

JCPAA Inquiry into the effectiveness of Australia's National Anti-Doping Scheme - Hearing 31 October 2025

Written Questions on Notice – Sport Integrity Australia Responses

1. **Enterprise risk:** The audit found SIA's risk management was not fit for purpose. SIA had commenced a project to consolidate, refine and simplify enterprise risks and risk management artefacts, including introducing a single overarching risk appetite statement.
- (a) What activities has SIA completed to date and how do these address the concerns raised by the ANAO in paragraphs 2.21–2.43 of the ANAO report?
- (b) Do the updated risks refer specifically to the SIA's anti-doping work and the National Integrity Framework, and how?

Answer

a)

SIA updated its Risk Management Policy ensuring alignment to the Commonwealth Risk Management Policy and introduced an overarching risk appetite statement and refined enterprise risks.

SIA's broader Risk Management Framework also includes risk registers, risk matrices, risk assessment templates, reporting tools and guidance for staff on the development of risk assessments.

b)

Yes. SIA's enterprise risks include three risk events where SIA's anti-doping work and the National Integrity Framework are captured. The specific risk events are:

- We fail to deliver operational outcomes that contribute to integrity in sport and athlete safety and wellbeing
- We fail to deliver high quality service delivery outcomes
- We are unable to deliver and/or comply with our regulatory functions.

- 2. Gifts and benefits:** The ANAO identified weaknesses in the implementation and oversight of SIA's integrity controls—including incomplete records, inconsistent declarations, and a lack executive review and management plans. SIA has stated that improvements to controls have been completed, including the introduction of an online tool to automate conflict of interest and gift and benefits declarations.

- (a) How does the online tool address the incidence of:
- failure to declare
 - incomplete records and inconsistent declarations
 - lack of executive review
 - absence of management plans
 - lack of documentation as to whether gifts and benefits are accepted or declined?
- (b) How does SIA gain assurance that the register is complete and accurate?

Answer

a)

The updated, online Conflict of Interest and Gifts and Benefits tool:

- increases awareness of the declaration process with staff
- improves the ease of declaration
- does not accept incomplete entries
- workflows individual declarations through to SES delegates
- requires officials to declare whether gifts and benefits are accepted or declined
- enables reporting through to Executive
- mandates the approval of a conflict of interest management plan prior to approval.

b)

A quarterly report is generated for SIA Executive to review.

- 3. Outside employment:** What procedures have been put in place to ensure formal review and/or management strategies to address potential conflicts arising from outside employment?

Answer

The SIA Outside Employment Policy allows employees to engage in outside, paid and unpaid employment.

Any employee engaging in outside employment is required to disclose any real, apparent or potential conflicts for consideration by their line manager and then to the appropriate SES delegate.

In the instance that the conflict cannot be reasonably managed or contained, the employee may be directed to not engage in the outside employment.

- 4. Management of conflicts of interest within committees:** The audit found conflict of interest declarations within SIA's advisory, oversight and assurance committees were inconsistently completed or not recorded when required.
- (a) What steps has SIA taken to strengthen oversight of conflict of interest management?
 - (b) How is SIA ensuring that all members meet their annual declaration and deed poll requirements on an ongoing basis, and that meeting records accurately reflect declared interests and the actions taken to manage them?

Answer

(a) and (b)

An update of the Conflict of Interest Policy includes the requirement for all Committee members to annually declare their interests.

A review is also underway of Committee Terms of Reference to include:

- a requirement to publish a list of all member declarations in the meeting pack to provide visibility and support active management of conflicts by the Chair.
- reference to the annual declaration process and explicit guidance on managing and recording declared interests in the meeting context.

- 5. Performance measures:** The ANAO found SIA did not have measures of effectiveness or efficiency pertaining to its anti-doping activities, as required by the Commonwealth Performance Framework.
- (a) What specific activities and investigations has SIA undertaken to develop effectiveness and efficiency measures?
 - (b) How is SIA developing longitudinal datasets to inform future effectiveness and efficiency measures?

Answer

a) and (b)

No globally recognised measure of effectiveness exists for anti-doping testing. Recognising the complexity of this task, we have engaged expert support to help SIA explore and develop effectiveness and efficiency measures and targets for anti-doping testing and investigations activities. We convened our first workshop on this matter in October 2025.

The work will include determining the data (including longitudinal datasets) and methodology required and the development of an action plan to guide how we mature this measure moving forward. The action plan will be in place by first half of 2026.

- 6. Regulatory approach:** SIA takes a different regulatory approach to user-pays and government-funded sports.
- (a) How does SIA justify a different regulatory approach for user-pays sports?
 - (b) How does SIA reconcile potential conflicts between the following:
 - user pays charging
 - maintaining service agreements with sports
 - fulfilling national anti-doping responsibilities?
 - (c) The ANAO determined that the regulation of user-pays sports was not demonstrably risk-based and data driven as required under the Regulatory Policy, Practice and Performance Framework. What changes will SIA implement to bring the regulation of user-pays sports within the required framework?

Answer

a)

SIA regulates anti-doping (via the Australian Sports Commission NSO recognition agreements) for all recognised Australian sporting organisations through the same requirement to implement an approved anti-doping policy and have an approved education plan in place.

These requirements do not include an obligation for sports to conduct anti-doping testing. These requirements are identical for both “Government Funded” and “User Pays” sports.

SIA implements an anti-doping testing program as part of its obligations as Australia’s National Anti-Doping Organisation and is funded by the Commonwealth for this purpose. This is an assurance program for the integrity of Australian athletes.

SIA believes that it is the responsibility of all sports to protect the integrity of their competitions, however only a small number of sports have the financial capacity to contribute to their own anti-doping programs.

For those sports who do have the capacity, SIA seeks to recover costs (partially) through User Pays arrangements (mainly with professional sports). By doing so, SIA is able to better spread its available resources across other (mainly Olympic and Commonwealth) Sports.

b)

SIA’s user-pays charging (and therefore agreements with sport) do not conflict with fulfilling our obligations as a national anti-doping agency.

Those obligations, particularly as they relate to the World Anti-Doping Code and International Standards, were recently audited by WADA who expressed no concerns with our compliance in that regard.

The practice of user pays arrangements for professional sports is extremely common across the world, including comparable national anti-doping agencies in the United Kingdom and New Zealand for example, and are not considered to breach strict independence requirements for national anti-doping agencies (which include requirements for independence from Sport and from Government).

An important element of SIA's testing program is ensuring the decision of who to test and when to test remains entirely with SIA and not the sport (whether government funded or user-pays). SIA also maintains the ability to conduct testing in any user-pays sport regardless of whether those tests are funded by the sport or by SIA itself.

User-pays arrangements do not provide sports any additional access or benefit to SIA's services or change our regulatory approach as compared to government funded sports, and they receive access to the full suite of other SIA resources such as education, Therapeutic Use Exemptions and Results management functions at no cost in the same manner as government funded sports.

c)

As it relates to our test planning process, SIA has completed updates to address recommendations 3 & 5 of the ANAO report which ensure the risk assessments and Test Distribution Plan planning process for user pays sports are better documented and recorded (see further details in question 7 below).

SIA's risk assessment process and the resulting test distribution plan remains the key tool through which the agency ensures its programs for both government funded and user-pays sports remain risk based and data driven.

The risk assessment process involves a holistic consideration and assessment of data and intelligence to inform decisions on required testing levels and planning needs. That data is gathered from a wide variety of sources but is fundamentally underpinned by requirements in the WADA's International Standard for Testing and Investigations.

Throughout this process, SIA considers and documents decisions around information such as the physical demands of the sport, the rewards and incentives available, the history of doping in the sport, available statistics on doping trends, intelligence gathered by SIA or available from third parties, the outcomes of previous testing and the structure of the season and competition schedule.

7. **Test distribution planning procedure:** SIA has advised that the Test Distribution Planning Procedure and 2025/26 risk assessment processes have been updated to include user pays sports:
- (a) What specific changes have been made to the Test Distribution Planning procedure to include user-pays sports and in what ways is this approach different from government-funded sports?
 - (b) What specific changes were made to the 2025/26 risk assessment process to inform test distribution planning for user-pays sports and in what ways is this approach different from government-funded sports?
 - (c) In updating these procedures and processes, how has SIA documented the criteria used to determine which sports fall under the user-pays model?
 - (d) **Decision to assess:** What was the rationale for SIA choosing in March 2024 to 'assess' an allegation of possible anti-doping rule violations (see paragraphs 4.28–4.29) rather than following its normal documented processes?

Answer

a)

The ANAO report found user pays sports Test Distribution Planning was not demonstrably risk-based compared to government funded sports. The Test Distribution Planning Procedure has now been updated to include a requirement for both user pays and government funded sports to be included in the same risk assessment.

The update to procedure ensures consistency and robust documentation. The only substantive difference in approach is the requirement to develop a Testing Proposal for user pays sports to consider and adopt given these services are provided under contract.

b)

As per recommendation 5 of the ANAO report, the risk assessment process/template was updated to include all user-pays sports.

There is no difference in the risk assessment process between User pays and Government funded sports – both follow the same process and were included in the same template.

SIA's answer to 6c also provides further information on considerations undertaken by SIA when documenting the yearly risk assessment documentation.

c)

SIA has mapped the current decision-making process which determines sports or events falling under the user-pays model. Further refinement or documentation of the funding model is planned.

d)

On 26 March 2024, allegations were raised in Parliament regarding the implementation of the Australian Football League (AFL) Illicit Drugs Policy and potential associated breaches of the AFL Anti-Doping Policy or World Anti-Doping Code (WADC).

Sport Integrity Australia has the following authority and functions to undertake this assessment:

- SIA is Australia's National Anti-Doping Organisation and has authorities and obligations to implement the WADC in Australia and enforce rules and polices relating to anti-doping. The authorities and obligations are outlined in the World Anti-Doping Code; Sport Integrity Australia Act 2020; and Australian National Anti-Doping Policy 2021. The WADC requires SIA to pursue all potential anti-doping violations.
- SIA's role and functions as set out in the [Sport Integrity Australia Act 2020](#), the [Sport Integrity Australia Regulations 2020](#), including playing a national coordination role for all sport integrity related matters, investigating threats to sports integrity and providing assistance and advice to sports administrators.

The information disclosed in Parliament was provided to SIA and assessed as intelligence. Section 11.3 of the World Anti-Doping Code International Standard testing and Investigations (ISTI) is titled "Assessment and Analysis of Anti-Doping Intelligence" and states at 11.3.2 that:

All anti-doping intelligence captured or received by an Anti-Doping Organization should be collated and analyzed to establish patterns, trends and relationships that: may assist the Anti-Doping Organization in developing an effective anti-doping strategy and/or in determining (where the intelligence relates to a particular case) whether there is reasonable cause to suspect that an anti-doping rule violation may have been committed, such that further investigation is warranted in accordance with Article 12 and the International Standard for Results Management.

Following SIA's assessment of the material, there were no reasonable grounds to indicate an anti-doping rule violation and therefore the assessment did not proceed to the formal ADRV investigation process.

The information provided to SIA presented an opportunity which allowed the agency to also undertake a significantly broader assessment process of the integrity threat posed by the use of illicit drugs in sport (outside of any potential anti-doping rule violations). SIA's rationale in undertaking the broader assessment included the clear potential for the findings to be of relevance and impact to all Australian sports, not just the AFL.

8. **Investigative practices:** The ANAO recommended SIA either establish controls to ensure its documented investigative practices and procedures were implemented or update its procedures to reflect current endorsed practice.
- (a) What actions have been commenced and completed?
- (b) How is SIA providing assurance its practices align with AGIS 2022 requirements?
- (c) **Quality assurance:** Please describe the quality assurance process for investigations that captures all types of investigations.

Answer

a)

Investigation Management Guidelines and Investigation Standard Operating Procedures (SOPS) have been updated and put in place to ensure documented investigative practices and procedures are consistent with current practice.

A new information case management system has been implemented to ensure consistency in investigations across the agency and satisfy record keeping requirements and compliance with AGIS.

b)

Our current SOPs provide general investigation standards and principles derived from the Australian Government Investigation Standards (AGIS), and APS Code of Conduct, which apply to all investigations conducted by the Agency. These principles form the foundation of our Agency's Operational Plan.

These standards and principles must be used by investigators in conjunction with the investigation specific SOPs, templates and the information case management system for recording of all investigative activities, to ensure consistency in investigations across the agency and satisfy record keeping requirements.

SIA has created a checklist designed to map alignment of process or procedure with the AGIS 2022 requirements. In addition to currently assessing process against the checklist, assurance of alignment will be tracked through the quality assurance policy (see answer to 9c below).

c)

SIA has drafted an Operational Quality Assurance Policy and is seeking review of the Policy through external qualified experts to ensure alignment with the requirements of the Australian Government Investigation Standards.

The draft policy itself follows the advice of AGIS by following the assurance model of 'three lines of defence' focused on compliance, reflections and lessons learnt.

The first line of defence (informal self, peer and supervisory review) has been (and is currently) in place through Sport Integrity Australia's standard operating procedures, and this remains. An additional informal internal review activity has been included for a team-led review.

A second line of defence approach (formal internal audit) involves an independent internal audit. This involves an independent internal officer reviewing an investigation or a collection of investigations/processes.

A third line of defence approach (formal external audit) involves an independent external audit, with at least one to be completed every two years. These audits may be focused either on individual matters or themes across a collection of matters.

Themes/process-based audits may also continue to be undertaken as part of SIA's internal audit program under the oversight of the Audit and Risk Committee.

Each Investigation team is responsible for developing a QA plan, for first line of defence activities, which will be approved by their relevant Senior Executive and reviewed on an annual basis. These plans will feed into an annual QA Plan, for second and third line of defence activities developed and oversighted by the Operations Committee and approved by the Deputy CEO - Safety in Sport.

9. **Assessment of education plans:** A key deliverable in SIA's 2023–24 National Education Plan is that all NSOs have an anti-doping education plan in place and reviewed by SIA. An approved education plan is also required for sports to be recognised as an NSO by the Australian Sports Commission. The ANAO found that the finalisation of sport-specific education plans was generally in accordance with the National Anti-Doping (NAD) Policy for government-funded sports, but not fully in accordance for user-pays sports (see paragraphs 3.32–3.33).
- (a) What specific actions is the SIA taking to ensure that all NSO's, including user-pays sports, have finalised an approved sport-specific education plans?
 - (b) How does the SIA address cases where education plans are not received, not approved, or not finalised by NSOs?
 - (c) What are the implications for the SIA's evaluation of education outcomes when plans are incomplete or not fully aligned with the NAD Policy, particularly for user pays sports?

Answer

a)

SIA works with every NSO to develop and review their annual integrity education plan.

Every recognised NSO in Australia has a SIA Education team contact, who is responsible for integrity education planning, implementation and evaluation in partnership with the NSO.

Meetings are scheduled with the NSO on a regular basis which varies from sport-to-sport based on the sport requirements and risk.

SIA conducts an annual assessment of sport education plans in April each year to inform our input to the ASC NSO Recognition process.

At the time of the ANAO audit, 2 sports (including one user-pays sport) out of 98 NSOs did not have a SIA approved education plan. One has since been submitted and reviewed. As of 12 November 2025, only 1 out of 98 NSOs does not currently have a SIA approved integrity education plan. This NSO is a small, volunteer-run organisation.

SIA has formally advised the remaining NSO that they are required to finalise their Integrity Education Plan prior to April and is supporting them with this requirement. SIA will work with the ASC to consider this requirement prior to April 2026 as part of the NSO recognition process.

There is no requirement for NSOs to have an Education Plan under the WADA International Standard for Education, with the exception of AFL who are required to

have their own (significantly more comprehensive) Education Plan as part of their WADA Signatory compliance requirements.

b)

NSOs are required to have sport-specific integrity education plans as part of ASC recognition criteria. SIA provides annual formal assessments to the ASC on education-related criteria, for them to consider as part of the NSO recognition process.

SIA works cooperatively with NSOs on their Education Plans and the implementation of those plans throughout the year. SIA continues to offer education services as sports are working through the finalisation of their plans.

c)

For the NSOs with no plan, SIA is unable to measure whether those athletes or support personnel have completed anti-doping education, or the impact of that education. As there is only 1 sport without a SIA Approved Education Plan, the overall impact is not substantial at a national level, however it remains a relevant consideration on a sport-by-sport basis.

10. Entities not eligible to become National Integrity Framework signatories:

The submission from the Combat Sports Commission (CSC) states that while it aligns its integrity program with the SIA National Integrity Framework (NIF) and the World Anti-Doping Code, it cannot become a signatory because it is a state regulatory body rather than a National Sporting Organisation.

- (a) Why is there no path for state regulators to obtain SIA services or to integrate fully into the National Anti-Doping Scheme?
- (b) How could such a path be created?
- (c) Would CSC's suggestion for a 'regulatory participant' class under the National Anti-Doping Scheme be workable? If not, what other alternatives might be workable?
- (d) What barriers are there to establishing a fee-for-service and MOU template for SIA to deliver collections and education to non-NIF regulators?

Answer

The National Integrity Framework (NIF) is a suite of integrity policies that does not include the anti-doping policy which sits separately. Any reference to the NIF is not strictly relevant to an organisation's ability to adopt a Code compliant anti-doping policy.

SIA recognises and commends the CSC for their objective to continue protecting the integrity of the events they regulate.

a)

The current anti-doping system relies on national sporting organisations adopting World Anti-Doping Code compliant anti-doping policies and being in a position to effectively impose and monitor sanctions.

It is currently unclear whether the CSC would be in a position to impose and enforce sanctions given they perform the role of a state regulator rather than national sporting organisation.

By way of example or comparison, some sports regulated by the CSC such as boxing and Muay Thai are recognised by the Australian Sports Commission and have adopted the *Australian National Anti-Doping Policy*.

Therefore, SIA conducts testing and results management in these sports as part of its anti-doping program.

b)

Further consideration, including legal consideration, would be required to ensure SIA had the authority to perform these functions and to ensure any pathway created enabled the appropriate and Code compliant enforcement of sanctions.

c)

Further consideration and including legal consideration advice would be required to determine if this suggested class would be workable.

d)

SIA would need to ensure any sanctions imposed on athletes were enforceable by the regulator. Further consideration, including legal consideration, would be required to determine whether this could occur

Additionally, SIA's partial cost recovery model only relates to its anti-doping testing services. Any additional services, particularly those including the results management process and legal costs are not accounted for.

By broadening the range of organisations able to access services through an MOU, SIA would need to consider the impact on its operations and budget from the additional costs.

11. Targeted education programs for small sporting organisations: The submission from Curling Australia details the challenges small national sporting organisations with volunteer boards and limited paid staff face in complying with national anti-doping scheme requirements.

- (a) How might the SIA expand targeted education programs for smaller sports, including direct athlete briefings prior to international competitions?
- (b) How has the SIA structured its materials to the unique circumstances of volunteer-based national sporting organisations and what improvements can be made?

Answer

a)

SIA offers all NSOs access to an extensive suite of educational resources that are free and available online. The content in these resources is tailored to audiences such as athletes, coaches, volunteers and Board members.

The submission from Curling Australia has requested tailored online courses for sports – when servicing 100 NSOs this is not currently feasible, however SIA provides free face to face sessions which are tailored to each sport and audience. We work with each sport to determine the timing of these sessions, including briefings prior to international competitions.

In 2024/25, SIA delivered 11 face-to-face sessions to 370 attendees, and 8 days of outreach at 5 events, across 7 smaller sports that are primarily volunteer-run, unfunded National Sporting Organisations.

b)

SIA provides 18 free eLearning courses to members of sport, including volunteer-based NSOs. SIA also runs free webinars on a range of integrity topics, including anti-doping, which are recorded and posted on our website for participants to watch at times convenient to them.

SIA provides support to 48 National Sporting Organisations/National Sporting Organisations for People with a Disability (NSO/NSOD) of various sizes to employ a National Integrity Manager (NIM) through a competitive grant process – there are currently 2 volunteer managed sporting organisations that have a funded NIM. In addition, SIA provides a cobranding service to tailor integrity education resources (like fact sheets, posters, booklets etc) for each sport.

SIA has provided the following support to Curling Australia in 2024/25:

- 69 participants have completed 234 SIA eLearning courses. Of the 69 participants, 57 are athletes.
- In 2024 SIA developed 9 co-branded integrity education resources for Curling Australia.

- Curling Australia requested an Outreach event in March/April 2025, but unfortunately the competition was in New Zealand, which SIA could not support.
- Curling Australia has a SIA funded NIM to support their implementation of the National Integrity Framework.

SIA is always open to working with sports to extend the reach and effectiveness of our education program. We will engage with Curling on the back of their submission to see how we can further support the sport and their athletes.

12. Olympic Games: The Submission from the Brisbane Organising Committee for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games (Brisbane 2032) details some of the anti-doping challenges that will be presented by Brisbane 2032.

- (a) How is the SIA planning to meet the surge requirements for testing prior to and during Brisbane 2032?
- (b) How will the SIA ensure integrity requirements, particularly with regard to gifts and benefits, are met by the significantly increased number of accredited Anti-Doping Officers required for Brisbane 2032?

Answer

SIA is already planning for how it can contribute to and support the success of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and how we might support the organising committee with innovative approaches to protecting the integrity of the Games. We have recently met (and will continue to meet) with the executive of the B2032 organising committee and QLD Government officials.

It should be noted however, the responsibility for the anti-doping program lies with the organising committee under the direction of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and International Testing Agency (ITA). SIA's involvement in the anti-doping program at the games will be negotiated as part of the games delivery planning process and will ensure SIA's expertise contributes to the delivery of a successful games.

a)

SIA will not be responsible for the delivery of the testing program during the 2032 Games; however, we do predict most of our Doping Control Officers will be employed by the organising committee during the time of the Games.

Models (surge capacity) used successfully at previous Olympic/Paralympic Games have included the recruitment (by the organising committee and ITA) of international Doping Control Officers to compliment local SIA staff given the demand for experienced officials will far outweigh what can be provided by the host country alone. Chaperones (normally casual employees of SIA who witness samples but are not in charge of the mission) are likely to be sourced as part of the Games volunteer program.

SIA is, however, likely to face increased demand for our services prior to the 2032 Games from international organisations requesting testing services (user pays) on international athletes in the country, as well as expected higher demands on testing for Australian athletes.

During this time of high demand, we expect to be required to also undertake some BAU activities for sports not on the Olympic program. SIA plans to learn from models implemented at the 2024, 2026 and 2028 Summer and Winter Olympics/Paralympics to assist our planning.

b)

As the Games delivery (and therefore staff) will be under the responsibility/employment of the organising committee, any additional staff required for the Games will be subject to that organisation's policies as they relate to gifts and benefits.

Any SIA staff members who work throughout the 2032 Games on behalf of the organising committee will remain bound by SIA's existing gifts and benefits policies and we will ensure they continue to be educated on our policies and posture.

- 13.** The ANAO reported (on Page 44, Paragraph 3.15) that “SIA does not have a workforce plan for the Safety in Sport Division, or the entity as a whole”. Has SIA developed a workforce plan since the publication of the report?
- (a) If not, why not? How does SIA determine workforce gaps?
- (b) How did SIA determine that an increase in staffing levels, reported as “six per cent for FTE staff and 17 per cent for casual staff between 2022-23 and 2024- 25” (Page 9, Paragraph 15) was necessary, without a workforce plan?

Answer

a) and (b)

While SIA does not currently have a workforce plan, the agency regularly conducts workforce planning at an operational level to identify and address workforce needs. SIA will develop a workforce plan in 2026 as part of our strategic planning for 2032.

14. With regard to user-pays sports testing:
- (a) Which user-pays sports put forward a list of names for testing in each year since 2022, and how many names were on each list?
 - (b) How many athletes were tested from each of these lists in each year since 2022?
 - (c) How many athletes were tested more than once in a year in each year since 2022?
 - (d) What was the total number of tests for each user-pays sport in each year since 2022?

Answer:

a)

The NRL and AFL both provided lists.

The WADA International Standard for Testing and Investigations (one of the 8 mandatory International Standards), includes a clause 4.5.3 a list of factors relevant to determine which athletes should be subject to targeted testing by an anti-doping organisation such as SIA. This list among other items includes k) *reliable information from a third party, or intelligence developed by or shared with the anti-doping organisation...*

Similarly to our Government Funded Program, we work closely with our User Pays clients to support their testing programs. We approach all sports (Government Funded and User Pays) and actively seek input from each sport regarding which athletes should be considered for testing. Prior to any list being shared, we engage in a detailed discussion with the sport to identify relevant athlete risk factors.

Following these discussions, sports then provide a list of names for our consideration. The number of athletes for each sport vary year to year. We review the lists provided and consider our own internal holdings/intelligence against these athletes when determining who we place onto a Testing Pool or who is suitable for testing. SIA undertakes all decision making for who is tested in each sport for both our Government Funded and User Pays programs.

For operational reasons, and also the requisite protected information provisions in the *Sport Integrity Australia Act 2020* (Cth) (***the Act***) (ss4, 67A – 70), SIA declines to provide details as to the number of names on the lists.

b)

For operational reasons, and also the requisite protected information provisions in the Act, SIA declines to provide details as to how many athletes were tested from each of these lists in each year since 2022

c)

For operational reasons, and also the requisite protected information provisions in the Act, SIA declines to disclose how many athletes were tested more than once in a year in each year since 2022

d)

Sport	2022*	2023*	2024*
AFL (Includes AFL, AFW, WAFL and SANFL)	248	336	248
Basketball	97	56	75
Cricket	44	116	105
Football (Includes both A Leagues)	271	367	240
Rugby League (Includes NRL, NRLW, NSWRL and QRL)	704	699	715
Rugby Union	252	260	182