

Ref: FOI-338

[Redacted]

Sent via email only: [Redacted]

24 August 2022

Dear [Redacted]

1. Thank you for your email dated 19 April 2022 in which you requested information from UK Anti-Doping ('UKAD') under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ('the Act').
2. You requested the following information:

a. *"...how many doping samples were collected and analysed by UKAD during the 2017/18, 2018/2019, 2019/2020 and 2020/21 Premier League seasons. Please can you provide a breakdown of how many were urine tests and how many were blood tests and within that how many were IC AND OOC and how many were for EPO, how many were for EPO and how many were IRMS tests."* You requested that this information be provided in the following form:

Season	URINE		BLOOD		ESA agents		IRMS		HGH	
	IC	OOC	IC	OOC	IC	OOC	IC	OOC	IC	OOC
2017/2018										
2018/2019										
2019/2020										
2020/2021										

b. *"...the number of AAFs (traditional AAFs as defined by the Wada Code) there were in the 2020/2021 Premier league season and which substances they were for. Please could you provide information on whether those AAFs led to ADRVs and what the eventual sanction was."*

- c. *“How many whistleblowers/individuals have reported information to UKAD about doping in the Premier league and/or football since 2017.”*
3. On 25 April 2022 following a request for clarification from UKAD, you confirmed that your request *“...relates to only Premier League footballers”*.

#### **Response – part a.**

---

4. With regard to your request for testing information (Samples *“collected and analysed”*) at part a. of your request, UKAD does not “hold” information in the form requested per section 1 of the Act as we do not record the league a footballer competed in at the time of collecting or analysing a Sample within the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS) or elsewhere.
5. To compile strands of information into the form requested (i.e. Samples collected and analysed by UKAD by season versus calendar year, with reference to Premier League footballers (versus non-Premier League footballers, which obviously varies by season), In-Competition versus Out-of-Competition, and the specifics of relevant analysis or further analysis in each case, and so on) would comfortably exceed the costs of compliance limits per section 12 of the Act. We have conducted similar exercises previously and where they may be on the cusp of the costs of compliance limits or just over, but this is increasingly burdensome for UKAD, not least because these types of requests are also increasing. On this basis, UKAD has to rely on section 12 of the Act in order to ensure that it is following the relevant rules, purpose and spirit of the Act, but it is not unduly burdening colleagues and systems.
6. This is before UKAD might navigate any relevant section 31 (law enforcement) consequences of the specifics of the request, as explained in [one of your] previous request[s] FOI-328.
7. UKAD invested considerable time and cost in responding to your request FOI-328 (such request also comfortably exceeded the relevant parameters of section 12 of the Act, but a full response was provided in any event to that request in good faith). The latest request is a more complex and multi-faceted recalibration of that request extending the scope yet further and also far exceeds the costs of compliance limits per section 12 of the Act.

8. The above notwithstanding, UKAD can confirm that it holds planning information for testing Premier League footballers during the seasons 2017/2018 through to 2020/2021. Accordingly, UKAD has completed a table in good faith on the basis of information it holds, which is annexed to this letter, subject to certain necessary adjustments.

### **9. Response – part b.**

---

10. As to part b. of your request, UKAD does not “hold” the information in the form requested as per section 1 of the Act as UKAD does not record Adverse Analytical Findings (AAFs) by reference to the league a footballer participates in.

11. The above points are reiterated here.

12. The above notwithstanding, UKAD has cross-referenced the data it holds with publicly available (not UKAD-specific) information in good faith, to try to discern where players were (i.e. which league), in order to respond to your request. UKAD is able to confirm that there were 0 (zero) AAFs (as that term is defined in the World Anti-Doping Code) for Premier League footballers during the 2020/2021 season (1 August 2020 – 31 May 2021).

### **13. Response – part c.**

---

14. As to the “whistleblowers”/individuals at part c. of your request, UKAD does not “hold” this information as per section 1 of the Act. UKAD receives considerable intelligence from various sources, commonly via confidential and anonymous routes. As such, it does not collate numerical data about individuals/ “whistleblowers” (as the term is commonly understood) or in a form to be relevant to and/or responsive to your request.

### **Conclusion**

---

15. If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review. Internal review requests should be submitted within two months of the date of receipt of the response to your request and should be addressed via email to: [foi@ukad.org.uk](mailto:foi@ukad.org.uk). Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications.
16. If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commission for a decision. The Information

Commissioner can be contacted at: Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.

Yours sincerely



**UK Anti-Doping**