by the Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization. In addition, USADA provides substantially more services than just drug testing. USADA also manages the anti-doping program for all United States Olympic Committee (USOC) recognized sport national governing bodies, including testing, results management processes, drug reference resources and athlete education initiatives.</p>
<p><i>Because of this role, USADA receives approximately \$10 million annually in Congressional funding, more in Olympic years. (¶ 20)</i></p>	<p>This is inaccurate. In 2014 USADA received \$8.75M in a grant from the federal government. With the exception of 2010, every year since 2001, when USADA first received a federal grant, USADA has received less than \$10M. In 2010 only, USADA received \$10M from the federal government. USADA has never received more than \$10M from a government grant in any year. USADA has an independent financial audit conducted yearly. Those audits are publicly available in the Annual Reports on our website at http://www.usada.org/about/annual-report/.</p>

<p><i>Thereafter, Tygart moved aggressively to expand USADA’s footprint in boxing and forged a working relationship with Richard Schaefer, who until 2014 served as CEO of Golden Boy Promotions, one of boxing’s most influential promoters. (¶ 24)</i></p>	<p>This is misleading. It is unclear what Mr. Hauser is trying to insinuate. There is no personal relationship between Mr. Tygart and Mr. Schaefer and the two have never met in person. USADA has a professional working relationship with several boxing promotion companies dating back to 2010.</p>
<p><i>Much of USADA’s operation insofar as boxing is concerned is shrouded in secrecy. Sometimes there’s an announcement when USADA oversees drug testing for a fight. Other times, there is not. (¶ 25)</i></p>	<p>This is not accurate. Typically either the fighter or promoter(s) will announce the fact that an upcoming bout will be subject to USADA drug testing; however, there have been occasions where substantial public interest or requests for information have prompted USADA to issue a formal announcement concerning a testing program.</p> <p>Absent inquiries or a significant public interest, USADA defers to the wishes of the fighters as to whether to publicize the program.</p>
<p><i>On several occasions, New York and Nevada have forced the issue. (¶ 25)</i></p>	<p>This is inaccurate. Mr. Hauser fails to attribute this information to a source or specifically indicate the “several occasions” on which the referenced commissions allegedly forced USADA to disclose its testing agreements. USADA has never been forced it to disclose a testing agreement. When requested, for valid reasons given, we have provided copies of those contracts to the appropriate commission. That includes both the Nevada and New York commissions.</p>
<p><i>USADA often declines to administer CIR testing on grounds that it’s unnecessary and too expensive. (¶ 28)</i></p>	<p>This is inaccurate. Mr. Hauser fails to attribute this information to a source or specifically identify a time when USADA has stated that CIR testing is "unnecessary" or "too expensive." In fact, USADA performs extensive CIR testing as part of the professional boxing testing programs it conducts and has never declined to administer CIR testing. All 22 urine samples collected during the Mayweather/Pacquiao testing program were tested by CIR and for EPO. Indeed, every professional boxer USADA has ever tested has been tested using the CIR methodology. Importantly, relying on CIR testing alone to detect the use of prohibited substances is yesterday’s science and not up to the current best scientific practices.</p>

	<p>The best scientific practices today, which USADA utilizes, is the Athlete Biological Passport (ABP) to longitudinally monitor an athlete’s urine and blood profiles, which allows us to look for any minor or major fluctuations in an athlete’s blood or steroid values. Any fluctuations can lead to additional targeted testing. In addition to regular CIR testing, USADA’s professional boxing testing programs all include testing for human growth hormone (hGH), Erythropoietin (EPO) and peptide hormones.</p>
<p><i>VADA charged a total of \$16,000 to administer drug testing for the April 18, 2015, junior-welterweight fight between Ruslan Provodnikov and Lucas Matthyse. By contrast, USADA charged \$36,000 to administer drug testing for the April 11, 2015, middleweight encounter between Andy Lee and Peter Quillin. (¶29)</i></p>	<p>This is misleading. The cost for the testing program for this fight was not \$36,000. As is the case with all of USADA’s professional boxing testing programs, between 25 and 33 percent of the testing fee is earmarked for a legal retainer for any necessary adjudication costs that may arise. The legal retainer is refunded upon the completion of the program, if not required.</p> <p>This statement also does not present an objective examination of the services provided in the respective testing programs. To say nothing of the differences that may exist between testing programs with respect to the number and type of samples collected as well as other services provided, USADA is not just a testing agency. USADA is a World Anti-Doping Code signatory with 15 years of expertise in conducting a robust anti-doping program including athlete education, comprehensive in-and-out-of-competition testing, laboratory analysis with CIR, hGH and additional special analysis, scientific review of its testing program, test results and test planning decisions, longitudinal monitoring as part of the Athlete Biological Passport for both blood and urine profiles, results management and adjudication of any potential violations.</p> <p>Additionally, unlike other testing agencies, all USADA samples are collected by USADA-trained, full-time, credentialed USADA employees</p>

	<p>and USADA uses only WADA-accredited laboratories for analysis of its biological samples.</p>
<p><i>More troubling than USADA’s fee structure are the accommodations that it seems to have made for clients who either pay more for its services or use USADA on a regular basis. The case of Erik Morales, who has held world titles in three weight divisions, is an example. (¶ 32)</i></p>	<p>It is unclear what Mr. Hauser is suggesting by this statement, but to the extent he is accusing USADA of covering up doping violations by athletes who have participated in USADA testing programs or who are represented by promoters who have contracted with USADA to conduct testing programs, USADA forcefully and unequivocally denies that charge. There is no truth or facts to support such a purely outrageous and speculative attack.</p> <p>As explained in more detail below, the Erik Morales situation has been completely inaccurately reported by Mr. Hauser, even though Mr. Hauser was given accurate facts and an accurate timeline before his story was published. Very unprofessionally, Mr. Hauser’s published story failed to even acknowledge facts provided by USADA that contradicted Mr. Hauser’s claims.</p>
<p><i>On Thursday, Oct. 18, 2012, the website Halestorm Sports reported that Morales had tested positive for a banned substance. Thereafter, Golden Boy and USADA engaged in damage control. (¶ 35)</i></p>	<p>The Halestorm Sports story referenced by Mr. Hauser can be accessed at http://halestormsports.com/2012/10/18/erik-morales-allegedly-tests-positive-for-banned-substance-is-fight-with-danny-garcia-still-on/, and appears to have been posted on the evening of October 18, 2012. By then, both fighters, the promoter, and the New York State Athletic Commission (NYSAC) had already all been advised by USADA of Mr. Morales' positive test. The results had also already been reported to WADA by sample number directly by the laboratory.</p> <p>There was no “damage control.” Both prior to and following the public disclosure of Mr. Morales’ positive test, USADA appropriately followed the procedures for the results management and adjudication of the potential anti-doping rule violation. Pursuant to the results management authority under its rules, USADA commenced an anti-doping rule violation proceeding against Mr. Morales that resulted in the athlete being sanctioned with a two year period of ineligibility.</p>

<p><i>Dan Rafael of ESPN.com spoke with two sources and wrote, “The reason the fight has not been called off, according to one of the sources, is because Morales’ ‘A’ sample tested positive but the results of the ‘B’ sample test likely won’t be available until after the fight. ‘[USADA] said it could be a false positive,’ one of the sources with knowledge of the disclosure said.” (¶ 36)</i></p>	<p>There are multiple inaccuracies with this report. USADA did not tell anyone that a clenbuterol finding could be a “false positive.” USADA had separate conversations with Golden Boy Promotions, Mr. Morales, Danny Garcia, and the NYSAC about the possibility that the positive could have been caused by the athlete’s ingestion of contaminated meat as well as the possibility that it was caused by the intentional ingestion of the prohibited substance.</p>
<p><i>Richard Schaefer told Chris Mannix of SI.com, “USADA has now started the process. The process will play out. There is not going to be a rush to judgment. Morales is a legendary fighter. And really, nobody deserves a rush to judgment. You are innocent until proven guilty.” (¶ 37)</i></p>	<p>The referenced SI.com article may be accessed at http://www.si.com/boxing/counter-punch/2012/10/19/morales-tests-positive-for-banned-substance-prior-to-bout-with-garcia?sct=hp_t2_a9&eref=sihp.</p>
<p><i>Then, on Friday, one day before the scheduled fight, Keith Idec revealed on Boxing Scene that samples had been taken from Morales on at least three occasions. Final test results from the samples taken on Oct. 17 were not in yet. But both the “A” and “B” samples taken from Morales on Oct. 3 and Oct. 10 had tested positive for clenbuterol. In other words, Morales had tested positive for clenbuterol four times. (¶ 38)</i></p>	<p>This information is incorrect. By the afternoon of Friday, October 19, 2012, USADA had reported out to the NYSAC the A and B sample results for the October 3 sample and the preliminary A sample results for the October 10 and October 16 samples. Clenbuterol was detected in three of the four samples that had been reported by the laboratory to USADA by that time.</p>
<p><i>According to a report in the New York Daily News, after Morales was confronted with the positive test results, he claimed a USADA official suggested that he might have inadvertently ingested clenbuterol by eating contaminated meat. Meanwhile, the New York State Athletic Commission issued a statement referencing a representation by Morales that he “unintentionally ingested contaminated food.” (¶ 41)</i></p>	<p>The suggestion of meat contamination was not made by USADA. Rather, in response to a question from Mr. Morales as to whether meat contamination was a possible explanation for his positive test given the low levels of the substance detected, he was advised that meat contamination could cause a positive test but that there was no way to reach that conclusion until all relevant information had been presented and considered by USADA and the USADA results management process was complete.</p> <p>Mr. Morales was ultimately sanctioned with a two-year period of ineligibility for his anti-doping rule violation.</p>

Nor was any explanation forthcoming as to why USADA kept taking samples from Morales after four tests (two "A" samples and two "B" samples from separate collections) came back positive. Giving Morales these additional tests was akin to giving someone who has been arrested for driving while intoxicated a second and third blood test a week after the arrest. (¶ 43)

Mr. Hauser's statement is inaccurate. Anti-doping organizations regularly continue to collect samples from athletes after a positive sample is reported by the laboratory. Additional samples are not collected in order to exonerate an athlete. Even though it would not have been unusual for USADA to do so, no additional samples were collected from Mr. Morales after USADA was informed of his positive test.

With respect to the timing of the collections of Mr. Morales' samples, USADA collected samples from him on October 3, October 10 and early on the morning of October 16. The first two samples were collected while Mr. Morales was living and training in Mexico and the third sample was collected after Mr. Morales arrived in New York for the fight. The results from the sample collected on October 3 were reported to USADA by the laboratory on the afternoon of October 16, 2012; after USADA had collected its final OOC sample from Mr. Morales.

Given that USADA testing policy does not allow for blackout dates, we are regularly testing and may collect a sample before the results from a previous sample are returned from the laboratory. The fact that USADA acquired multiple positive samples from Mr. Morales merely strengthened the case against Mr. Morales and demonstrated that USADA was doing its job. In no sense can the acquisition of additional samples be said to have weakened the case against Mr. Morales or done anything other than make it more likely that he would be found liable for an anti-doping rule violation.

<p><i>The moment that the “B” sample from Morales’ first test came back positive, standard testing protocol dictated that this information be forwarded to the New York State Athletic Commission. But neither USADA nor Richard Schaefer did so in a timely manner. (¶ 44)</i></p>	<p>Contrary to Mr. Hauser’s false claim, USADA did not wait until the B sample result was reported by the laboratory before informing the NYSAC of Mr. Morales’ positive test. Rather, USADA informed the NYSAC of Mr. Morales’ positive test after the laboratory reported the results of the A sample, which is earlier in the process than when Mr. Hauser now states USADA should have notified the NYSAC. USADA advised the NYSAC of the A sample positive for the October 3 sample on October 17, 2012, the day after USADA received notice of the A sample test result from the laboratory.</p>
<p><i>Rather, it appears as though the commission and the public may have been deliberately misled in regard to the testing and how many tests Morales had failed. (¶ 44)</i></p>	<p>This is a serious allegation, provided without any substantiation and is false. At no time did USADA attempt to mislead the NYSAC or public regarding the testing that was conducted on Mr. Morales. Indeed, the NYSAC was notified of Mr. Morales’ positive test the day after USADA received the report from the laboratory.</p> <p>As explained above, Mr. Hauser has recklessly and repeatedly gotten his facts wrong concerning the Morales situation. Mr. Hauser’s story is worse than merely shoddy journalism, it consists of numerous false allegations, unsupported by any facts, and where the truth could have been verified through effort by Mr. Hauser. It is Mr. Hauser, not USADA, who has “misled” through his factually inaccurate reporting of the Morales situation.</p>
<p><i>New York State Athletic Commission sources say that the first notice the NYSAC received regarding Morales’ test results came in a three-way telephone conversation with representatives of Golden Boy and USADA after the story broke on Halestorm Sports. (¶ 45)</i></p>	<p>The reported date of when this conversation occurred is inaccurate. USADA informed NYSAC Chairwoman Melvina Lathan of the A sample positive, by phone, on October 17, 2012, the day prior to the publication of the Halestorm Sports story. The timing of this conversation is supported by public comments made by Richard Schaefer on October 18, 2012 (see http://www.boxingscene.com/?m=show&opt=printable&id=58332#ixz z29hgz0vCS and http://www.si.com/boxing/counter-punch/2012/10/19/morales-tests-positive-for-banned-substance-prior-to-bout-with-garcia?sct=hp t2 a9&eref=sihp).</p>

	<p>Mr. Hauser was informed that his timeline was inaccurate in an email from USADA on August 14, 2015, which stated, in part:</p> <p>“We were notified by the Laboratory of the adverse analytical finding on the afternoon of October 16, 2012, and were in contact with the commission by phone the following day, once it was determined that a potential anti-doping rule violation had been committed.”</p> <p>It is unclear why Mr. Hauser published false and inaccurate information about the timeline despite USADA having provided him the accurate facts ahead of time.</p>
<p><i>In that conversation, the commission was told that there were “some questionable test results” for Morales but that testing of Morales’ “B” sample would not be available until after the fight. (¶ 45)</i></p>	<p>Fully understanding the urgency of the situation, USADA scheduled the B sample opening for October 18, 2012, the earliest possible date the analysis could occur after notification was made to Mr. Morales regarding the A sample positive on October 17, 2012.</p> <p>Ultimately, upon a request by USADA to make the analysis and processing of the samples a top priority, the laboratory was able to report the B sample confirmation results on the evening of October 18 and turn around preliminary A sample findings for the October 10 and October 16 samples on October 19, 2012. All of the results were immediately communicated to the athletes, promoter and NYSAC.</p>
<p><i>Travis Tygart has since said, “The licensing body was aware of the positive test prior to the fight. What they did with it was their call.”</i></p> <p><i>That’s terribly misleading. (¶ 46-47)</i></p>	<p>There is nothing misleading about Mr. Tygart’s statement. In professional boxing, USADA does not have the authority to prevent a fight from occurring. That is a decision that must be made by the appropriate boxing commission, the promoters and the athletes scheduled to participate in the boxing match. That is why the NYSAC was informed of the A sample positive immediately after notice had been provided to the promoter and both fighters.</p>

<p><i>This writer submitted a request for information to the New York State Athletic Commission asking whether it was advised that Erik Morales had tested positive for Clenbuterol prior to the Oct. 18, 2012, revelation on Halestorm Sports.</i></p> <p><i>On Aug. 10, 2015, Laz Benitez (a spokesperson for the New York State Department of State, which oversees the NYSAC) advised in writing, “There is no indication in the Commission’s files that it was notified of this matter prior to October 18, 2012.” (¶ 48-49)</i></p>	<p>The NYSAC was notified, by phone on October 17, 2012, of Mr. Morales’ positive test. Notice was provided directly to NYSAC Chairwoman Melvina Lathan by USADA Legal Affairs Director Onye Ikwuakor and USADA Sports Testing and Resources Director Andrew Morrison. A representative from Golden Boy Promotions was also on the call when notification was provided to the NYSAC.</p> <p>On August 14, 2015, well in advance of the publication of Mr. Hauser’s article, a USADA spokesperson provided him with the following written statement regarding the timing of USADA’s notification to the NYSAC:</p> <p>“We were notified by the Laboratory of the adverse analytical finding on the afternoon of October 16, 2012, and were in contact with the commission by phone the following day, once it was determined that a potential anti-doping rule violation had been committed.”</p> <p>Since the NYSAC was notified promptly of Mr. Morales’ positive test by telephone, there was no need for USADA to send any written follow-up for the NYSAC’s files (nor was one requested). There are multiple witnesses to the fact and substance of that telephone conversation. It is totally irresponsible journalism for Mr. Hauser to ignore the factual information USADA provided to him regarding the notification timeline.</p>
<p><i>The Garcia-Morales fight was allowed to proceed on Oct. 20, in part because the NYSAC did not know of Morales’ test history until it was too late for the commission to fully consider the evidence and make a decision to stop the fight. (¶ 50)</i></p>	<p>This statement is misleading.</p> <p>If the NYSAC decision-makers felt they did not have enough time to fully consider the evidence concerning Mr. Morales’ samples; as noted above, that timing is not the fault of USADA or due to USADA withholding that evidence from them.</p> <p>Although the disclosure to the NYSAC was not required by the Testing Agreement, USADA ultimately determined it was appropriate to</p>

	<p>promptly notify the NYSAC of the situation immediately after notifying Mr. Morales of his positive test on October 17, 2012. USADA also immediately advised the NYSAC of the preliminary A sample results for the October 10 and October 16 samples on October 19, 2012, and the B sample results for the October 3 sample on the evening of October 18, 2012, or early the following morning.</p>
<p><i>Since then, people in the PED-testing community have begun to openly question the role played in boxing by USADA. What good are tests if the results are not properly reported? (¶ 50)</i></p>	<p>The Morales test results were in fact properly reported by the laboratory and USADA. Indeed, at USADA’s request, the Sports Medicine Research and Testing Laboratory in Salt Lake City, Utah, reported the results much more quickly than the typical four to six week reporting timeframe.</p> <p>Thus, Mr. Hauser’s baseless contention that USADA test reports were not properly reported is patently false.</p>
<p><i>Don Catlin founded the UCLA Olympic Analytical Laboratory in 1982 and is one of the founders of modern drug testing in sports. Three years ago, Catlin told this writer, “USADA should not enter into a contract that doesn’t call for it to report positive test results to the appropriate governing body. If it’s true that USADA reported the results [in the Morales case] to Golden Boy and not to the governing state athletic commission, that’s a recipe for deception.” (¶ 51)</i></p>	<p>Dr. Catlin’s opinion is based on a false representation of the facts. It is absolutely not true to say that USADA only reported the results to Golden Boy Promotions. The results were reported to the NYSAC the day after USADA received the results from the laboratory.</p> <p>There is no excuse for Mr. Hauser to rely on a three year old opinion from Dr. Catlin when, before publication, USADA provided Mr. Hauser a full chronology of the relevant facts which Mr. Hauser evidently had not provided to Dr. Catlin.</p>
<p><i>When asked about the possibility of withholding notification because of inadvertent use (such as eating contaminated meat), Catlin declared, “No! The International Olympic Committee allowed for those waivers 25 years ago, and it didn’t work. An athlete takes a steroid, tests positive, and then claims it was inadvertent. No one says, ‘I was cheating. You caught me.’” (¶ 52)</i></p>	<p>Again, Dr. Catlin’s opinion is based on an inaccurate account of what actually transpired. USADA did not withhold notification to the NYSAC based on an "inadvertent use" explanation or for any other reason. The results were reported to the NYSAC the day after USADA received the results from the laboratory.</p> <p>Again, it appears Mr. Hauser failed to provide the full facts to Dr. Catlin.</p>

<p><i>Victor Conte is in accord and says, “The Erik Morales case was a travesty. If you’re doing honest testing, you don’t have a positive “A” and “B” sample and then another positive “A” and “B” sample and keep going until you get a negative result.” (¶ 53)</i></p>	<p>This is an inaccurate description of what occurred in the case of Mr. Morales. All three of the out-of-competition samples provided by Mr. Morales were collected before USADA received notice from the laboratory of the positive A sample finding for the October 3 sample.</p> <p>Moreover, there would be absolutely no reason for USADA to test until USADA got a negative result. USADA is not the only recipient of the test results. All of the test results also went to the World Anti-Doping Agency. As occurred in the Morales case, USADA and WADA policy is to proceed on any positive samples regardless of whether there are subsequent negative samples.</p>
<p><i>In the absence of a credible explanation for what happened or an acknowledgement by USADA that there was wrongdoing that will not be repeated, the Erik Morales matter casts a pall over USADA. (¶ 54)</i></p>	<p>USADA was notified by the laboratory of the adverse analytical finding on the afternoon of October 16, 2012, and was in contact with the NYSAC by phone the following day, once it was determined that a potential anti-doping rule violation had been committed.</p> <p>The NYSAC chose not to stop the fight, as was their right. USADA continued forward with the results management process in accordance with the rules and the agreement of the contract with the fighters. As a result of that process, it was determined that Mr. Morales had committed an anti-doping rule violation, and as per our rules, a two-year sanction was imposed and publicly announced. That announcement can be found at http://www.usada.org/professional-boxing-athlete-morales-receives-sanction-for-doping-violation/.</p> <p>There clearly was not any “wrongdoing” by USADA as Mr. Hauser, without any factual basis, falsely claims.</p>

<p><i>The way things stand now, how can any of USADA’s testing in any sport be trusted by the sports establishment or the public? Would USADA handle the testing of an Olympic athlete the way it handled the testing of Erik Morales? (¶ 55)</i></p>	<p>USADA’s testing of Mr. Morales and management of Mr. Morales’ results were handled in the appropriate manner and led to USADA sanctioning Mr. Morales in 2013. USADA handled the Morales matter strictly in accordance with the rules, and Mr. Morales was sanctioned just as the rules require – facts that Mr. Hauser leaves out of his story. For Mr. Hauser to claim otherwise is journalistically irresponsible.</p> <p>Under the same circumstances, the testing of any Olympic sport athlete would have been handled in the same way. However, under USADA’s Olympic testing protocol, the process would not have been disclosed publicly until it had been established through the adjudication process that an anti-doping rule violation had been committed.</p> <p>Unfortunately, State Athletic Commissions operate differently than the Olympics and some do not (or did not in the past) have in place sufficient authority to stop a fight based on an A sample positive.</p>
<p><i>At a media “roundtable” in New York before the June 24, 2013, kick-off press conference for Mayweather vs. Canelo Alvarez, Mayweather Promotions CEO Leonard Ellerbe declared, “We’ve put in place a mechanism where all Mayweather Promotions fighters will do mandatory blood and urine testing 365-24-7 by USADA.” (¶ 58)</i></p>	<p>USADA has always said that a year-round program in the sport of boxing is the most effective strategy.</p> <p>To that end, we have had ongoing discussions with many in the boxing industry to move the sport to a national, year-round program for all athletes as has recently occurred with the UFC anti-doping program.</p>
<p><i>“Mayweather is not doing ‘Olympic-style testing,’” Conte states. “Olympic testing means that you can be tested twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year. If USADA was serious about boxing becoming a clean sport, it would say, ‘We don’t do one-offs. If you sign up for USADA testing, we reserve the right to test you at any time 365-24-7.’ But that’s not what USADA does with Mayweather or any other fighter that I know of.” (¶ 63)</i></p>	<p>USADA has always said that a year-round program in the sport of boxing is the most effective strategy.</p> <p>USADA sent the following information to Mr. Hauser on August 14, 2015 (none of which appeared in his article):</p> <p>“While USADA’s testing provides an independent and more stringent solution in the sport of pro-boxing, we certainly feel that the best direction for the good of the competitors is for the sport as a whole to</p>

	<p>adopt a unified strategy and engage in a year-round independent testing program. We have had initial discussions with stakeholders in the sport to look at ways that a program of this type may be able to be implemented, similar to what we are doing for the UFC’s anti-doping program.”</p> <p>We hope that the sport of professional boxing will progress in this direction.</p>
<p><i>As noted earlier, USADA CEO Travis Tygart declined to be interviewed for this article. Instead, senior communications manager Annie Skinner emailed a statement to this writer that outlines USADA’s mission and reads in part, “Just like for our Olympic athletes, any pro-boxing program follows WADA’s international standards, including: the Prohibited List, the International Standard for Testing & Investigations (ISTI), the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUEs) and the International Standards for Protection of Privacy and Personal Information (ISPPPI).”</i></p> <p><i>Skinner’s statement is incorrect. This writer has obtained a copy of the contract entered into between USADA, Floyd Mayweather, and Manny Pacquiao for drug testing in conjunction with Mayweather-Pacquiao. A copy of the entire contract can be found here.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 30 of the contract states, “If any rule or regulation whatsoever incorporated or referenced herein conflicts in any respect with the terms of this Agreement, this Agreement shall in all such respects control. Such rules and regulations include, but are not limited to: the Code [the World Anti-Doping Code]; the USADA Protocol; the WADA Prohibited List; the ISTUE [WADA International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions]; and the ISTI [WADA International Standard for Testing and Investigations].”</i></p>	<p>Mr. Hauser fails to specifically identify any provisions in the Testing Agreement that conflict with USADA’s statement that our professional boxing testing programs are in accordance with the WADA International Standards.</p> <p>In addition, Mr. Hauser’s statement that Floyd Mayweather received a TUE granted under standards different than the WADA International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUE) is false. The TUE Committee which granted a retroactive TUE to Mr. Mayweather relied upon the WADA ISTUE.</p> <p>Moreover, the Mayweather v Pacquiao testing program was the first time that the language contained in Paragraph 30 was ever included in a USADA professional boxing Testing Agreement. The language was added at the insistence of Mr. Pacquiao’s representatives.</p>

<p><i>In other words, USADA was not bound by the drug testing protocols that one might have expected it to follow in conjunction with Mayweather-Pacquiao. And this divergence was significant vis-a-vis its rulings with regard to the IV that was administered to Mayweather on May 1. (¶ 66-69)</i></p>	
<p><i>In early March, USADA presented the Pacquiao camp with a contract that allowed the testing agency to grant a retroactive therapeutic use exemption (TUE) to either fighter in the event that the fighter tested positive for a prohibited drug. That retroactive exemption could have been granted without notifying the Nevada State Athletic Commission or the opposing fighter’s camp. (¶ 71)</i></p>	<p>This is misleading. Retroactive TUEs are permitted under the WADA ISTUE and they were therefore permitted under the terms of the Testing Agreement. It is important to recognize, however, that the Testing Agreement that was initially presented to the Pacquiao camp contained no specific reference to retroactive TUEs, but rather to the ISTUE which contains the specific retroactive TUE language.</p>
<p><i>Thereafter, Mayweather and USADA agreed to mutual notification and the limitation of retroactive therapeutic use exemptions to narrowly delineated circumstances. (¶ 73)</i></p>	<p>This is wrong. USADA agreed to the request from Mr. Pacquiao’s representatives that USADA provide mutual notification to both fighters upon the approval of a TUE; however, no limitation was imposed concerning the processing or approval process for retroactive TUE applications.</p> <p>Furthermore, neither Mr. Mayweather nor his representatives were involved in the negotiations between USADA and Mr. Pacquiao’s representatives regarding the revisions to the Testing Agreement. Once USADA and Mr. Pacquiao’s representatives settled on the revised contract language, it was sent to Mr. Mayweather’s representatives for their review and comment. No changes were requested by Mr. Mayweather’s representatives and the Testing Agreement was finalized and fully executed without further revision.</p>

<p><i>Finally, on May 21, USADA sent a letter to Francisco Aguilar and Bob Bennett (respectively, the chairman and executive director of the NSAC) with a copy to Top Rank (Pacquiao’s promoter) informing them that a retroactive therapeutic use exemption had been granted to Mayweather. (¶ 76)</i></p>	<p>The reporting of the TUE approval was in accordance with the terms of the Testing Agreement as well as the procedure that the NSAC was informed about via email on April 6, 2015 – that notice of any TUEs would be given to the NSAC after TUE approval.</p>
<p><i>Subsequent correspondence in response to requests by the NSAC and Top Rank for further information revealed that the TUE was not applied for until May 19 and was granted on May 20. (¶ 77)</i></p>	<p>USADA was advised that Mr. Mayweather would be applying for a TUE several days after the IV was administered. The completed TUE application was received by USADA on May 19, 2015, and approved on May 21, 2015. Mr. Mayweather, Mr. Pacquiao and the NSAC were all provided notice of Mr. Mayweather’s TUE approval on May 21, 2015.</p>
<p><i>And because of a loophole in its drug-testing contract, USADA wasn’t obligated to notify the Nevada State Athletic Commission or Pacquiao camp regarding Mayweather’s IV until after the retroactive TUE was granted. (¶ 78)</i></p>	<p>There was no loophole in the Testing Agreement. Because, as the NSAC advised Mr. Hauser, IVs are not prohibited in the NSAC rules. As such, there was no need for Mr. Mayweather to apply to NSAC for a TUE for the use of IVs. The TUE that was granted to by USADA to Mr. Mayweather was reported in accordance with the reporting obligations contained in the Testing Agreement, which specified that a TUE would only be disclosed upon its approval, not at the application stage.</p>
<p><i>Meanwhile, on May 2 (fight night), Pacquiao’s request to be injected with Toradol (a legal substance) to ease the pain caused by a torn rotator cuff was denied by the Nevada State Athletic Commission because the request was not made in a timely manner.</i></p> <p><i>A conclusion that one might draw from these events is that it helps to have friends at USADA. (¶ 79-80)</i></p>	<p>As Mr. Hauser knows, USADA was not involved with the NSAC's decision to deny Mr. Pacquiao's request for an injection. As Toradol is not prohibited under WADA rules, it was not necessary for Mr. Pacquiao to apply to USADA for a TUE or otherwise advise USADA of his intended use of the substance prior to the administration of the medication.</p>

<p><i>It's bizarre," Don Catlin says with regard to the retroactive therapeutic use exemption that USADA granted to Mayweather. "It's very troubling to me. USADA has yet to explain to my satisfaction why Mayweather needed an IV infusion. There might be a valid explanation, but I don't know what it is."</i></p> <p><i>Victor Conte is equally perturbed.</i></p> <p><i>"I don't get it," Conte says. "There are strict criteria for the granting of a TUE. You don't hand them out like Halloween candy. And this sort of IV use is clearly against the rules. Also, from a medical point of view, if they're administering what they said they did, it doesn't make sense to me. There are more effective ways to rehydrate. If you drank ice-cold Celtic seawater, you'd have far greater benefits. It's very suspicious to me. I can tell you that IV drugs clear an athlete's system more quickly than drugs that are administered by subcutaneous injection. So why did USADA make this decision? Why did they grant something that's prohibited? In my view, that's something federal law enforcement officials should be asking Travis Tygart." (¶ 81-83)</i></p>	<p>Under the WADA International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information (ISPPPI), TUE applications are treated as confidential information and are not to be disclosed beyond the extent necessary to process the application. As the underlying information regarding the approval of Mr. Mayweather's TUE has not been disclosed by USADA, there is no way that Mr. Conte or Dr. Catlin would know the confidential information upon which Mr. Mayweather's TUE was based, and they have offered their comments without knowing the facts.</p> <p>Also, given that USADA was a part of the BALCO case, which resulted in Mr. Conte being convicted of a felony and sentenced to prison for his involvement in providing performance-enhancing drugs to athletes, and the fact that Mr. Conte currently has or previously had connections to an organization that also conducts professional boxing testing programs, he is not an un-biased source and has an incentive to smear USADA.</p> <p>For all of Victor Conte's posturing regarding what he allegedly thinks USADA should have done in this case, it is important to remember that this is the man who long after he was exposed as a drug cheat refused to accept responsibility and tell the truth and would not testify in cases in which he had first-hand information about athletes and coaches charged with using performance enhancing drugs.</p>
<p><i>Bob Bennett (who worked for the FBI before assuming his present position as executive director of the Nevada State Athletic Commission) has this to say: "The TUE for Mayweather's IV - and the IV was administered at Floyd's house, not in a medical facility, and wasn't brought to our attention at the time - was totally unacceptable." (¶ 84)</i></p>	<p>IVs are not prohibited by the NSAC and the use of IVs is, in fact, a common practice among athletes licensed to fight in Nevada. As such, it is illogical to suggest that Mr. Mayweather had an obligation to apply to NSAC for a TUE for a procedure that is not prohibited or otherwise monitored by them.</p> <p>As Mr. Bennett confirmed in an interview aired during the Mayweather v Berto pay-per-view telecast on September 12, 2015:</p>

	<p>“Mr. Mayweather has done nothing wrong. The Nevada State Athletic Commission has no interest in any type of investigation regarding his IV. He did not violate the WADA Prohibited List for any type of drugs that are prohibited on that list, and we have no interest in it whatsoever.”</p> <p>Mr. Mayweather’s use of the IV was not prohibited under the NSAC rules at the time it was administered and would not be a violation of the NSAC rules today. Nonetheless, because Mr. Mayweather was voluntarily taking part in a USADA program, and therefore subject to the rules of the WADA Code, he took the additional step of applying for a TUE after the IV infusion was administered in order remain in compliance with the USADA program. Mr. Mayweather disclosed the infusion to USADA in advance of the IV being administered to him. Furthermore, once the TUE was granted, the NSAC and Mr. Pacquiao were immediately notified even though the practice is not prohibited under NSAC rules.</p>
<p><i>“I’ve made it clear to Travis Tygart that this should not happen again. We have the sole authority to grant any and all TUEs in the state of Nevada. USADA is a drug-testing agency. USADA should not be granting waivers and exemptions. Not in this state. We are less than pleased that USADA acted the way it did.” (¶ 84)</i></p>	<p>Because IVs are not prohibited under the NSAC rules, it stands to reason that there was no need for him to apply to them for a TUE. Mr. Mayweather only required a TUE for his IV because the Testing Agreement he and Mr. Pacquiao entered into with USADA provided that USADA would apply the full WADA Prohibited List to its testing program. That Testing Agreement, which was signed by both fighters, also provided that USADA had authority to grant TUEs for the Mayweather/Pacquiao testing program. As noted above, the NSAC was given a copy of the Testing Agreement and advised in writing on April 6, 2015, that USADA would review and grant TUEs applied for by Mr. Mayweather or Mr. Pacquiao during the testing program, and that the NSAC would be advised at the time a TUE was <u>approved</u>.</p>

<p><i>As noted earlier, USADA often declines to administer CIR testing to boxers on grounds that it is unnecessary and too expensive. The cost is roughly \$400 per test, although VADA CEO Dr. Margaret Goodman notes, “If you do a lot of them, you can negotiate price.”</i></p> <p><i>If VADA (which charges far less than USADA for drug testing) can afford CIR testing on every urine sample that it collects from a boxer, then USADA can afford it too.</i></p> <p><i>“If you’re serious about drug testing,” says Victor Conte, “you do CIR testing.” (¶ 87-89)</i></p>	<p>As explained above, USADA conducts extensive CIR testing, as part of its professional boxing testing programs.</p> <p>Urine samples from every boxing testing program conducted by USADA, and in some cases all samples collected by both fighters, have been tested using CIR. However, a single-minded focus only on CIR testing is not up to current scientific practices. USADA also utilizes the Athlete Biological Passport (ABP) to longitudinally monitor an athlete’s urine and blood profiles, which allows us to look for any minor or major fluctuations in an athlete’s samples. Any fluctuations can lead to additional targeted testing. In addition USADA’s professional boxing testing programs all include testing for hGH and peptide hormones.</p>
<p><i>But CIR testing has been not been fully utilized for Floyd Mayweather’s fights. Instead, USADA has chosen to rely primarily on a testosterone-to-epitestosterone ratio test to determine if exogenous testosterone is in an athlete’s system. (¶ 90)</i></p>	<p>This is inaccurate. CIR as well as the athlete biological passport have been used extensively for Mayweather fights, as well as our other professional boxing testing programs. In fact, in some cases all samples in the lead up to a particular fight have been CIR tested. It is clear, therefore, that USADA goes well beyond the WADA guidelines and frequently conducts CIR testing regardless of an athletes T/E ratio.</p>
<p><i>All of this leads to another issue. As noted by NSAC executive director Bob Bennett, “As of now, USADA does not give us the full test results. They give us the contracts for drug testing and summaries that tell us whether a fighter has tested positive or negative. It is incumbent on them to notify us if a fighter tests positive. But no, they don’t give us the full test results.”</i></p> <p><i>Laz Benitez reports a similar lack of transparency in New York. On Aug. 10, Benitez advised this writer that the New York State Athletic Commission had received information from USADA regarding test results for four fights where the drug testing was conducted by USADA. But Benitez added, “The results received were summaries.” (¶ 103-104)</i></p>	<p>All test results are reported not just to USADA but also to WADA by sample number directly from the laboratory. Moreover, USADA has no objection in principle to providing State Athletic Commissions access to test results if used appropriately under the WADA ISPPPI and only for legitimate anti-doping purposes.</p>

<p><i>As reported by this writer on MaxBoxing in Dec. 2012, information filtered through the drug-testing community on May 20, 2012 to the effect that Mayweather had tested positive on three occasions for an illegal performance-enhancing drug. More specifically, it was rumored that Mayweather’s “A” sample had tested positive three times and, after each positive test, USADA had given Floyd an inadvertent use waiver. These waivers, if they were in fact given, would have negated the need to test Floyd’s “B” samples. And because the “B” samples were never tested, a loophole in Mayweather’s USADA contract would have allowed testing to continue without the positive “A” sample results being reported to Mayweather’s opponent or the Nevada State Athletic Commission. (¶ 107)</i></p>	<p>This was inaccurate when Mr. Hauser reported it in 2012, and it is still inaccurate today. There is no such thing as an “inadvertent use waiver” under the WADA Code and USADA certainly did not invent such a process for the benefit of Mr. Mayweather or any other athlete.</p>
<p><i>The [subpoenaed] documents were not produced. (¶ 109)</i></p>	<p>This is inaccurate. USADA produced a total of 2,695 pages of documents in response to the subpoena from Mr. Pacquiao’s legal counsel between July 6 and August 21, 2012. Those documents were provided to Mr. Pacquiao’s legal counsel as well as representatives for Mr. Mayweather.</p>
<p><i>The settlement meant that the demand for documents relating to USADA’s testing of Mayweather became moot. (¶ 110)</i></p>	<p>In July and August of 2012, USADA produced a total of 2,695 pages of documents to representatives for Mr. Pacquiao and Mr. Mayweather in response to the subpoena from Mr. Pacquiao’s legal counsel.</p>
<p><i>If Mayweather’s “A” sample tested positive for a performance-enhancing drug on one or more occasions and he was given a waiver by USADA that concealed this fact from the Nevada State Athletic Commission, his opponent, and the public, it could contribute to a scandal that undermines the already-shaky public confidence in boxing. At present, the relevant information is not a matter of public record. (¶ 111)</i></p>	<p>As stated above, in addition to USADA, WADA is notified of all positive test results. USADA has not given any waivers to use a prohibited substance and for every sample collected by USADA under a professional boxing testing program the drug testing rules have been strictly followed.</p>

<p><i>One can speculate that, had Halestorm Sports not broken the Morales story, USADA might not have “found” that Morales committed an anti-doping violation either. (¶ 116)</i></p>	<p>This is a completely unfounded and inaccurate accusation. With respect to the timing of the Halestorm Sports story, both fighters, the promoter and NYSAC were all notified before the story was published. In addition, if an athlete tests positive under a USADA testing program, they are afforded a full and fair legal process and, if it is established that they have committed an anti-doping rule violation, they are sanctioned according to the applicable rules. This is exactly what occurred with Mr. Morales, and he was sanctioned for 2 years.</p>
<p><i>“USADA’s boxing testing program is propoganda; that’s all,” says Victor Conte. “It has one set of rules for some fighters and a different set of rules for others. That’s not the way real drug testing works. Travis Tygart wants people to think that anyone who questions USADA is against clean sport. But that’s nonsense.” (¶ 117)</i></p>	<p>USADA applies the same set of rules to all fighters who voluntarily agree to participate in a USADA professional boxing testing program.</p> <p>As noted above, Mr. Conte should not be viewed as an unbiased commentator as USADA’s involvement in exposing the BALCO doping scandal lead to Mr. Conte being exposed as a drugs cheat.</p>
<p><i>A website and those who write for it are not the final arbiters of whether USADA has acted properly insofar as drug testing in boxing is concerned. Nor can they fully investigate USADA. But Congress and various law enforcement agencies can. (¶ 129)</i></p>	<p>Just as when USADA's process and fairness were challenged by those we sought to bring to justice during our investigations into the BALCO and U.S. Postal Service Cycling Team doping conspiracies, we always welcome the opportunity to discuss our mission and what we do with interested members of Congress.</p>
<p><i>There’s an open issue as to whether USADA has become an instrument of accommodation. For an agency that tests United States Olympic athletes and receives \$10 million a year from the federal government, that’s a significant issue. (¶ 130)</i></p>	<p>As was fact checked above, USADA does not receive \$10M annually from the government. In addition, Mr. Hauser’s “open issue” as to whether USADA “has become an instrument of accommodation” was addressed specifically in an email to him from USADA on August 14, 2015 stating:</p> <p>“During our conversation you also said your opinion is that USADA ‘has become an instrument of accommodation.’ I don’t think that statement could be further from the truth. Athletes in the sport of pro-boxing can and do choose not to participate in additional anti-doping programs under USADA. Others volunteer to be held to the standards set by USADA under the global World Anti-Doping Code. Any</p>

	<p>athlete under our program, no matter how famous or anonymous is treated the same under our rules in accordance with the WADA Code.”</p>
<p><i>Meanwhile, the presence of performance enhancing drugs in boxing cries out for action. To ensure a level playing field, a national solution with uniform national testing standards is essential. A year-round testing program is necessary. (¶ 131)</i></p>	<p>A national solution is exactly what USADA has been advocating for. It is important to recognize that prior to USADA, no other organization was conducting robust anti-doping programs in professional boxing. USADA was approached by stakeholders in the boxing community to help with concerns about doping in the sport. We are pleased, but not satisfied, with the progress that has been made since 2010 and remain committed to working with those who have a genuine interest in clean competition to continue to campaign for a year-round comprehensive, robust and consistent anti-doping programs nationwide.</p>
<p><i>It should be a condition of being granted a boxing license in this country that any fighter is subject to blood and urine testing at any time. While logistics and cost would make mandatory testing on a broad scale impractical, unannounced spot testing could be implemented, particularly on elite fighters. (¶ 131)</i></p>	<p>USADA disagrees with the notion that a national, year-round, testing program is cost prohibitive. As USADA spokesperson Annie Skinner told boxinginsider.com’s Hans Olson in 2011, “The cost of a testing program varies depending on a variety of factors, but its cost pales in comparison to its value for clean athletes. We’ve said that you could add \$1.00 ‘integrity in sport fee’ to a single pay-per-view fight and be able to fund an anti-doping program for years. The costs of a robust testing program is a drop in the bucket compared to the prize money that athletes involved in a fight may win, or the money that is earned by promoters, and those that televise these events. The costs are certainly not prohibitive. The benefits of implementing a thorough, WADA-accredited testing program for clean athletes, the integrity of the sport, and the health and safety of the competitors, far outweigh the cost.”</p> <p>The full article can be found at http://www.boxinginsider.com/headlines/mayweatherpacquiao-an-interview-with-usada%e2%80%99s-annie-skinner/.</p>

<p><i>All contracts for drug testing should be filed upon execution with the Association of Boxing Commissions and the governing state athletic commission. Full tests results, not just summaries, should be disclosed immediately to the governing commission. A commission doctor should review all test results as they come in. (¶ 132)</i></p>	<p>As a signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code, USADA has 15 years of experience in anti-doping, and employs the world’s leading scientific experts. All USADA samples are analyzed by independent WADA accredited laboratories and are reviewed by our science team.</p> <p>As a World Anti-Doping Code signatory, USADA is bound by the WADA ISPPPI. The ISPPPI ensures that all relevant parties involved in anti-doping in sport adhere to a set of minimum privacy protections when collecting, distributing and using athlete personal information, such as information relating to whereabouts, doping controls, and Therapeutic Use Exemptions. USADA has always supported full and open transparency in its operations, respecting the privacy rules, and the use of all information for legitimate anti-doping purposes only.</p>
--	--