

Summary of Underpinning Analysis: Sports Anti-Doping Rules 2027 (SADRs)

Agency responsible	Sport Integrity Commission Te Kahu Raunui
Portfolio	Ministry of Culture and Heritage
Date finalised	19 August 2026
Identification number	Intentionally blank as it is secondary legislation made outside of Cabinet processes.

Good law-making: 9(i)

The importance of consulting, to the extent that is reasonably practicable, the persons or representatives of the persons that the responsible agency considers will be directly and materially affected by the legislation

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

The Commission developed draft SADRs for consultation purposes with the input of external legal advisers, the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, the Sports Tribunal and the World Anti-Doping Authority.

The consultation requirements for the SADRs are set out in the Integrity Sport and Recreation Act 2023 (the Act). As part of these requirements, the Commission consulted with national sporting organisations, athletes, the Sports Tribunal, Māori, and the Privacy Commissioner. The Commission had previously engaged with each of these groups as part of its Integrity Code consultation process, and has used these well-established engagement channels (including the Commission's athlete, Māori, and Pacific advisory groups) to allow us to reach these target stakeholders effectively.

Outside of this targeted engagement, to streamline the process of wider consultation, we used a consultation platform hosted on the Commission website that allowed us to receive, collate and analyse feedback from the public generally. This platform contained a discussion document summarising the key changes and issues that we wanted to highlight and was accessible and promoted through our website, social media and targeted electronic messaging.

The formal consultation process was open for 6 weeks from 17 June 2026 and we received feedback from a range of sources including national sporting organisations,

peak sporting bodies, athletes and specific target organisations such as the Sports Tribunal and the Privacy Commissioner.

This feedback has informed the final version of the SADR that is proposed as secondary legislation.

Good law-making: 9(j)

The importance of carefully evaluating—

- the issue concerned; and
- the effectiveness of any relevant existing legislation and common law; and
- whether the public interest requires that the issue be addressed; and
- any options (including non-legislative options) that are reasonably available for addressing the issue; and
- who is likely to benefit, and who is likely to suffer a detriment, from the legislation

Inconsistency identified?

NO

Summary of agency analysis

New Zealand is known internationally for clean, fair sport. It's important that we maintain and build on this reputation by balancing fairness and athlete rights in our efforts to fight doping. A key part of achieving this is having a clear and coherent set of rules in the form of the SADR which set out how we enforce anti-doping requirements in New Zealand sport.

New Zealand is a signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code (the Code). The Code provides that New Zealand must have SADR which address specific anti-doping areas including education, privacy, testing and results management. These international obligations must be met in order for New Zealand to be able to have athletes compete at a high level including but not limited to national, regional and world championships and Olympic and Commonwealth Games. Without the SADR in place, New Zealand's ability to compete in high-level sport would be almost non-existent.

The Act requires New Zealand to have SADR in place at all times. This is a mandatory requirement. What this means in practice is that we need to incorporate the provisions of the Code into our SADR on an annual basis in order for New Zealand to be legally compliant with WADA's requirements. There are no non-legislative ways to achieve this outcome and there is only very limited discretion as to what the SADR must contain.

Once the SADR are made, all major sports in New Zealand who wish to engage in competition at a high level, are able to choose to adopt the SADR, which then binds their participants. The vast majority of sports in New Zealand have made the choice to adopt the SADR.

By being able to attend and host international sporting events and have our athletes competing at this level, New Zealand will continue to derive significant social, cultural and economic benefits. New Zealand's athletes will also have the continued individual benefit of being able to compete at a high level both domestically and internationally. The public interest in these requirements being met is therefore extremely high. It should also be noted that these requirements are updated, but not new. WADA has required countries wishing to participate in high level international sport to have compliant anti-doping rules since 1999.

New Zealand athletes who wish to compete in sport at a certain level (where that sport has adopted the SADR) must comply with the anti-doping regime as contained in the SADR. That regime is consistent with the anti-doping regimes that they will encounter in other countries in which they compete and at all international sporting events they attend.

There are provisions in the SADR that require athletes to provide detailed and sensitive personal information and to submit to testing procedures. This regime is strict, can be invasive and can include the giving of blood, dried blood and urine samples, which are then tested to see whether they contain substances that are banned under the Code and the SADR. For those who are subject to the SADR, failure to comply with the requirements of the SADR can (at its highest level) result in an exclusion from participating in sport.

Against these requirements, there are significant safeguards within the SADR that mitigate the impact of these invasive requirements including clear consent-based testing processes that must be followed, the delivery of comprehensive education to athletes and athlete support personnel about the anti-doping programme and how it operates, strict privacy requirements, highly trained chaperones and testing officers, specific protections for minors and vulnerable people, and clear legal avenues to challenge a process if it is considered to be improper or unfair.

Overall, the requirements of the SADR (when viewed alongside the protections that are in place) are directly and proportionately connected with the purpose of ensuring safe and fair competition in sport. They are also directly necessary to ensure safety and fairness of competition for athletes who wish to compete in clean sport.

Good law-making: 9(k)

The importance of the responsible agency identifying and developing effective arrangements for implementing the legislation

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

The Act specifically envisages SADR being made as secondary legislation by the Board of the Commission. There is a well-established and effective drafting and consultation process to put in place these mandatory legislative requirements.

In addition, there are International Standards that bind New Zealand (alongside the WADA Code) which clearly set out exactly how the SADR's must be implemented.

Good law-making: 9(l)

Legislation should be expected to produce benefits that exceed the costs of the legislation to the public or persons

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

There is no financial cost to individuals who are subject to the requirements of the SADR's.

The financial cost to the Commission of implementing the SADR's is approximately \$2.87m. This includes direct testing costs, anti-doping education delivery costs, team salaries and an apportionment of IT, insurance, premises and accounting costs. There are also some administrative costs to sports in complying with the SADR's.

By being able to attend and host international sporting events and have New Zealand athletes competing at this level, New Zealand will continue to derive significant social, cultural and economic benefits from the SADR's being in place. New Zealand's athletes will also have the continued individual benefit of being able to compete internationally.

This range of benefits will continue to significantly outweigh the financial cost.

Good law-making: 9(m)

Legislation should be the most effective, efficient, and proportionate response to the issue concerned that is available

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

The Commission is legally mandated to have SADR's in place at all times.

There are no non-legislative ways to achieve this outcome and there is only very limited discretion as to what the SADR's must contain.

Rule of Law: 9(a)(i)

The law should be clear and accessible

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

The SADR is clearly posted on the Commission's website along with a suite of supporting resources that explain its impact.

The Commission also operates a comprehensive education programme which explains the SADR and the Commission's anti-doping role at a practical level. The Commission's anti-doping education modules are delivered through its Capability team by former top-level athletes to thousands of New Zealand athletes annually.

Rule of Law: 9(a)(ii)

The law should not adversely affect rights and liberties, or impose obligations, retrospectively

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

The SADR does not have any adverse retrospective effect.

Every person is equal before the law

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

There are no unlawfully discriminatory elements to the SADR.

Rule of Law: 9(a)(iv)

There should be an independent impartial judiciary

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

The SADR specifically preserve the statutory role of the Sports Tribunal of New Zealand in hearing any disputes relating to anti-doping matters. The Sports Tribunal is an independent body that determines certain types of disputes for the sports sector.

Parliament has determined through primary legislation that this is the appropriate body to hear these matters. Its operations are governed by the Sports Tribunal Act and the Rules of the Sports Tribunal, which are set out below:

[Sports Tribunal Act 2006 | New Zealand Legislation](#)

[Rules-of-the-Sports-Tribunal-2024.pdf](#)

The aim of the Tribunal is to ensure that national sport organisations and other parties to a sports dispute, such as athletes, have access to an affordable, just and speedy means of resolving a sports dispute.

Appeal rights to the Court of Arbitration for Sport are specifically preserved.

Rule of Law: 9(a)(v)

Issues of legal right and liability should be resolved by the application of law, rather than the exercise of administrative discretion

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

The Commission is able to refer matters to the Sports Tribunal and impose provisional suspensions pending the Sports Tribunal deciding an outcome, but otherwise does not have a decision making role in terms of rights or liability.

Liberties: 9(b)

Legislation should not unduly diminish a person's liberty, personal security, freedom of choice or action, or rights to own, use, and dispose of property, except as is necessary to provide for, or protect, any such liberty, freedom, or right of another person

Inconsistency identified? NO

Summary of agency analysis

New Zealand athletes who wish to compete in sport at a certain level (where that sport has adopted the SADR's) must comply with the anti-doping regime as contained in the SADR's. That regime is consistent with the anti-doping regimes that they will encounter in other countries in which they compete and at all international sporting events they attend.

There are provisions in the SADR's that require athletes to provide detailed and sensitive personal information and to submit to testing procedures. This is invasive and can include the giving of blood, dried blood and urine samples, which are then tested to see whether they contain substances that are banned under the Code and the SADR's. For those who are subject to the SADR's, failure to comply with the requirements of the SADR's can (at its highest level) result in an exclusion from participating in sport.

Against these requirements, there are significant safeguards within the SADR's that mitigate the impact of these invasive requirements including clear consent based testing processes that must be followed, the delivery of comprehensive education to athletes and athlete support personnel about the anti-doping programme and how it operates,

strict privacy requirements, highly trained chaperones and testing officers, specific protections for minors and vulnerable people, and clear legal avenues to challenge a process if it is considered to be improper or unfair.

Overall, the requirements of the SADR (when viewed alongside the protections that are in place) are directly and proportionately connected with the purpose of ensuring safe and fair competition in sport. They are also directly necessary to ensure safety and fairness of competition for athletes who wish to compete in clean sport.

Taking of property: 9(c)

Legislation should not take or severely impair, or authorise the taking or severe impairment of, property without the consent of the owner unless-

- there is a good justification for the taking or severe impairment; and
- fair compensation for the taking or severe impairment is provided to the owner; and
- the compensation is provided, to the extent practicable, by or on behalf of the persons who obtain the benefit of the taking or severe impairment

Inconsistency identified?

NOT APPLICABLE

Summary of agency analysis

Taxes, fees and levies: 9(d)

The importance of maintaining consistency with section 22(a) of the Constitution Act 1996 (Parliamentary control of taxation)

Inconsistency identified?

NOT APPLICABLE

Summary of agency analysis

Taxes, fees and levies: 9(e)

Legislation should impose, or authorise the imposition of, a fee for goods or services only if the amount of the fee bears a proper relation to the cost of providing the good or service to which it relates

Inconsistency identified?

NOT APPLICABLE

Summary of agency analysis

Taxes, fees and levies: 9(f)

Legislation should impose, or authorise the imposition of, a levy to fund

an objective or a function only if the amount of the levy is reasonable in relation to both—

- the benefits that the class of payers is likely to derive, or the risks attributable to the class, in connection with the objective or function; and
- the costs of efficiently achieving the objective or providing the function

Inconsistency identified?

NOT APPLICABLE

Summary of agency analysis

Role of courts: 9(g)

Legislation should preserve the courts' constitutional role of ascertaining the meaning of legislation

Inconsistency identified?

NO

Summary of agency analysis

The SADR specifically preserve the statutory role of the Sports Tribunal of New Zealand in hearing any disputes relating to anti-doping matters. The Sports Tribunal is an independent body that determines certain types of disputes for the sports sector.

Parliament has determined through primary legislation that this is the appropriate body to hear these matters. Its operations are governed by the Sports Tribunal Act and the Rules of the Sports Tribunal, which are set out below:

[Sports Tribunal Act 2006 | New Zealand Legislation](#)

[Rules-of-the-Sports-Tribunal-2024.pdf](#)

The aim of the Tribunal is to ensure that national sport organisations and other parties to a sports dispute, such as athletes, have access to an affordable, just and speedy means of resolving a sports dispute.

Appeal rights to the Court of Arbitration for Sport are specifically preserved.

Role of courts: 9(h)

Legislation should make rights and liberties, or obligations, dependent on administrative power only if the power is sufficiently defined and subject to appropriate review

Inconsistency identified?

NO

Summary of agency analysis

The SADR specifically preserve the statutory role of the Sports Tribunal of New Zealand in hearing any disputes relating to anti-doping matters. The Sports Tribunal is an independent body that determines certain types of disputes for the sports sector.

Parliament has determined through primary legislation that this is the appropriate body to hear these matters. Its operations are governed by the Sports Tribunal Act and the Rules of the Sports Tribunal, which are set out below:

[Sports Tribunal Act 2006 | New Zealand Legislation](#)

[Rules-of-the-Sports-Tribunal-2024.pdf](#)

The aim of the Tribunal is to ensure that national sport organisations and other parties to a sports dispute, such as athletes, have access to an affordable, just and speedy means of resolving a sports dispute.

Appeal rights to the Court of Arbitration for Sport are specifically preserved.

Additional information

Relevant international treaties, standards and obligations

New Zealand is a signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code which requires us to have SADR in place.

[2027 world anti-doping code code june final.pdf](#)

The following International Standards direct how the SADR must be implemented:

[2027 International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories \(ISCCS\)](#)

[2027 International Standard for Data Protection \(ISDP\)](#)

[2027 International Standard for Education \(ISE\)](#)

[2027 International Standard for Intelligence and Investigations \(ISII\)](#)

[2027 International Standard for Laboratories \(ISL\)](#)

[2027 International Standard for Results Management \(ISRM\)](#)

[2027 International Standard for Testing \(IST\)](#)

[2027 International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions \(ISTUE\)](#)