



The World Bridge Federation

Anti Doping Rules

(Based upon the 2009 revised Code)

Issued January 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
PREFACE	3
FUNDAMENTAL RATIONALE FOR THE CODE AND IF'S ANTI-DOPING RULES.....	3
SCOPE	3
ARTICLE 1 : DEFINITION OF DOPING	4
ARTICLE 2 : ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS.....	4
ARTICLE 3 : PROOF OF DOPING	7
ARTICLE 4 : THE PROHIBITED LIST	8
ARTICLE 5 : TESTING	11
ARTICLE 6 : ANALYSIS OF SAMPLES	13
ARTICLE 7 : RESULTS MANAGEMENT	14
ARTICLE 8 : RIGHT TO A FAIR HEARING	17
ARTICLE 9 : AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS	19
ARTICLE 10 : SANCTIONS ON INDIVIDUALS	19
ARTICLE 11 : CONSEQUENCES TO TEAMS	31
ARTICLE 12 : SANCTIONS AND COSTS ASSESSED AGAINST NATIONAL FEDERATIONS	32
ARTICLE 13 : APPEALS.....	32
ARTICLE 14 : NATIONAL FEDERATIONS ' INCORPORATION OF IF RULES, REPORTING AND RECOGNITION	35
ARTICLE 15 : RECOGNITION OF DECISIONS BY OTHER ORGANISATIONS.....	35
ARTICLE 16 : STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.....	36
ARTICLE 17 : IF COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO WADA.....	36
ARTICLE 18 : AMENDMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF ANTI-DOPING RULES	36
APPENDIX 1 - DEFINITIONS	38
APPENDIX 2 - ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT	43

IF ANTI-DOPING RULES

INTRODUCTION

Preface

At the IF (World Bridge Federation's) Executive Council Meeting held in October 2008 in Beijing, IF accepted the revised (2009) World Anti-Doping Code (the "Code"). These Anti-Doping Rules are adopted and implemented in conformance with IF's responsibilities under the Code, and are in furtherance of IF's continuing efforts to eradicate doping in the sport of Bridge.

Anti-Doping Rules, like Competition rules, are sport rules governing the conditions under which sport is played. Athletes and other Persons accept these rules as a condition of participation and shall be bound by them. These sport-specific rules and procedures, aimed at enforcing anti-doping principles in a global and harmonized manner, are distinct in nature and, therefore, not intended to be subject to, or limited by any national requirements and legal standards applicable to criminal proceedings or employment matters. When reviewing the facts and the law of a given case, all courts, arbitral tribunals and other adjudicating bodies should be aware of and respect the distinct nature of the anti-doping rules in the Code and the fact that these rules represent the consensus of a broad spectrum of stakeholders around the world with an interest in fair sport.

Fundamental Rationale for the Code and IF's Anti-Doping Rules

Anti-doping programs seek to preserve what is intrinsically valuable about sport. This intrinsic value is often referred to as "the spirit of sport"; it is the essence of Olympism; it is how we play true. The spirit of sport is the celebration of the human spirit, body and mind, and is characterized by the following values:

- Ethics, fair play and honesty
- Health
- Excellence in performance
- Character and education
- Fun and joy
- Teamwork
- Dedication and commitment
- Respect for rules and laws
- Respect for self and other participants
- Courage
- Community and solidarity

Doping is fundamentally contrary to the spirit of sport.

Scope

These Anti-Doping Rules shall apply to IF, and each Participant in the activities of IF by virtue of the Participant's membership, accreditation, or participation in IF activities or Events. Any Person who is not a member of a National Federation and who fulfils the requirements to be part of the IF Registered

Testing Pool, must become a member of the Person's National Federation, and must make himself or herself available for Testing , at least twelve months before participating in International Events.

To be eligible for participation in IF events, a competitor must have an IF licence issued by his or her National Federation. The IF licence will only be issued to competitors who have personally signed the Appendix 1 consent form, in the actual form approved by the IF Executive. All forms from under-age applicants must be counter-signed by their legal guardians.

The National Federation must guarantee that all athletes registered for a IF Licence accept the Rules of the IF, including these IF Anti-Doping Rules.

These Anti-Doping Rules shall apply to all Doping Controls over which IF has jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 1 : DEFINITION OF DOPING

Doping is defined as the occurrence of one or more of the anti-doping rule violations set forth in Article 2.1 through Article 2.8 of these Anti-Doping Rules.

ARTICLE 2 : ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS

Athletes and other Persons shall be responsible for knowing what constitutes an anti-doping rule violation and the substances and methods which have been included on the Prohibited List.

The following constitute anti-doping rule violations:

[Comment to Article 2: The purpose of Article 2 is to specify the circumstances and conduct which constitute violations of anti-doping rules. Hearings in doping cases will proceed based on the assertion that one or more of these specific rules has been violated.]

2.1 The presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample

- 2.1.1** It is each Athlete's personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Athletes are responsible for any Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in their Samples. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete's part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping violation under Article 2.1.

[Comment to Article 2.1.1: For purposes of anti-doping violations involving the presence of a Prohibited Substance (or its Metabolites or Markers), IF's Anti-Doping Rules adopt the rule of strict liability which was found in the Olympic Movement Anti-Doping Code ("OMADC") and the vast majority of pre-Code anti-doping rules. Under the strict liability principle, an Athlete is responsible, and an anti-doping rule violation occurs, whenever a Prohibited Substance is found in an Athlete's Sample. The violation occurs whether or not the Athlete intentionally or unintentionally used a Prohibited Substance or was negligent or otherwise at fault. If the positive Sample came from an In-Competition test, then the results of that Competition are automatically invalidated (Article 9 (Automatic Disqualification of Individual Results)). However, the Athlete then has the possibility to avoid or reduce sanctions if the Athlete can demonstrate that he or she was not at fault or significant fault (Article 10.5 (Elimination or Reduction of Period of Ineligibility Based on Exceptional Circumstances)) or in certain circumstances did not intend to enhance his or her sport performance (Article 10.4 (Elimination or Reduction of the Period of Ineligibility for Specified Substances under Specific Circumstances)).

The strict liability rule for the finding of a Prohibited Substance in an Athlete's Sample, with a possibility that sanctions may be modified based on specified criteria, provides a reasonable balance between effective anti-doping enforcement for the benefit of all "clean" Athletes and fairness in the exceptional circumstance where a Prohibited Substance entered an Athlete's system through No Fault or Negligence or No Significant Fault or Negligence on the

Athlete's part. It is important to emphasize that while the determination of whether the anti-doping rule has been violated is based on strict liability, the imposition of a fixed period of Ineligibility is not automatic. The strict liability principle set forth in IF's Anti-Doping Rules has been consistently upheld in the decisions of CAS.]

- 2.1.2** Sufficient proof of an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 is established by either of the following: presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in the Athlete's A Sample where the Athlete waives analysis of the B Sample and the B Sample is not analyzed; or, where the Athlete's B Sample is analyzed and the analysis of the Athlete's B Sample confirms the presence of the Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found in the Athlete's A Sample.

[Comment to Article 2.1.2: IF may in its discretion choose to have the B Sample analyzed even if the Athlete does not request the analysis of the B Sample.]

- 2.1.3** Excepting those substances for which a quantitative threshold is specifically identified in the Prohibited List, the presence of any quantity of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.

- 2.1.4** As an exception to the general rule of Article 2.1, the Prohibited List or International Standards may establish special criteria for the evaluation of Prohibited Substances that can also be produced endogenously.

2.2 Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method

[Comment to Article 2.2: As noted in Article 3 (Proof of Doping), it has always been the case that Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method may be established by any reliable means. Unlike the proof required to establish an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1, Use or Attempted Use may also be established by other reliable means such as admissions by the Athlete, witness statements, documentary evidence, conclusions drawn from longitudinal profiling, or other analytical information which does not otherwise satisfy all the requirements to establish "Presence" of a Prohibited Substance under Article 2.1. For example, Use may be established based upon reliable analytical data from the analysis of an A Sample (without confirmation from an analysis of a B Sample) or from the analysis of a B Sample alone where IF provides a satisfactory explanation for the lack of confirmation in the other Sample.]

- 2.2.1** It is each Athlete's personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete's part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping rule violation for Use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method.

- 2.2.2** The success or failure of the Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method is not material. It is sufficient that the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method was Used or Attempted to be Used for an anti-doping rule violation to be committed.

[Comment to Article 2.2.2: Demonstrating the "Attempted Use" of a Prohibited Substance requires proof of intent on the Athlete's part. The fact that intent may be required to prove this particular anti-doping rule violation does not undermine the strict liability principle established for violations of Article 2.1 and violations of Article 2.2 in respect of Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.]

An Athlete's "Use" of a Prohibited Substance constitutes an anti-doping rule violation unless such substance is not prohibited Out-of-Competition and the Athlete's Use takes place Out-of-Competition. (However, the presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in a Sample collected In-Competition will be a violation of Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers) regardless of when that substance might have been administered.)

- 2.3** Refusing or failing without compelling justification to submit to Sample collection after notification as authorized in these Anti-Doping Rules, or otherwise evading Sample collection.

[Comment to Article 2.3: Failure or refusal to submit to Sample collection after notification was prohibited in almost all pre-Code anti-doping rules. This Article expands the typical pre-Code rule to include "otherwise evading Sample collection" as prohibited conduct. Thus, for example, it would be an anti-doping rule violation if it were established that an Athlete was hiding from a Doping Control official to evade notification or Testing. A violation of "refusing or failing to submit to Sample collection" may be based on either intentional or negligent conduct of the Athlete, while "evading" Sample collection contemplates intentional conduct by the Athlete.]

- 2.4** Violation of applicable requirements regarding Athlete availability for Out-of-Competition Testing set out in the International Standard for Testing, including failure to file whereabouts information in accordance with Article 11.3 of the International Standard for Testing (a "Filing Failure") and failure to be available for Testing at the declared whereabouts in accordance with Article 11.4 of the International Standard for Testing (a "Missed Test"). Any combination of three Missed Tests and/or Filing Failures committed within an eighteen-month period, as declared by IF or any other Anti-Doping Organization with jurisdiction over an Athlete, shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 2.4: Separate whereabouts filing failures and missed tests declared under the rules of IF or any other Anti-Doping Organization with authority to declare whereabouts filing failures and missed tests in accordance with the International Standard for Testing shall be combined in applying this Article. In appropriate circumstances, missed tests or filing failures may also constitute an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.3 or Article 2.5.]

- 2.5** Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control.

[Comment to Article 2.5: This Article prohibits conduct which subverts the Doping Control process but which would not otherwise be included in the definition of Prohibited Methods. For example, altering identification numbers on a Doping Control form during Testing, breaking the B Bottle at the time of B Sample analysis or providing fraudulent information to IF.]

- 2.6** Possession of Prohibited Substances and Methods

- 2.6.1** Possession by an Athlete In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance, or Possession by an Athlete Out-of-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance which is prohibited in Out-of-Competition Testing unless the Athlete establishes that the Possession is pursuant to a therapeutic use exemption ("TUE") granted in accordance with Article 4.4 (Therapeutic Use) or other acceptable justification.

- 2.6.2** Possession by Athlete Support Personnel In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance, or Possession by Athlete Support Personnel Out-of-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance which is prohibited Out-of-Competition, in connection with an Athlete, Competition or training, unless the Athlete Support Personnel establishes that the Possession is pursuant to a TUE granted to an Athlete in accordance with Article 4.4 (Therapeutic Use) or other acceptable justification.

[Comment to Article 2.6.1 and 2.6.2: Acceptable justification would not include, for example, buying or possessing a Prohibited Substance for purposes of giving it to a friend or relative, except under justifiable medical circumstances where that Person had a physician's prescription, e.g., buying Insulin for a diabetic child.]

[Comment to Article 2.6.2: Acceptable justification would include, for example, a team doctor carrying Prohibited Substances for dealing with acute and emergency situations.]

- 2.7** Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking in any Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.
- 2.8** Administration or Attempted administration to any Athlete In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or Prohibited Substance, or administration or Attempted administration to any Athlete Out-of-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance that is prohibited Out-of-Competition, or assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, covering up or any other type of complicity involving an anti-doping rule violation or any Attempted anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 2: The Code does not make it an anti-doping rule violation for an Athlete or other Person to work or associate with Athlete Support Personnel who are serving a period of Ineligibility. However, IF may adopt its own specific policy which prohibit such conduct.]

ARTICLE 3 : PROOF OF DOPING

3.1 Burdens and Standards of Proof

IF shall have the burden of establishing that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. The standard of proof shall be whether IF has established an anti-doping rule violation to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel bearing in mind the seriousness of the allegation which is made. This standard of proof in all cases is greater than a mere balance of probability but less than proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Where these Rules place the burden of proof upon the Athlete or other Person alleged to have committed an anti-doping rule violation to rebut a presumption or establish specified facts or circumstances, the standard of proof shall be by a balance of probability, except as provided in Articles 10.4 and 10.6, where the Athlete must satisfy a higher burden of proof.

[Comment to Article 3.1: This standard of proof required to be met by IF is comparable to the standard which is applied in most countries to cases involving professional misconduct. It has also been widely applied by courts and hearing panels in doping cases. See, for example, the CAS decision in N., J., Y., W. v. FINA, CAS 98/208, 22 December 1998.]

3.2 Methods of Establishing Facts and Presumptions

Facts related to anti-doping rule violations may be established by any reliable means, including admissions. The following rules of proof shall be applicable in doping cases:

[Comment to Article 3.2: For example, IF may establish an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.2 (Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method) based on the Athlete's admissions, the credible testimony of third Persons, reliable documentary evidence, reliable analytical data from either an A or B Sample as provided in the Comments to Article 2.2, or conclusions drawn from the profile of a series of the Athlete's blood or urine Samples.]

3.2.1 WADA-accredited laboratories are presumed to have conducted Sample analysis and custodial procedures in accordance with the International Standard for Laboratories. The Athlete or other Person may rebut this presumption by establishing that a departure from the International Standard occurred which could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding.

3.2.2 If the Athlete or other Person rebuts the preceding presumption by showing that a departure from the International Standard occurred which could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding, then IF shall have the burden to establish that such departure did not cause the Adverse Analytical Finding.

[Comment to Article 3.2.1: The burden is on the Athlete or other Person to establish, by a balance of probability, a departure from the International Standard that could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding. If the

Athlete or other Person does so, the burden shifts to IF to prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that the departure did not cause the Adverse Analytical Finding.]

- 3.2.3** Departures from any other International Standard or other anti-doping rule or policy which did not cause an Adverse Analytical Finding or other anti-doping rule violation shall not invalidate such results. If the Athlete or other Person establishes that a departure from another International Standard or other anti-doping rule or policy which could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding or other anti-doping rule violation occurred, then IF shall have the burden to establish that such a departure did not cause the Adverse Analytical Finding or the factual basis for the anti-doping rule violation.
- 3.2.4** The facts established by a decision of a court or professional disciplinary tribunal of competent jurisdiction which is not the subject of a pending appeal shall be irrebuttable evidence against the Athlete or other Person to whom the decision pertained of those facts unless the Athlete or other Person establishes that the decision violated principles of natural justice.
- 3.2.5** The hearing panel in a hearing on an anti-doping rule violation may draw an inference adverse to the Athlete or other Person who is asserted to have committed an anti-doping rule violation based on the Athlete's or other Person's refusal, after a request made in a reasonable time in advance of the hearing, to appear at the hearing (either in person or telephonically as directed by the tribunal) and to answer questions either from the hearing panel or from the Anti-Doping Organization asserting the anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 3.2.4: Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances has been recognized in numerous CAS decisions.]

ARTICLE 4 : THE PROHIBITED LIST

4.1 Incorporation of the Prohibited List

These Anti-Doping Rules incorporate the Prohibited List which is published and revised by WADA as described in Article 4.1 of the Code. IF will make the current Prohibited List available to each National Federation, and each National Federation shall ensure that the current Prohibited List is available to its members and constituents.

[Comment to Article 4.1: The Prohibited List will be revised and published on an expedited basis whenever the need arises. However, for the sake of predictability, a new Prohibited List will be published every year whether or not changes have been made. The Prohibited List in force is available on WADA's website at www.wada-ama.org. The Prohibited List is an integral part of the International Convention against Doping in Sport. WADA will inform the Director-General of UNESCO of any change to the Prohibited List.]

4.2 Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods Identified on the Prohibited List

4.2.1 Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods

Unless provided otherwise in the Prohibited List and/or a revision, the Prohibited List and revisions shall go into effect under these Anti-Doping Rules three months after publication of the Prohibited List by WADA without requiring any further action by IF. As described in Article 4.2 of the Code, IF may request that WADA expand the Prohibited List for the sport of Bridge. IF may also request that WADA include additional substances or methods, which have the potential for abuse in the sport of Bridge, in the monitoring program described in

Article 4.5 of the Code. As provided in the Code, WADA shall make the final decision on such requests by IF.

[Comment to Article 4.2.1: There will be one Prohibited List. The substances which are prohibited at all times would include masking agents and those substances which, when Used in training, may have long term performance enhancing effects such as anabolics. All substances and methods on the Prohibited List are prohibited In-Competition. Out-of-Competition Use (Article 2.2) of a substance which is only prohibited In-Competition is not an anti-doping rule violation unless an Adverse Analytical Finding for the substance or its Metabolites is reported for a Sample collected In-Competition (Article 2.1).

There will be only one document called the "Prohibited List." WADA may add additional substances or methods to the Prohibited List for particular sports (e.g. the inclusion of beta-blockers for shooting) but this will also be reflected on the single Prohibited List. A particular sport is not permitted to seek exemption from the basic list of Prohibited Substances (e.g. eliminating anabolics from the Prohibited List for "mind sports"). The premise of this decision is that there are certain basic doping agents which anyone who chooses to call himself or herself an Athlete should not take.]

4.2.2 Specified Substances

For purposes of the application of Article 10 (Sanctions on Individuals), all Prohibited Substances shall be "Specified Substances" except (a) substances in the classes of anabolic agents and hormones; and (b) those stimulants and hormone antagonists and modulators so identified on the Prohibited List. Prohibited Methods shall not be Specified Substances.

4.2.3 New Classes of Prohibited Substances

In the event WADA expands the Prohibited List by adding a new class of Prohibited Substances in accordance with Article 4.1 of the Code, WADA's Executive Committee shall determine whether any or all Prohibited Substances within the new class of Prohibited Substances shall be considered Specified Substances under Article 4.2.2.

4.3 Criteria for Including Substances and Methods on the Prohibited List

As provided in Article 4.3.3 of the Code, WADA's determination of the Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods that will be included on the Prohibited List and the classification of substances into categories on the Prohibited List is final and shall not be subject to challenge by an Athlete or other Person based on an argument that the substance or method was not a masking agent or did not have the potential to enhance performance, represent a health risk or violate the spirit of sport.

[Comment to Article 4.3: The question of whether a substance meets the criteria in Article 4.3 (Criteria for Including Substances and Methods on the Prohibited List) in a particular case cannot be raised as a defence to an anti-doping rule violation. For example, it cannot be argued that the Prohibited Substance detected would not have been performance enhancing in that particular sport. Rather, doping occurs when a substance on the Prohibited List is found in an Athlete's Sample. Similarly, it cannot be argued that a substance listed in the class of anabolic agents does not belong in that class.]

4.4 Therapeutic Use

- 4.4.1** Athletes with a documented medical condition requiring the use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method must first obtain a TUE. The presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers (Article 2.1), Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method (Article 2.2), Possession of Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods (Article 2.6) or administration of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method (Article 2.8) consistent with the provisions of an applicable TUE issued pursuant to the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions shall not be considered an anti-doping rule violation. In addition, for all athletes the use of inhaled Beta-2 Agonists should be declared through ADAMS when reasonably feasible as soon as the product is used and must as well be declared on the Doping Control Form at the time of testing (Art. 7.13 International Standard for TUEs). While not prohibited, the use of Glucocorticosteroids by non systemic routes namely, intraarticular, periarticular, peritendinous, epidural, intradermal injections and inhaled route requires the filling of a Declaration of Use.
- 4.4.2** Subject to Article 4.4.3, Athletes included by IF in its Registered Testing Pool and other Athletes participating in an International Event identified by IF must obtain a TUE from IF (regardless of whether the Athlete previously has received a TUE at the national level). The application for a TUE must be made as soon as possible (in the case of an Athlete in the Registered Testing Pool, this would be when he/she is first notified of his/her inclusion in the pool) and in any event (save in emergency situations) no later than 21 days before the Athlete's participation in the Event.
- 4.4.3** As an exception to Article 4.4.2, in accordance with Article 7.13 of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, Athletes not in IF's Registered Testing Pool who inhale formoterol, salbutamol, salmeterol or terbutaline to treat asthma or one of its clinical variants do not need a TUE in advance of participating in an International Event unless so specified by IF. Instead, any such athlete should declare this use through ADAMS when reasonably feasible at the same time as the use starts and must be declared on the DCF at the time of testing. Any such Athlete may apply for a Retroactive TUE after the Event in accordance with Article 7.13 of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions and Article 7.13 of these Anti-Doping Rules. As a further exception, Athletes using Glucocorticosteroids by non systemic routes namely, intraarticular, periarticular, peritendinous, epidural, intradermal injections and inhaled route will be required to file a declaration of use at the same time the use starts.
- 4.4.4** TUE's granted by IF shall be reported to the Athlete's National Federation and to WADA.
- 4.4.5** The IF Executive shall appoint a panel of physicians to consider requests for TUE's (the "TUE Panel"). Upon IF's receipt of a TUE request, the Chair of the TUE Panel shall appoint one or more members of the TUE Panel (which may include the Chair) to consider such request. The TUE Panel member(s) so designated shall promptly evaluate such request in accordance with the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions and render a decision on such request, which shall be the final decision of IF.

- 4.4.6** WADA, at the request of an Athlete or on its own initiation, may review the granting or denial of any TUE by IF. If WADA determines that the granting or denial of a TUE did not comply with the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions in force at the time then WADA may reverse that decision. Decisions on TUE's are subject to further appeal as provided in Article 13.

ARTICLE 5 : TESTING

5.1 Authority to Test

All Athletes under the jurisdiction of IF shall be subject to In-Competition Testing by IF, and any other Anti-Doping Organization responsible for Testing at a Competition or Event in which they participate. All Athletes under the jurisdiction of IF, including Athletes serving a period of ineligibility or a Provisional Suspension, shall also be subject to Out-of-Competition Testing at any time or place, with or without advance notice, by IF, WADA, , the IOC during the Olympic Games, and the IPC during Paralympic Games. Target Testing will be made a priority.

[Comment to Article 5.1: Target Testing is specified because random Testing, or even weighted random Testing, does not ensure that all of the appropriate Athletes will be tested (e.g., world-class Athletes, Athletes whose performances have dramatically improved over a short period of time, Athletes whose coaches have had other Athletes test positive, etc.). Obviously, Target Testing must not be used for any purposes other than legitimate Doping Control. The Code makes it clear that Athletes have no right to expect that they will be tested only on a random basis. Similarly, it does not impose any reasonable suspicion or probable cause requirement for Target Testing]

5.2 Responsibility for IF Testing

The IF shall be responsible for drawing up a test distribution plan for the sport of Bridge in accordance with Article 4 of the International Standard for Testing, and for the implementation of that plan, including overseeing all Testing conducted by or on behalf of IF. Testing may be conducted by members of the IF or by other qualified persons so authorized by IF.

5.3 Testing Standards

Testing conducted by IF and its National Federations shall be in substantial conformity with the International Standard for Testing in force at the time of Testing.

- 5.3.1** Blood (or other non-urine) Samples may be used to detect Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods, for screening procedure purposes, or for longitudinal hematological profiling ("the passport").

5.4 Coordination of Testing

IF shall promptly report completed tests through the WADA clearinghouse to avoid unnecessary duplication in Testing.

5.5 Athlete Whereabouts Requirements

- 5.5.1** IF shall identify a Registered Testing Pool of those Athletes who are required to comply with the whereabouts requirements of the International Standard for Testing, and shall publish the criteria for Athletes to be included in this Registered Testing Pool as well as a list of the Athletes meeting those criteria for the period in question. IF shall review and update as necessary its criteria for including Athletes in its Registered Testing Pool, and shall revise the membership of its Registered

Testing Pool from time to time as appropriate²⁹ in accordance with the set criteria. Each Athlete in the Registered Testing Pool (a) shall advise IF of his/her whereabouts on a quarterly basis, in the manner set out in Article 11.3 of the International Standard for Testing; (b) shall update that³⁰ information as necessary, in accordance with Article 11.4.2 of the International Standard for Testing, so that it remains accurate and complete at all times; and (c) shall make him/herself available for Testing at such whereabouts, in accordance with Article 11.4 of the International Standard for Testing.

[Comment to Article 5.5.1: The purpose of the IF Registered Testing Pool is to identify top-level International Athletes who the IF requires to provide whereabouts information to facilitate Out-of-Competition Testing by IF and other Anti-Doping Organizations with jurisdiction over the Athletes. IF will identify such Athletes in accordance with the requirements of Articles 4 and 11.2 of the International Standard for Testing.]

Examples for the criteria which could be used separately or in combination include:

- *[All medallists] [team members of Team medallists] from the previous [one][two] [world championships][continental championships][Olympic Games] [top 10][top 20]athletes in each discipline or [top 50] in World Ranking or World Cup.*
- *Any athlete whose performance (time or distance) is better than or equal to the fiftiest best performances in the preceding competition year.*
- *[All athletes who are members of the [top 8] teams in the Team Ranking]*

5.6 An Athlete's failure to advise IF of his/her whereabouts shall be deemed a Filing Failure for purposes of Article 2.4 where the conditions of Article 11.3.5 of the International Standard for Testing are met.

5.6.1 An Athlete's failure to be available for Testing at his/her declared whereabouts shall be deemed a Missed Test for purposes of Article 2.4 where the conditions of Article 11.4.3 of the International Standard for Testing are met.

5.7 Retirement and Return to Competition

5.7.1 An Athlete who has been identified by IF for inclusion in IF's Registered Testing Pool shall continue to be subject to these Anti-Doping Rules, including the obligation to comply with the whereabouts requirements of the International Standard for Testing unless and until the Athlete gives written notice to IF that he or she has retired or until he or she no longer satisfies the criteria for inclusion in IF's Registered Testing Pool and has been so informed by IF.

5.7.2 An Athlete who has given notice of retirement to IF may not resume competing unless he or she notifies IF at least [six] [twelve] months before he or she expects to return to competition and makes him/herself available for unannounced Out-of-Competition Testing, including (if requested) complying with the whereabouts requirements of the International Standard for Testing, at any time during the period before actual return to competition.

5.8 Selection of Athletes to be Tested

5.8.1 At International Events, the IF Anti-Doping Commission shall determine the number of finishing placement tests, random tests and target tests to be performed.

5.8.2 The IF Anti-Doping Commission shall target a certain number of athletes not necessarily linked to final placements in order to maximize the diversity of athletes

tested or based on information provided by the WADA Clearinghouse on previous tests.

5.8.3 In addition to the selection procedures set forth in Articles 5.7.1 and 5.7.2 above, the Anti-Doping Commission at International Events may also select Athletes or teams for Target Testing so long as such Target Testing is not used for any purpose other than legitimate Doping Control purposes.

5.8.4 Athletes shall be selected for Out-of-Competition Testing by the IF Anti-Doping Commission through a process that substantially complies with the International Standard for Testing in force at the time of selection.

5.9 An Athlete who is not regular member of an IF or one of its National Federations will not be permitted to compete unless he or she is available for Sample collection and where applicable, he/she provides accurate and up-to-date whereabouts information as part of the IF's Registered Testing Pool at least three months before he or she expects to compete.

ARTICLE 6 : ANALYSIS OF SAMPLES

Doping Control Samples collected under these Anti-Doping Rules shall be analyzed in accordance with the following principles:

6.1 Use of Approved Laboratories

For purposes of Article 2.1, IF shall send Doping Control Samples for analysis only to WADA-accredited laboratories or as otherwise approved by WADA. The choice of the WADA-accredited laboratory (or other laboratory or method approved by WADA) used for the Sample analysis shall be determined exclusively by IF.

6.2 Purpose of Collection and Analysis of Samples

Samples shall be analyzed to detect Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods identified on the Prohibited List and other substances as may be directed by WADA pursuant to the Monitoring Program described in Article 4.5 of the Code or to assist IF in profiling relevant parameters in an Athlete's urine, blood or other matrix, including DNA or genomic profiling, for anti-doping purposes.

[Comment to Article 6.2: For example, relevant profile information could be used to direct Target Testing or to support an anti-doping rule violation proceeding under Article 2.2 (Use of a Prohibited Substance), or both.]

6.3 Research on Samples

No Sample may be used for any purpose other than as described in Article 6.2 without the Athlete's written consent. Samples used (with the Athlete's consent) for purposes other than Article 6.2 shall have any means of identification removed such that they cannot be traced back to a particular Athlete.

6.4 Standards for Sample Analysis and Reporting

Laboratories shall analyze Doping Control Samples and report results in conformity with the International Standard for Laboratories.

6.5 Retesting Samples

A Sample may be reanalyzed for the purposes described in Article 6.2 at any time exclusively at the direction of IF or WADA. The circumstances and conditions for retesting Samples shall conform with the requirements of the International Standard for Laboratories.

[Comment to Article 6.5: Although this Article is new, Anti-Doping Organizations have always had the authority to reanalyze Samples. The International Standard for Laboratories or a new technical document which is made a part of the International Standard will harmonize the protocol for such retesting.]

ARTICLE 7 : RESULTS MANAGEMENT

7.1 Results Management for Tests Initiated by IF

Results management for tests initiated by IF (including tests performed by WADA pursuant to agreement with IF) shall proceed as set forth below:

- 7.1.1** The results from all analyses must be sent to IF in encoded form, in a report signed by an authorised representative of the laboratory. All communication must be conducted in confidentiality and in conformity with ADAMS, a database management tool developed by WADA. ADAMS is consistent with data privacy statutes and norms applicable to WADA and other organizations using it.
- 7.1.2** Upon receipt of an A Sample Adverse Analytical Finding, the IF Anti-Doping Administrator shall conduct a review to determine whether: (a) the Adverse Analytical Finding is consistent with an applicable TUE (or whether other special requirements set forth in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions applicable to Glucocorticosteroids and Beta-2 Agonists apply), or (b) there is any apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing or International Standard for Laboratories that caused the Adverse Analytical Finding.
- 7.1.3** When the Adverse Analytical Finding is for formoterol, salbutamol, salmeterol or terbutaline and the Athlete is not in IF's Registered Testing Pool, or where the IF rules do not require regular TUE for such substances, then, before the IF completes its review under Article 7.1.2, the Athlete shall be given an opportunity to apply to the TUE Committee for a Retroactive TUE in accordance with Article 7.13 of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions. When the Adverse Analytical Finding is for a Glucocorticosteroid, the IF shall confirm that a declaration of use is in place for the non-systemic use of Glucocorticosteroids.
- 7.1.4** If the initial review of an Adverse Analytical Finding under Article 7.1.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE, or departure from the International Standard for Testing or the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the Adverse Analytical Finding, IF shall promptly notify the Athlete of: (a) the Adverse Analytical Finding; (b) the anti-doping rule violated; (c) the Athlete's right to promptly request the analysis of the B Sample or, failing such request, that the B Sample analysis may be deemed waived; (d) the scheduled date, time and place for the B Sample analysis (which shall be within the time period specified in the International Standard for Laboratories) if the Athlete or IF chooses to request an analysis of the B Sample; (e) the opportunity for the Athlete and/or the Athlete's representative to attend the B Sample opening and analysis at the scheduled date, time and place if such analysis is requested; and (f) the Athlete's right to request copies of the A and B Sample laboratory documentation package which includes information as required by the International Standard for Laboratories. IF shall also notify WADA. If IF decides not to bring forward the Adverse Analytical Finding as an anti-doping rule violation, it shall so notify the Athlete and WADA.
- 7.1.5** Where requested by the Athlete or IF, arrangements shall be made for Testing the B Sample within the time period specified in the International Standard for

Laboratories. An Athlete may accept the A Sample analytical results by waiving the requirement for B Sample analysis. IF may nonetheless elect to proceed with the B Sample analysis.

- 7.1.6** The Athlete and/or his representative shall be allowed to be present at the analysis of the B Sample within the time period specified in the International Standard for Laboratories. Also a representative of the Athlete's National Federation as well as a representative of IF shall be allowed to be present.
- 7.1.7** If the B Sample proves negative, then (unless IF takes the case forward as an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.2) the entire test shall be considered negative and the Athlete, his National Federation, and IF shall be so informed.
- 7.1.8** If a Prohibited Substance or the Use of a Prohibited Method is identified, the findings shall be reported to the Athlete, his National Federation, IF, and to WADA.
- 7.1.9** For apparent anti-doping rule violations that do not involve Adverse Analytical Findings, IF shall conduct any necessary follow-up investigation and, at such time as it is satisfied that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, it shall then promptly notify the Athlete of the anti-doping rule which appears to have been violated, and the basis of the violation.

7.2 Results Management for Atypical Findings

- 7.2.1** As provided in the International Standards, in certain circumstances laboratories are directed to report the presence of Prohibited Substances that may also be produced endogenously as Atypical Findings that should be investigated further.
- 7.2.2** If a laboratory reports an Atypical Finding in respect of a Sample collected from an Athlete by or on behalf of IF, the IF Anti-Doping Administrator shall conduct a review to determine whether: (a) the Atypical Finding is consistent with an applicable TUE that has been granted as provided in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, or (b) there is any apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing or International Standard for Laboratories that caused the Atypical Analytical Finding.
- 7.2.3** If the initial review of an Atypical Finding under Article 7.2.2 reveals an applicable TUE or departure from the International Standard for Testing or the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the Atypical Finding, the entire test shall be considered negative and the Athlete, his National Federation, and IF shall be so informed.
- 7.2.4** If the initial review of an Atypical Finding under Article 7.2.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE or departure from the International Standard for Testing or the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the Atypical Finding, IF shall conduct the follow-up investigation required by the International Standards. If, once that investigation is completed, it is concluded that the Atypical Finding should be considered an Adverse Analytical Finding, IF shall pursue the matter in accordance with Article 7.1.
- 7.2.5** IF will not provide notice of an Atypical Finding until it has completed its investigation and has decided whether it will bring the Atypical Finding forward as an Adverse Analytical Finding unless one of the following circumstances exists:
 - a) If IF determines the B Sample should be analyzed prior to the conclusion of its

follow-up investigation, it may conduct the B Sample analysis after notifying the Athlete, with such notice to include a description of the Atypical Finding and the information described in Article 7.1.4(c) to (f).

- b) If IF receives a request, either from a Major Event Organization shortly before one of its International Events or from a sports organization responsible for meeting an imminent deadline for selecting team members for an International Event, to disclose whether any Athlete identified on a list provided by the Major Event Organization or sports organization has a pending Atypical Finding, IF shall so identify any such Athlete after first providing notice of the Atypical Finding to the Athlete.

7.3 Results Management for Tests Initiated During Other International Events

Results management and the conduct of hearings from a test by the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, or a Major Event Organization, shall be managed, as far as sanctions beyond Disqualification from the Event or the results of the Event, by IF.

7.4 Results Management for Whereabouts Violations

7.4.1 Results management in respect of an apparent Filing Failure by an Athlete in IF's Registered Testing Pool shall be conducted by IF in accordance with Article 11.6.2 of the International Standard for Testing.

7.4.2 Results management in respect of an apparent Missed Test by an Athlete in IF's Registered Testing Pool as a result of an attempt to test the Athlete by or on behalf of IF shall be conducted by IF in accordance with Article 11.6.3 of the International Standard for Testing. Results management in respect of an apparent Missed Test by such Athlete as a result of an attempt to test the Athlete by or on behalf of another Anti-Doping Organization shall be conducted by that other Anti-Doping Organization in accordance with Article 11.7.6(c) of the International Standard for Testing.

7.4.3 Where, in any eighteen-month period, an Athlete in IF's Registered Testing Pool is declared to have three Filing Failures, or three Missed Tests, or any combination of Filing Failures or Missed Tests adding up to three in total, whether under these Anti-Doping Rules or under the rules of any other Anti-Doping Organization, IF shall bring them forward as an apparent anti-doping rule violation.

7.5 Provisional Suspensions

7.5.1 If analysis of an A Sample has resulted in an Adverse Analytical Finding for a Prohibited Substance that is not a Specified Substance, and a review in accordance with Article 7.1.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE or departure from the International Standard for Testing or the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the Adverse Analytical Finding, IF shall Provisionally Suspend the Athlete pending the hearing panel's determination of whether he/she has committed an anti-doping rule violation.

7.5.2 In any case not covered by Article 7.5.1 where IF decides to take the matter forward as an apparent anti-doping rule violation in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Article 7, the IF, after consultation with the IF Anti-Doping

Administrator, may Provisionally Suspend the Athlete pending the hearing panel's determination of whether he/she has committed an anti-doping rule violation.

7.5.3 Where a Provisional Suspension is imposed, whether pursuant to Article 7.5.1 or Article 7.5.2, the Athlete shall be given either (a) an opportunity for a Provisional Hearing before imposition of the Provisional Suspension or on a timely basis after imposition of the Provisional Suspension; or (b) an opportunity for an expedited hearing in accordance with Article 8 (Right to a Fair Hearing) on a timely basis after imposition of a Provisional Suspension.

7.5.4 If a Provisional Suspension is imposed based on an Adverse Analytical Finding in respect of an A Sample, and any subsequent analysis of the B Sample analysis does not confirm the A Sample analysis, then the Athlete shall not be subject to any further Provisional Suspension on account of a violation of Article 2.1 of the Code (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers). In circumstances where the Athlete (or the Athlete's team as may be provided in the rules of the applicable IF) has been removed from a Competition based on a violation of Article 2.1 and the subsequent B Sample analysis does not confirm the A Sample finding, if, without otherwise affecting the Competition, it is still possible for the Athlete or team to be reinserted, the Athlete or team may continue to take part in the Competition.

[Comment to Article 7.5: Before a Provisional Suspension can be unilaterally imposed by an Anti-Doping Organization, the internal review specified in the Code must first be completed. In addition, a Signatory imposing a Provisional Suspension is required to give the Athlete an opportunity for a Provisional Hearing either before or promptly after the imposition of the Provisional Suspension, or an expedited final hearing under Article 8 promptly after imposition of the Provisional Suspension. The Athlete has a right to appeal under Article 13.2.]

In the rare circumstance where the B Sample analysis does not confirm the A Sample finding, the Athlete who had been provisionally suspended will be allowed, where circumstances permit, to participate in subsequent Competitions during the Event. Similarly, depending upon the relevant rules of the International Federation in a Team Sport, if the team is still in Competition, the Athlete may be able to take part in future Competitions.

Athletes shall receive credit for a Provisional Suspension against any period of Ineligibility which is ultimately imposed as provided in Article 10.9.3.]

7.6 Retirement from Sport

If an Athlete or other Person retires while a results management process is underway, IF retains jurisdiction to complete its results management process. If an Athlete or other Person retires before any results management process has begun and IF would have had results management jurisdiction over the Athlete or other Person at the time the Athlete or other Person committed an anti-doping rule violation, IF has jurisdiction to conduct results management.

[Comment to Article 7.6: Conduct by an Athlete or other Person before the Athlete or other Person was subject to the jurisdiction of any Anti-Doping Organization would not constitute an anti-doping rule violation but could be a legitimate basis for denying the Athlete or other Person membership in a sports organization.]

ARTICLE 8 : RIGHT TO A FAIR HEARING

8.1 Hearings arising out of IF Testing or Tests at International Events

8.1.1 The IF Executive shall appoint a standing panel consisting of a Chair and four other experts with experience in anti-doping ("IF Doping Hearing Panel"). The Chair shall

be a lawyer. Each panel member shall be otherwise independent of IF. Each panel member shall serve a term of four years.

- 8.1.2** When it appears, following the Results Management process described in Article 7, that these Anti-Doping Rules have been violated in connection with IF Testing or Testing at an International Event then the case shall be assigned to the IF Doping Hearing Panel for adjudication.
- 8.1.3** The Chair of the IF Doping Hearing Panel shall appoint three members from the panel (which may include the Chair) to hear each case. At least one appointed member shall be a lawyer. The appointed members shall have had no prior involvement with the case and shall not have the same nationality as the Athlete or other Person alleged to have violated these Anti-Doping Rules.
- 8.1.4** Hearings pursuant to this Article shall be completed expeditiously following the completion of the results management process described in Article 7. Hearings held in connection with Events may be conducted on an expedited basis.
- 8.1.5** The National Federation of the Athlete or other Person alleged to have violated these Anti-Doping Rules may attend the hearing as an observer.
- 8.1.6** IF shall keep WADA fully apprised as to the status of pending cases and the result of all hearings.
- 8.1.7** An Athlete or other Person may forego a hearing by acknowledging the Anti-Doping Rule violation and accepting Consequences consistent with Articles 9 and 10 as proposed by IF. The right to a hearing may be waived either expressly or by the Athlete's or other Person's failure to challenge IF's assertion that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred within Period of Time. Where no hearing occurs, IF shall submit to the persons described in Article 13.2.3 a reasoned decision explaining the action taken.
- 8.1.8** Decisions of the IF Doping Hearing Panel may be appealed to Court of Arbitration for Sport as provided in Article 13.
- 8.2** Principles for a Fair Hearing All hearings pursuant to Article 8.1 shall respect the following principles:
- a timely hearing;
 - fair and impartial hearing panel;
 - the right to be represented by counsel at the Person's own expense;
 - the right to be informed in a fair and timely manner of the asserted anti-doping rule violation;
 - the right to respond to the asserted anti-doping rule violation and resulting Consequences;
 - the right of each party to present evidence, including the right to call and question witnesses (subject to the hearing panel's discretion to accept testimony by telephone or written submission);
 - the Person's right to an interpreter at the hearing, with the hearing panel to determine the identity, and responsibility for the cost of the interpreter; and
 - a timely, written, reasoned decision, specifically including an explanation of the reason(s) for any period of Ineligibility.]

ARTICLE 9 : AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS

A violation of these Anti-Doping Rules in Individual Sports in connection with an In-Competition test automatically leads to Disqualification of the result obtained in that Competition with all resulting consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.

[Comment to Article 9: When an Athlete wins a gold medal with a Prohibited Substance in his or her system, that is unfair to the other Athletes in that Competition regardless of whether the gold medallist was at fault in any way. Only a "clean" Athlete should be allowed to benefit from his or her competitive results.

For Team Sports, see Article 11 (Consequences to Teams).

In sports which are not Team Sports but where awards are given to teams, Disqualification or other disciplinary action against the team when one or more team members have committed an anti-doping rule violation shall be as provided in the applicable rules of IF.]

ARTICLE 10 : SANCTIONS ON INDIVIDUALS

10.1 Disqualification of Results in Event During which an Anti-Doping Rule Violation Occurs

An Anti-Doping Rule violation occurring during or in connection with an Event may lead to Disqualification of all of the Athlete's individual results obtained in that Event with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes, except as provided in Article 10.1.1.

[Comment to Article 10.1: Whereas Article 9 (Automatic Disqualification of Individual Results) Disqualifies the result in a single Competition in which the Athlete tested positive, this Article may lead to Disqualification of all results in all races during the Event. Factors to be included in considering whether to Disqualify other results in an Event might include, for example, the severity of the Athlete's anti-doping rule violation and whether the Athlete tested negative in the other Competitions.]

10.1.1 If the Athlete establishes that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence for the violation, the Athlete's individual results in the other Competition shall not be Disqualified unless the Athlete's results in Competition other than the Competition in which the anti-doping rule violation occurred were likely to have been affected by the Athlete's anti-doping rule violation.

10.2 Ineligibility for Presence, Use or Attempted Use, or Possession of Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods

The period of Ineligibility imposed for a violation of Article 2.1 (Presence of Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers), Article 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use of Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method) or Article 2.6 (Possession of Prohibited Substances and Methods) shall be as follows, unless the conditions for eliminating or reducing the period of Ineligibility, as provided in Articles 10.4 and 10.5, or the conditions for increasing the period of Ineligibility, as provided in Article 10.6, are met:

First violation: Two (2) years' Ineligibility.

[Comment to Article 10.2: Harmonization of sanctions has been one of the most discussed and debated areas of anti-doping. Harmonization means that the same rules and criteria are applied to assess the unique facts of each case. Arguments against requiring harmonization of sanctions are based on differences between sports including, for example, the following: in some sports the Athletes are professionals making a sizable income from the sport and in others the Athletes are true amateurs; in those sports where an Athlete's career is short (e.g., artistic gymnastics) a two year Disqualification has a much more significant effect on the Athlete than in sports where careers are traditionally much longer (e.g., equestrian and shooting); in Individual Sports, the Athlete is better able

to maintain competitive skills through solitary practice during Disqualification than in other sports where practice as part of a team is more important. A primary argument in favour of harmonization is that it is simply not right that two Athletes from the same country who test positive for the same Prohibited Substance under similar circumstances should receive different sanctions only because they participate in different sports. In addition, flexibility in sanctioning has often been viewed as an unacceptable opportunity for some sporting bodies to be more lenient with dopers. The lack of harmonization of sanctions has also frequently been the source of jurisdictional conflicts between IFs and National Anti-Doping Organizations.]

10.3 Ineligibility for Other Anti-Doping Rule Violations

The period of Ineligibility for violations of these Anti-Doping Rules other than as provided in Article 10.2 shall be as follows:

10.3.1 For violations of Article 2.3 (refusing or failing to submit to Sample collection) or Article 2.5 (Tampering with Doping Control), the Ineligibility period shall be two (2) years unless the conditions provided in Article 10.5, or the conditions provided in Article 10.6, are met.

10.3.2 For violations of Article 2.7 (Trafficking) or Article 2.8 (Administration of Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method), the period of Ineligibility imposed shall be a minimum of four (4) years up to lifetime Ineligibility unless the conditions provided in Article 10.5 are met. An anti-doping rule violation involving a Minor shall be considered a particularly serious violation, and, if committed by Athlete Support Personnel for violations other than Specified Substances shall result in lifetime Ineligibility for such Athlete Support Personnel. In addition, significant violations of such Articles which also violate non-sporting laws and regulations, shall be reported to the competent administrative, professional or judicial authorities.

[Comment to Article 10.3.2: Those who are involved in doping Athletes or covering up doping should be subject to sanctions which are more severe than the Athletes who test positive. Since the authority of sport organizations is generally limited to Ineligibility for credentials, membership and other sport benefits, reporting Athlete Support Personnel to competent authorities is an important step in the deterrence of doping.]

10.3.3 For violations of Article 2.4 (Filing Failures and/ or Missed Tests), the period of Ineligibility shall be at a minimum one (1) year and at a maximum two (2) years based on the Athlete's degree of fault.

[Comment to Article 10.3.3: The sanction under Article 10.3.3 shall be two years where all three filing failures or missed tests are inexcusable. Otherwise, the sanction shall be assessed in the range of two years to one year, based on the circumstances of the case.]

10.4 Elimination or Reduction of the Period of Ineligibility for Specified Substances under Specific Circumstances

Where an Athlete or other Person can establish how a Specified Substance entered his or her body or came into his or her possession and that such Specified Substance was not intended to enhance the Athlete's sport performance or mask the use of a performance-enhancing substance, the period of Ineligibility found in Article 10.2 shall be replaced with the following:

First violation: At a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility from future Events, and at a maximum, two (2) years of Ineligibility.

To justify any elimination or reduction, the Athlete or other Person must produce corroborating evidence in addition to his or her word which establishes to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel the absence of an intent to enhance sport performance or

mask the use of a performance enhancing substance. The Athlete or other Person's degree of fault shall be the criterion considered in assessing any reduction of the period of Ineligibility.

[Comment to Article 10.4: Specified Substances as now defined in Article 4.2.2 are not necessarily less serious agents for purposes of sports doping than other Prohibited Substances (for example, a stimulant that is listed as a Specified Substance could be very effective to an Athlete in competition); for that reason, an Athlete who does not meet the criteria under this Article would receive a two-year period of Ineligibility and could receive up to a four-year period of Ineligibility under Article 10.6. However, there is a greater likelihood that Specified Substances, as opposed to other Prohibited Substances, could be susceptible to a credible, non-doping explanation.]

This Article applies only in those cases where the hearing panel is comfortably satisfied by the objective circumstances of the case that the Athlete in taking a Prohibited Substance did not intend to enhance his or her sport performance. Examples of the type of objective circumstances which in combination might lead a hearing panel to be comfortably satisfied of no performance-enhancing intent would include: the fact that the nature of the Specified Substance or the timing of its ingestion would not have been beneficial to the Athlete; the Athlete's open Use or disclosure of his or her Use of the Specified Substance; and a contemporaneous medical records file substantiating the non-sport-related prescription for the Specified Substance. Generally, the greater the potential performance-enhancing benefit, the higher the burden on the Athlete to prove lack of an intent to enhance sport performance.

While the absence of intent to enhance sport performance must be established to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel, the Athlete may establish how the Specified Substance entered the body by a balance of probability.

In assessing the Athlete's or other Person's degree of fault, the circumstances considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Athlete's or other Person's departure from the expected standard of behaviour. Thus, for example, the fact that an Athlete would lose the opportunity to earn large sums of money during a period of Ineligibility or the fact that the Athlete only has a short time left in his or her career or the timing of the sporting calendar would not be relevant factors to be considered in reducing the period of Ineligibility under this Article. It is anticipated that the period of Ineligibility will be eliminated entirely in only the most exceptional cases.]

10.5 Elimination or Reduction of Period of Ineligibility Based on Exceptional Circumstances

10.5.1 No Fault or Negligence

If an Athlete establishes in an individual case that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence, the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility shall be eliminated. When a Prohibited Substance or its Markers or Metabolites is detected in an Athlete's Sample in violation of Article 2.1 (presence of Prohibited Substance), the Athlete must also establish how the Prohibited Substance entered his or her system in order to have the period of Ineligibility eliminated. In the event this Article is applied and the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable is eliminated, the anti-doping rule violation shall not be considered a violation for the limited purpose of determining the period of Ineligibility for multiple violations under Article 10.7.

10.5.2 No Significant Fault or Negligence

If an Athlete or other Person establishes in an individual case that he or she bears No Significant Fault or Negligence, then the period of Ineligibility may be reduced, but the reduced period of Ineligibility may not be less than one-half of the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable. If the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility is a lifetime, the reduced period under this section may be no less than 8 years. When a Prohibited Substance or its Markers or Metabolites is detected in an Athlete's Sample in violation of Article 2.1 (Presence of Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers), the Athlete must also establish how the Prohibited

Substance entered his or her system in order to have the period of Ineligibility reduced.

[Comment to Articles 10.5.1 and 10.5.2: IF's Anti-Doping Rules provide for the possible reduction or elimination of the period of Ineligibility in the unique circumstance where the Athlete can establish that he or she had No Fault or Negligence, or No Significant Fault or Negligence, in connection with the violation. This approach is consistent with basic principles of human rights and provides a balance between those Anti-Doping Organizations that argue for a much narrower exception, or none at all, and those that would reduce a two year suspension based on a range of other factors even when the Athlete was admittedly at fault. These Articles apply only to the imposition of sanctions; they are not applicable to the determination of whether an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. Article 10.5.2 may be applied to any anti-doping violation even though it will be especially difficult to meet the criteria for a reduction for those anti-doping rule violations where knowledge is an element of the violation.

Articles 10.5.1 and 10.5.2 are meant to have an impact only in cases where the circumstances are truly exceptional and not in the vast majority of cases.

To illustrate the operation of Article 10.5.1, an example where No Fault or Negligence would result in the total elimination of a sanction is where an Athlete could prove that, despite all due care, he or she was sabotaged by a competitor. Conversely, a sanction could not be completely eliminated on the basis of No Fault or Negligence in the following circumstances: (a) a positive test resulting from a mislabelled or contaminated vitamin or nutritional supplement (Athletes are responsible for what they ingest (Article 2.1.1) and have been warned against the possibility of supplement contamination); (b) the administration of a Prohibited Substance by the Athlete's personal physician or trainer without disclosure to the Athlete (Athletes are responsible for their choice of medical personnel and for advising medical personnel that they cannot be given any Prohibited Substance); and (c) sabotage of the Athlete's food or drink by a spouse, coach or other person within the Athlete's circle of associates (Athletes are responsible for what they ingest and for the conduct of those persons to whom they entrust access to their food and drink). However, depending on the unique facts of a particular case, any of the referenced illustrations could result in a reduced sanction based on No Significant Fault or Negligence. (For example, reduction may well be appropriate in illustration (a) if the Athlete clearly establishes that the cause of the positive test was contamination in a common multiple vitamin purchased from a source with no connection to Prohibited Substances and the Athlete exercised care in not taking other nutritional supplements.)

For purposes of assessing the Athlete or other Person's fault under Articles 10.5.1 and 10.5.2, the evidence considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Athlete or other Person's departure from the expected standard of behaviour. Thus, for example the fact that an Athlete would lose the opportunity to earn large sums of money during a period of Ineligibility or the fact that the Athlete only has a short time left in his or her career or the timing of the sporting calendar would not be relevant factors to be considered in reducing the period of Ineligibility under this Article.

While minors are not given special treatment per se in determining the applicable sanction, certainly youth and lack of experience are relevant factors to be assessed in determining the Athlete or other Person's fault under Article 10.5.2, as well as Articles 10.4 and 10.5.1.

Article 10.5.2 should not be applied in cases where Articles 10.3.3 or 10.4 apply, as those Articles already take into consideration the Athlete or other Person's degree of fault for purposes of establishing the applicable period of Ineligibility.]

10.5.3 Substantial Assistance in Discovering or Establishing Anti-Doping Rule Violations

The IF Executive may, prior to a final appellate decision under Article 13 or the expiration of the time to appeal, suspend a part of the period of Ineligibility imposed in an individual case where the Athlete or other Person has provided Substantial Assistance to an Anti-Doping Organization, criminal authority or professional disciplinary body which results in the Anti-Doping Organization discovering or establishing an anti-doping rule violation by another Person or which results in a criminal or disciplinary body discovering or establishing a criminal

offense or the breach of professional rules by another Person. After a final appellate decision under Article 13 or the expiration of time to appeal, IF may only suspend a part of the applicable period of Ineligibility with the approval of WADA. The extent to which the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility may be suspended shall be based on the seriousness of the anti-doping rule violation committed by the Athlete or other Person and the significance of the Substantial Assistance provided by the Athlete or other Person to the effort to eliminate doping in sport. No more than three-quarters of the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility may be suspended. If the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility is a lifetime, the non-suspended period under this Article must be no less than 8 years. If IF suspends any part of the period of Ineligibility under this Article, it shall promptly provide a written justification for its decision to each Anti-Doping Organization having a right to appeal the decision. If IF subsequently reinstates any part of the suspended period of Ineligibility because the Athlete or other Person has failed to provide the Substantial Assistance which was anticipated, the Athlete or other Person may appeal the reinstatement pursuant to Article 13.2.

[Comment to Article 10.5.3: The cooperation of Athletes, Athlete Support Personnel and other Persons who acknowledge their mistakes and are willing to bring other anti-doping rule violations to light is important to clean sport.

Factors to be considered in assessing the importance of the Substantial Assistance would include, for example, the number of individuals implicated, the status of those individuals in the sport, whether a scheme involving Trafficking under Article 2.7 or administration under Article 2.8 is involved and whether the violation involved a substance or method which is not readily detectible in Testing. The maximum suspension of the Ineligibility period shall only be applied in very exceptional cases. An additional factor to be considered in connection with the seriousness of the anti-doping rule violation is any performance-enhancing benefit which the Person providing Substantial Assistance may be likely to still enjoy. As a general matter, the earlier in the results management process the Substantial Assistance is provided, the greater the percentage of the period of Ineligibility may be suspended.

If the Athlete or other Person who is asserted to have committed an anti-doping rule violation claims entitlement to a suspended period of Ineligibility under this Article in connection with the Athlete or other Person's waiver of a hearing under Article 8.3 (Waiver of Hearing), IF shall determine whether a suspension of a portion of the period of Ineligibility is appropriate under this Article. If the Athlete or other Person claims entitlement to a suspended period of Ineligibility before the conclusion of a hearing under Article 8 on the anti-doping rule violation, the hearing panel shall determine whether a suspension of a portion of the period of Ineligibility is appropriate under this Article at the same time the hearing panel decides whether the Athlete or other Person has committed an anti-doping rule violation. If a portion of the period of Ineligibility is suspended, the decision shall explain the basis for concluding the information provided was credible and was important to discovering or proving the anti-doping rule violation or other offense. If the Athlete or other Person claims entitlement to a suspended period of Ineligibility after a final decision finding an anti-doping rule violation has been rendered and is not subject to appeal under Article 13, but the Athlete or other Person is still serving the period of Ineligibility, the Athlete or other Person may apply to IF to consider a suspension in the period of Ineligibility under this Article. Any such suspension of the period of Ineligibility shall require the approval of WADA. If any condition upon which the suspension of a period of Ineligibility is based is not fulfilled, IF shall reinstate the period of Ineligibility which would otherwise be applicable. Decisions rendered by IF under this Article may be appealed pursuant Article 13.2.

This is the only circumstance under IF's Anti-Doping Rules where the suspension of an otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility is authorized.]

10.5.4 Admission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation in the Absence of Other Evidence

Where an Athlete or other Person voluntarily admits the commission of an anti-doping rule violation before having received notice of a Sample collection which could establish an anti-doping rule violation (or, in the case of an anti-doping rule violation other than Article 2.1, before receiving first notice of the admitted violation pursuant to Article 7) and that admission is the only reliable evidence of the violation at the time of admission, then the period of Ineligibility may be reduced, but not below one-half of the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable.

[Comment to Article 10.5.4: This Article is intended to apply when an Athlete or other Person comes forward and admits to an anti-doping rule violation in circumstances where no Anti-Doping Organization is aware that an anti-doping rule violation might have been committed. It is not intended to apply to circumstances where the admission occurs after the Athlete or other Person knows he or she is about to be caught.]

10.5.5 Where an Athlete or Other Person Establishes Entitlement to Reduction in Sanction under More than One Provision of this Article

Before applying any reductions under Articles 10.5.2, 10.5.3 or 10.5.4, the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility shall be determined in accordance with Articles 10.2, 10.3, 10.4 and 10.6. If the Athlete or other Person establishes entitlement to a reduction or suspension of the period of Ineligibility under two or more of Articles 10.5.2, 10.5.3 or 10.5.4, then the period of Ineligibility may be reduced or suspended, but not below one-quarter of the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility.

[Comment to Article 10.5.5: The appropriate sanction is determined in a sequence of four steps. First, the hearing panel determines which of the basic sanctions (Article 10.2, Article 10.3, Article 10.4 or Article 10.6) applies to the particular anti-doping rule violation. In a second step, the hearing panel establishes whether there is a basis for elimination or reduction of the sanction (Articles 10.5.1 through 10.5.4). Note, however, not all grounds for elimination or reduction may be combined with the provisions on basic sanctions. For example, Article 10.5.2 does not apply in cases involving Articles 10.3.3 or 10.4, since the hearing panel, under Articles 10.3.3 and 10.4, will already have determined the period of Ineligibility based on the Athlete or other Person's degree of fault. In a third step, the hearing panel determines under Article 10.5.5 whether the Athlete or other Person is entitled to a reduction under more than one provision of Article 10.5. Finally, the hearing panel decides on the commencement of the period of Ineligibility under Article 10.9. The following four examples demonstrate the proper sequence of analysis:

Example 1.

Facts: An Adverse Analytical Finding involves the presence of an anabolic steroid; the Athlete promptly admits the anti-doping rule violation as alleged; the Athlete establishes No Significant Fault (Article 10.5.2); and the Athlete provides important Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3).

Application of Article 10:

- 1. The basic sanction would be two years under Article 10.2. (Aggravating circumstances (Article 10.6) would not be considered because the Athlete promptly admitted the violation. Article 10.4 would not apply because a steroid is not a Specified Substance.)*
- 2. Based on No Significant Fault alone, the sanction could be reduced up to one-half of the two years. Based on Substantial Assistance alone, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the two years.*
- 3. Under Article 10.5.5, in considering the possible reduction for No Significant Fault and Substantial Assistance together, the most the sanction could be reduced is up to three-quarters of the two years. Thus, the minimum sanction would be a six-month period of Ineligibility.*
- 4. Under Article 10.9.2, because the Athlete promptly admitted the anti-doping rule violation, the period of Ineligibility could start as early as the date of Sample collection, but in any event the Athlete would have to*

serve at least one-half of the Ineligibility period (minimum three months) after the date of the hearing decision.

Example 2.

Facts: An Adverse Analytical Finding involves the presence of an anabolic steroid; aggravating circumstances exist and the Athlete is unable to establish that he did not knowingly commit the anti-doping rule violation; the Athlete does not promptly admit the anti-doping rule violation as alleged; but the Athlete does provide important Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3).

Application of Article 10:

- 1. The basic sanction would be between two and four years Ineligibility as provided in Article 10.6.*
- 2. Based on Substantial Assistance, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the maximum four years.*
- 3. Article 10.5.5 does not apply.*
- 4. Under Article 10.9.2, the period of Ineligibility would start on the date of the hearing decision.*

Example 3.

Facts: An Adverse Analytical Finding involves the presence of a Specified Substance; the Athlete establishes how the Specified Substance entered his body and that he had no intent to enhance his sport performance; the Athlete establishes that he had very little fault; and the Athlete provides important Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3).

Application of Article 10:

- 1. Because the Adverse Analytical Finding involved a Specified Substance and the Athlete has satisfied the other conditions of Article 10.4, the basic sanction would fall in the range between a reprimand and two years Ineligibility. The hearing panel would assess the Athlete's fault in imposing a sanction within that range. (Assume for illustration in this example that the panel would otherwise impose a period of Ineligibility of eight months.)*
- 2. Based on Substantial Assistance, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the eight months. (No less than two months.) [No Significant Fault (Article 10.2) would not be applicable because the Athlete's degree of fault was already taken into consideration in establishing the eight-month period of Ineligibility in step 1.]*
- 3. Article 10.5.5 does not apply.*
- 4. Under Article 9.2, because the Athlete promptly admitted the anti-doping rule violation, the period of Ineligibility could start as early as the date of Sample collection, but in any event, the Athlete would have to serve at least half of the Ineligibility period after the date of the hearing decision. (Minimum one month.)*

Example 4.

Facts: An Athlete who has never had an Adverse Analytical Finding or been confronted with an anti-doping rule violation spontaneously admits that he intentionally used multiple Prohibited Substances to enhance his performance. The Athlete also provides important Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3).

Application of Article 10:

- 1. While the intentional Use of multiple Prohibited Substances to enhance performance would normally warrant consideration of aggravating circumstances (Article 10.6), the Athlete's spontaneous admission means that Article 10.6 would not apply. The fact that the Athlete's Use of Prohibited Substances was intended to enhance performance would also eliminate the application of Article 10.4 regardless of whether the Prohibited Substances Used were Specified Substances. Thus, Article 10.2 would be applicable and the basic period of Ineligibility imposed would be two years.*

2. *Based on the Athlete's spontaneous admissions (Article 10.5.4) alone, the period of Ineligibility could be reduced up to one-half of the two years. Based on the Athlete's Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3) alone, the period of Ineligibility could be reduced up to three-quarters of the two years.*
3. *Under Article 10.5.5, in considering the spontaneous admission and Substantial Assistance together, the most the sanction could be reduced would be up to three-quarters of the two years. (The minimum period of Ineligibility would be six months.)*
4. *If Article 10.5.4 was considered by the hearing panel in arriving at the minimum six month period of Ineligibility at step 3, the period of Ineligibility would start on the date the hearing panel imposed the sanction. If, however, the hearing panel did not consider the application of Article 10.5.4 in reducing the period of Ineligibility in step 3, then under Article 10.9.2, the commencement of the period of Ineligibility could be started as early as the date the anti-doping rule violation was committed, provided that at least half of that period (minimum of three months) would have to be served after the date of the hearing decision.]*

10.6 Aggravating Circumstances Which May Increase the Period of Ineligibility

If IF establishes in an individual case involving an anti-doping rule violation other than violations under Article 2.7 (Trafficking) and 2.8 (Administration) that aggravating circumstances are present which justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction, then the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable shall be increased up to a maximum of four years unless the Athlete or other Person can prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that he did not knowingly violate the anti-doping rule.

An Athlete or other Person can avoid the application of this Article by admitting the anti-doping rule violation as asserted promptly after being confronted with the anti-doping rule violation by IF.

[Comment to Article 10.6: Examples of aggravating circumstances which may justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction are: the Athlete or other Person committed the anti-doping rule violation as part of a doping plan or scheme, either individually or involving a conspiracy or common enterprise to commit anti-doping rule violations; the Athlete or other Person used or possessed multiple Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods or used or possessed a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method on multiple occasions; a normal individual would be likely to enjoy the performance-enhancing effects of the anti-doping rule violation(s) beyond the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility; the Athlete or Person engaged in deceptive or obstructing conduct to avoid the detection or adjudication of an anti-doping rule violation.

For the avoidance of doubt, the examples of aggravating circumstances described in this Comment to Article 10.6 are not exclusive and other aggravating factors may also justify the imposition of a longer period of Ineligibility. Violations under Article 2.7 (Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking) and 2.8 (Administration or Attempted Administration) are not included in the application of Article 10.6 because the sanctions for these violations (from four years to lifetime Ineligibility) already build in sufficient discretion to allow consideration of any aggravating circumstance.]

10.7 Multiple Violations

10.7.1 Second Anti-Doping Rule Violation

For an Athlete's or other Person's first anti-doping rule violation, the period of Ineligibility is set forth in Articles 10.2 and 10.3 (subject to elimination, reduction or suspension under Articles 10.4 or 10.5, or to an increase under Article 10.6). For a second anti-doping rule violation the period of Ineligibility shall be within the range set forth in the table below.

Second Violation	RS	FFMT	NSF	St	AS	TRA
First Violation						
RS	1-4	2-4	2-4	4-6	8-10	10-life
FFMT	1-4	4-8	4-8	6-8	10-life	life
NSF	1-4	4-8	4-8	6-8	10-life	life
St	2-4	6-8	6-8	8-life	life	life
AS	4-5	10-life	10-life	life	life	life
TRA	8-life	life	Life	life	life	life

Definitions for purposes of the second anti-doping rule violation table:

RS (Reduced sanction for Specified Substance under Article 10.4): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by a reduced sanction under Article 10.4 because it involved a Specified Substance and the other conditions under Article 10.4 were met.

FFMT (Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned under Article 10.3.3 (Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests).

NSF (Reduced sanction for No Significant Fault or Negligence): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by a reduced sanction under Article 10.5.2 because No Significant Fault or Negligence under Article 10.5.2 was proved by the Athlete.

St (Standard sanction under Articles 10.2 or 10.3.1): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by the standard sanction of two years under Article 10.2 or 10.3.1.

AS (Aggravated sanction): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by an aggravated sanction under Article 10.6 because the Anti-Doping Organization established the conditions set forth under Article 10.6.

TRA (Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking and administration or Attempted administration): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by a sanction under Article 10.3.2.

[Comment to Article 10.7.1: The table is applied by locating the Athlete or other Person's first anti-doping rule violation in the left-hand column and then moving across the table to the right to the column representing the second violation. By way of example, assume an Athlete receives the standard period of Ineligibility for a first violation under Article 10.2 and then commits a second violation for which he receives a reduced sanction for a Specified Substance under Article 10.4. The table is used to determine the period of Ineligibility for the second violation. The table is applied to this example by starting in the left-hand column and going down to the fourth row which is "St" for standard sanction, then moving across the table to the first column which is "RS" for reduced sanction for a Specified Substance, thus resulting in a 2-4 year range for the period of Ineligibility for the second violation. The Athlete or other Person's degree of fault shall be the criterion considered in assessing a period of Ineligibility within the applicable range.]

[Comment to Article 10.7.1 RS Definition: See Article 25.4 with respect to application of Article 10.7.1 to pre-Code anti-doping rule violations.]

10.7.2 Application of Articles 10.5.3 and 10.5.4 to Second Anti-Doping Rule Violation

Where an Athlete or other Person who commits a second anti-doping rule violation establishes entitlement to suspension or reduction of a portion of the period of Ineligibility under Article 10.5.3 or Article 10.5.4, the hearing panel shall first determine the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility within the range established in the table in Article 10.7.1, and then apply the appropriate suspension

or reduction of the period of Ineligibility. The remaining period of Ineligibility, after applying any suspension or reduction under Articles 10.5.3 and 10.5.4, must be at least one-fourth of the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility.

10.7.3 Third Anti-Doping Rule Violation

A third anti-doping rule violation will always result in a lifetime period of Ineligibility, except if the third violation fulfils the condition for elimination or reduction of the period of Ineligibility under Article 10.4 or involves a violation of Article 2.4 (Filing Failures and/or and Missed Tests). In these particular cases, the period of Ineligibility shall be from eight (8) years to life ban.

10.7.4 Additional Rules for Certain Potential Multiple Violations

- For purposes of imposing sanctions under Article 10.7, an anti-doping rule violation will only be considered a second violation if the IF (or its National Federation) can establish that the Athlete or other Person committed the second anti-doping rule violation after the Athlete or other Person received notice pursuant to Article 7 (Results Management), or after IF (or its National Federation) made reasonable efforts to give notice, of the first anti-doping rule violation; if the IF (or its National Federation) cannot establish this, the violations shall be considered together as one single first violation, and the sanction imposed shall be based on the violation that carries the more severe sanction; however, the occurrence of multiple violations may be considered as a factor in determining Aggravating Circumstances (Article 10.6).
- If, after the resolution of a first anti-doping rule violation, IF discovers facts involving an anti-doping rule violation by the Athlete or other Person which occurred prior to notification regarding the first violation, then IF shall impose an additional sanction based on the sanction that could have been imposed if the two violations would have been adjudicated at the same time. Results in all Competitions dating back to the earlier anti-doping rule violation will be Disqualified as provided in Article 10.8. To avoid the possibility of a finding of Aggravating Circumstances (Article 10.6) on account of the earlier-in-time but later-discovered violation, the Athlete or other Person must voluntarily admit the earlier anti-doping rule violation on a timely basis after notice of the violation for which he or she is first charged. The same rule shall also apply when IF discovers facts involving another prior violation after the resolution of a second anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 10.7.4: In a hypothetical situation, an Athlete commits an anti-doping rule violation on January 1, 2008 which IF does not discover until December 1, 2008. In the meantime, the Athlete commits another anti-doping rule violation on March 1, 2008 and the Athlete is notified of this violation by IF on March 30, 2008 and a hearing panel rules on June 30, 2008 that the Athlete committed the March 1, 2008 anti-doping rule violation. The later-discovered violation which occurred on January 1, 2008 will provide the basis for Aggravating Circumstances because the Athlete did not voluntarily admit the violation in a timely basis after the Athlete received notification of the later violation on March 30, 2008.]

10.7.5 Multiple Anti-Doping Rule Violations during an Eight-Year Period

For purposes of Article 10.7, each anti-doping rule violation must take place within the same eight (8) year period in order to be considered multiple violations.

10.8 Disqualification of Results in Competitions Subsequent to Sample Collection or Commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation

In addition to the automatic Disqualification of the results in the Competition which produced the positive Sample under Article 9 (Automatic Disqualification of Individual Results), all other competitive results obtained from the date a positive Sample was collected (whether In-Competition or Out-of-Competition), or other anti-doping rule violation occurred, through the commencement of any Provisional Suspension or Ineligibility period, shall, unless fairness requires otherwise, be Disqualified with all of the resulting consequences including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.

10.8.1 As a condition of regaining eligibility after being found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation, the Athlete must first repay all prize money forfeited under this Article.

10.8.2 Allocation of Forfeited Prize Money.

Forfeited prize money shall be allocated first to reimburse the collection expenses incurred by the Anti-Doping Organization in order to perform the necessary steps to collect the prize money back, then to reimburse the expenses incurred by the Anti-Doping Organization in order to conduct results management in the case, with the balance, if any, allocated in accordance with IF's specific rules.

[Comment to Article 10.8.2: Nothing in IF's Anti-Doping Rules precludes clean Athletes or other Persons who have been damaged by the actions of a Person who has committed an anti-doping rule violation from pursuing any right which they would otherwise have to seek damages from such Person.]

10.9 Commencement of Ineligibility Period

Except as provided below, the period of Ineligibility shall start on the date of the hearing decision providing for Ineligibility or, if the hearing is waived, on the date Ineligibility is accepted or otherwise imposed.

10.9.1 Delays Not Attributable to the Athlete or other Person

Where there have been substantial delays in the hearing process or other aspects of Doping Control not attributable to the Athlete or other Person, the IF or Anti-Doping Organization imposing the sanction may start the period of Ineligibility at an earlier date commencing as early as the date of Sample collection or the date on which another anti-doping rule violation last occurred.

10.9.2 Timely Admission

Where the Athlete promptly (which, in all events, means before the Athlete competes again) admits the anti-doping rule violation after being confronted with the anti-doping rule violation by IF, the period of Ineligibility may start as early as the date of Sample collection or the date on which another anti-doping rule violation last occurred. In each case, however, where this Article is applied, the Athlete or other Person shall serve at least one-half of the period of Ineligibility going forward from the date the Athlete or other Person accepted the imposition of a sanction, the date of a hearing decision imposing a sanction, or the date the sanction is otherwise imposed.

[Comment to Article 10.9.2: This Article shall not apply where the period of Ineligibility already has been reduced under Article 10.5.4 (Admission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation in the Absence of Other Evidence).]

10.9.3 If a Provisional Suspension is imposed and respected by the Athlete, then the Athlete shall receive a credit for such period of Provisional Suspension against any period of Ineligibility which may ultimately be imposed.

10.9.4 If an Athlete voluntarily accepts a Provisional Suspension in writing from IF and thereafter refrains from competing, the Athlete shall receive a credit for such period of voluntary Provisional Suspension against any period of Ineligibility which may ultimately be imposed. A copy of the Athlete's voluntary acceptance of a Provisional Suspension shall be provided promptly to each party entitled to receive notice of a potential anti-doping rule violation under Article 14.1.

[Comment to Article 10.9.4: An Athlete's voluntary acceptance of a Provisional Suspension is not an admission by the Athlete and shall not be used in any way as to draw an adverse inference against the Athlete.]

10.9.5 No credit against a period of Ineligibility shall be given for any time period before the effective date of the Provisional Suspension or voluntary Provisional Suspension regardless of whether the Athlete elected not to compete or was suspended by his or her team.

[Comment to Article 10.9: The text of Article 10.9 has been revised to make clear that delays not attributable to the Athlete, timely admission by the Athlete and Provisional Suspension are the only justifications for starting the period of Ineligibility earlier than the date of the hearing decision. This amendment corrects inconsistent interpretation and application of the previous text.]

10.10 Status During Ineligibility

10.10.1 Prohibition against Participation during Ineligibility

No Athlete or other Person who has been declared Ineligible may, during the period of Ineligibility, participate in any capacity in an Event or activity (other than authorized anti-doping education or rehabilitation programs) authorized or organized by IF or other member organization of IF or in Competitions authorized or organized by any professional league or any international level Event organization.

An Athlete or other Person subject to a period of Ineligibility longer than four years may, after completing four years of the period of Ineligibility, participate in local sport events in a sport other than sports subject to the jurisdictions of IF.

An Athlete or other Person subject to a period of Ineligibility shall remain subject to Testing.

[Comment to Article 10.10.1: . An ineligible Athlete may not compete in a non-Signatory professional league (e.g., the National Hockey League, the National Basketball Association, etc.), Events organized by a non-Signatory International Event organization without triggering the consequences set forth in Article 10.10.2. Sanctions in one sport will also be recognized by other sports (see Article 15).]

10.10.2 Violation of the Prohibition of Participation during Ineligibility

Where an Athlete or other Person who has been declared Ineligible violates the prohibition against participation during Ineligibility described in Article 10.10.1, the results of such participation shall be Disqualified and the period of Ineligibility which was originally imposed shall start over again as of the date of the violation. The new period of Ineligibility may be reduced under Article 10.5.2 if the Athlete or other Person establishes he or she bears No Significant Fault or Negligence for

violating the prohibition against participation. The determination of whether an Athlete or other Person has violated the prohibition against participation, and whether a reduction under Article 10.5.2 is appropriate, shall be made by IF.

[Comment to Article 10.10.2: If an Athlete or other Person is alleged to have violated the prohibition against participation during a period of Ineligibility, IF shall determine whether the Athlete violated the prohibition and, if so, whether the Athlete or other Person has established grounds for a reduction in the restarted period of Ineligibility under Article 10.5.2. Decisions rendered by IF under this Article may be appealed pursuant to Article 13.2.]

Where an Athlete Support Personnel or other Person substantially assists an Athlete in violating the prohibition against participation during Ineligibility, IF may appropriately impose sanctions under its own disciplinary rules for such assistance.]

10.10.3 Withholding of Financial Support during Ineligibility

In addition, for any anti-doping rule violation not involving a reduced sanction for Specified Substances as described in Article 10.4, some or all sport-related financial support or other sport-related benefits received by such Person will be withheld by IF and its National Federations.

10.11 Reinstatement Testing

As a condition to regaining eligibility at the end of a specified period of Ineligibility, an Athlete must, during any period of Provisional Suspension or Ineligibility, make him or herself available for Out-of-Competition Testing by IF, and any other Anti-Doping Organization having Testing jurisdiction, and must comply with the whereabouts requirements of Article 11 of the International Standard for Testing. If an Athlete subject to a period of Ineligibility retires from sport and is removed from Out-of-Competition Testing pools and later seeks reinstatement, the Athlete shall not be eligible for reinstatement until the Athlete has notified IF and has been subject to Out-of-Competition Testing for a period of time equal to the [longer of (a) the period set forth in Article 5.6 and (b)] period of Ineligibility remaining as of the date the Athlete had retired. During such remaining period of Ineligibility, a minimum of 2 tests must be conducted on the Athlete with at least three months between each test. In addition, immediately prior to the end of the period of Ineligibility, an Athlete must undergo Testing by IF for the Prohibited Substances and Methods that are prohibited in Out-of-Competition Testing. Once the period of an Athlete's Ineligibility has expired, and the Athlete has fulfilled the conditions of reinstatement, then the Athlete will become automatically re-eligible and no application by the Athlete or by the Athlete's National Federation will then be necessary.

10.12 Imposition of Financial Sanctions

Anti-Doping Organizations may, in their own rules, provide for financial sanctions on account of anti-doping rule violations. However, no financial sanction may be considered a basis for reducing the period of Ineligibility or other sanction which would otherwise be applicable under the Code.

ARTICLE 11 : CONSEQUENCES TO TEAMS

[Alternative 1: 11.1 Where more than one member of a team in a Team Sport has been notified of a possible Anti-Doping Rule violation under Article 7 in connection with an Event, the Team ruling body for the Event shall conduct appropriate Target Testing of the team during the Event Period. If more than two members of a team in a Team Sport are found to have committed an Anti-Doping Rule violation

during an Event period, the ruling body of the Event shall impose an appropriate sanction on the team (e.g., loss of points, Disqualification from a Competition or Event, or other sanction) in addition to any Consequences imposed upon the individual Athlete(s) committing the Anti-Doping Rule violation.]

ARTICLE 12 : SANCTIONS AND COSTS ASSESSED AGAINST NATIONAL FEDERATIONS

- 12.1** The IF has the authority to withhold some or all funding or other non financial support to National Federations that are not in compliance with these Anti-Doping Rules.
- 12.2** National Federations shall be obligated to reimburse IF for all costs (including but not limited to laboratory fees, hearing expenses and travel) related to a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules committed by an Athlete or other Person affiliated with that National Federation.
- 12.3** IF may elect to take additional disciplinary action against National Federations with respect to recognition, the eligibility of its officials and athletes to participate in International Events and fines based on the following:
- 12.3.1** Four or more violations of these Anti-Doping Rules (other than violations involving Articles 2.4 and 10.3) are committed by Athletes or other Persons affiliated with a National Federation within a 12-month period in testing conducted by IF or Anti-Doping Organizations other than the National Federation or its National Anti-Doping Organization. [In such event the IF may in its discretion elect to: (a) ban all officials from that National Federation for participation in any IF activities for a period of up to two years and/or (b) fine the National Federation in an amount up to \$3,000 U.S. Dollars. (For purposes of this Rule, any fine paid pursuant to Rule 12.3.2 shall be credited against any fine assessed.)
- 12.3.1.1** If four or more violations of these Anti-Doping Rules (other than violations involving Articles 2.4 and 10.3) are committed in addition to the violations described in Article 12.3.1 by Athletes or other Persons affiliated with a National Federation within a 12-month period in testing conducted by IF or Anti-Doping Organizations other than the National Federation or its National Anti-Doping Organization, then the IF may suspend that National Federation's membership for a period of up to 4 years.
- 12.3.2** More than one Athlete or other Person from a National Federation commits an Anti-Doping Rule violation during an International Event. In such event IF may fine that National Federation in an amount up to \$5,000 U.S. Dollars.
- 12.3.3** A National Federation has failed to make diligent efforts to keep IF informed about an Athlete's whereabouts after receiving a request for that information from IF. In such event IF may fine the National Federation in an amount up to \$3,000 U.S. Dollars per Athlete in addition to all of IF costs incurred in Testing that National Federation's Athletes.

ARTICLE 13 : APPEALS

13.1 Decisions Subject to Appeal

Decisions made under these Anti-Doping Rules may be appealed as set forth below in Article 13.2 through 13.4 or as otherwise provided in these Anti-Doping Rules. Such decisions shall remain in effect while under appeal unless the appellate body orders otherwise. Before an

appeal is commenced, any post-decision review authorized in these rules must be exhausted (except as provided in Article 13.1.1).

13.1.1 WADA Not Required to Exhaust Internal Remedies

Where WADA has a right to appeal under Article 13 and no other party has appealed a final decision within the IF's process, WADA may appeal such decision directly to CAS without having to exhaust other remedies in the IF's process.

[Comment to Article 13.1.1: Where a decision has been rendered before the final stage of IF's process (for example, a first hearing) and no party elects to appeal that decision to the next level of IF's process (e.g., the Managing Board), then WADA may bypass the remaining steps in IF's internal process and appeal directly to CAS.]

13.2 Appeals from Decisions Regarding Anti-Doping Rule Violations, Consequences, and Provisional Suspensions

A decision that an anti-doping rule violation was committed, a decision imposing Consequences for an anti-doping rule violation, or a decision that no anti-doping rule violation was committed; a decision that an anti-doping rule violation proceeding cannot go forward for procedural reasons (including, for example, prescription); a decision under Article 10.10.2 (prohibition of participation during Ineligibility); a decision that the IF lacks jurisdiction to rule on an alleged anti-doping rule violation or its Consequences; may be appealed exclusively as provided in this Article 13.2. [Notwithstanding any other provision herein, the only Person that may appeal from a Provisional Suspension is the Athlete or other Person upon whom the Provisional Suspension is imposed.]

13.2.1 Appeals Involving International-Level Athletes

In cases arising from competition in an International Event or in cases involving International-Level Athletes, the decision may be appealed exclusively to CAS in accordance with the provisions applicable before such court.

[Comment to Article 13.2.1: CAS decisions are final and binding except for any review required by law applicable to the annulment or enforcement of arbitral awards.]

13.2.2 Persons Entitled to Appeal

In cases under Article 13.2.1, the following parties shall have the right to appeal to CAS:

- a) the Athlete or other Person who is the subject of the decision being appealed;
- b) the other party to the case in which the decision was rendered;
- c) IF and any other Anti-Doping Organization under whose rules a sanction could have been imposed;
- d) the International Olympic Committee or International Paralympic Committee, as applicable, where the decision may have an effect in relation to the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games, including decisions affecting eligibility for the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games; and
- e) WADA.

13.3 Failure to Render a Timely Decision by IF

Where, in a particular case, IF fail's to render a decision with respect to whether an anti-doping rule violation was committed within a reasonable deadline set by WADA, WADA may elect to appeal directly to CAS as if IF had rendered a decision finding no anti-doping rule violation. If the CAS panel determines that an anti-doping rule violation was committed and that WADA acted reasonably in electing to appeal directly to CAS, then WADA's costs and attorneys fees in prosecuting the appeal shall be reimbursed to WADA by IF..

[Comment to Article 13.3: Given the different circumstances of each anti-doping rule violation investigation and results management process, it is not feasible to establish a fixed time period for IF to render a decision before WADA may intervene by appealing directly to CAS. Before taking such action, however, WADA will consult with IF and give IF an opportunity to explain why it has not yet rendered a decision.]

13.4 Appeals from Decisions Granting or Denying a Therapeutic Use Exemption

Decisions by WADA reversing the grant or denial of a TUE may be appealed exclusively to CAS by the Athlete, or IF. Decisions to deny TUE's, and which are not reversed by WADA, may be appealed by International-Level Athletes to. When IF, fails to take action on a properly submitted TUE application within a reasonable time, their failure to decide may be considered a denial for purposes of the appeal rights provided in this Article.

13.5 Appeal from Decisions Pursuant to Article 12

Decisions by IF pursuant to Article 12 may be appealed exclusively to CAS by the National Federation.

13.6 Time for Filing Appeals

The time to file an appeal to CAS shall be twenty-one (21) days from the date of receipt of the decision by the appealing party. The above notwithstanding, the following shall apply in connection with appeals filed by a party entitled to appeal but which was not a party to the proceedings having lead to the decision subject to appeal:

- a) Within ten (10) days from notice of the decision, such party/ies shall have the right to request from the body having issued the decision a copy of the file on which such body relied;
- b) If such a request is made within the ten-day period, then the party making such request shall have twenty-one (21) days from receipt of the file to file an appeal to CAS.

13.6.2 The above notwithstanding, the filing deadline for an appeal or intervention filed by WADA shall be the later of:

- a) Twenty-one (21) days after the last day on which any other party in the case could have appealed, or
- b) Twenty-one (21) days after WADA's receipt of the complete file relating to the decision.

ARTICLE 14 : NATIONAL FEDERATIONS ' INCORPORATION OF IF RULES, REPORTING AND RECOGNITION

14.1 Incorporation of IF Anti-Doping Rules

All National Federations shall comply with these Anti-Doping Rules. Each National Federation shall obtain the written acknowledgement and agreement, in the form attached as Appendix 1, of all Athletes subject to Doping Control and Athlete Support Personnel for such Athletes.

14.2 Public Disclosure

14.2.1 IF shall not publicly identify Athletes whose Samples have resulted in Adverse Analytical Findings, or who were alleged to have violated other Articles of these Anti-Doping Rules until it has been determined in a hearing in accordance with Article 8 that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, or such hearing has been waived, or the assertion of an anti-doping rule violation has not been timely challenged or the Athlete has been Provisionally Suspended. Once a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules has been established, it shall be publicly reported within 20 days. IF must also report within 20 days appeal decisions on an anti-doping rule violation. IF shall also, within the time period for publication, send all hearing and appeal decisions to WADA.

14.2.2 In any case where it is determined, after a hearing or appeal, that the Athlete or other Person did not commit an anti-doping rule violation, the decision may be disclosed publicly only with the consent of the Athlete or other Person who is the subject of the decision. IF shall use reasonable efforts to obtain such consent, and if consent is obtained, shall publicly disclose the decision in its entirety or in such redacted form as the Athlete or other Person may approve.

14.2.3 Neither IF nor its National Federation or WADA accredited laboratory, or official of either, shall publicly comment on the specific facts of a pending case (as opposed to general description of process and science) except in response to public comments attributed to the Athlete, other Person or their representatives.

14.3 Recognition of Decisions by IF

Any decision of IF regarding a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules shall be recognized by all National Federations.

ARTICLE 15 : RECOGNITION OF DECISIONS BY OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Subject to the right to appeal provided in Article 13, the Testing, TUE's and hearing results or other final adjudications of any Signatory to the Code which are consistent with the Code and are within the Signatory's authority, shall be recognized and respected by IF. IF may recognize the same actions of other bodies which have not accepted the Code if the rules of those bodies are otherwise consistent with the Code.

[Comment to Article 15: Where the decision of a body that has not accepted the Code is in some respects Code compliant and in other respects not Code compliant, IF should attempt to apply the decision in harmony with the principles of the Code. For example, if in a process consistent with the Code a non-Signatory has found an Athlete to have committed an anti-doping rule violation on account of the presence of a Prohibited Substance in his body but the period of Ineligibility applied is shorter than the period provided for in the Code, then IF should recognize the finding of an anti-doping rule violation and they should conduct a hearing consistent with Article 8 to determine whether the longer period of Ineligibility provided in the Code should be imposed.]

ARTICLE 16 : STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

No action may be commenced under these Anti-Doping Rules against an Athlete or other Person for a violation of an anti-doping rule contained in these Anti-Doping Rules unless such action is commenced within eight years from the date the violation occurred.

ARTICLE 17 : IF COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO WADA

The IF will report to WADA on the IF's compliance with the Code every second year and shall explain reasons for any noncompliance.

ARTICLE 18 : AMENDMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF ANTI-DOPING RULES

- 18.1** These Anti-Doping Rules may be amended from time to time by the IF Executive.
- 18.2** Except as provided in Article 18.5, these Anti-Doping Rules shall be interpreted as an independent and autonomous text and not by reference to existing law or statutes.
- 18.3** The headings used for the various Parts and Articles of these Anti-Doping Rules are for convenience only and shall not be deemed part of the substance of these Anti-Doping Rules or to affect in any way the language of the provisions to which they refer.
- 18.4** The INTRODUCTION and the APPENDIX I DEFINITIONS shall be considered integral parts of these Anti-Doping Rules.
- 18.5** These Anti-Doping Rules have been adopted pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Code and shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with applicable provisions of the Code. The comments annotating various provisions of the Code may, where applicable, assist in the understanding and interpretation of these Anti-Doping Rules.
- 18.6** Notice to an Athlete or other Person who is a member of a National Federation may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the National Federation.
- 18.7** These Anti-Doping Rules shall come into full force and effect on 1 January 2009 (the "Effective Date"). They shall not apply retrospectively to matters pending before the Effective Date; provided, however, that:
 - 18.7.1** Any case pending prior to the Effective Date, or brought after the Effective Date based on an anti-doping rule violation that occurred prior to the Effective Date, shall be governed by the predecessor to these Anti-Doping Rules in force at the time of the anti-doping rule violation, subject to any application of the principle of *lex mitior* by the hearing panel determining the case.
 - 18.7.2** Any Article 2.4 whereabouts violation (whether a filing failure or a missed test) declared by IF under rules in force prior to the Effective Date that has not expired prior to the Effective Date and that would qualify as a whereabouts violation under Article 11 of the International Standard for Testing shall be carried forward and may be relied upon, prior to expiry, as one of the three Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests giving rise to an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.4 of these Anti-Doping Rules. [*Note: where existing whereabouts violations are carried over to the new regime, any restrictions under the old rules on combining those whereabouts violations with other whereabouts violations must also be carried over.*] [Hence: unless otherwise stated by IF, however:

- a) a filing failure that is carried forward in this manner may only be combined with (post-Effective Date) Filing Failures;
- b) a missed test that is carried forward in this manner may only be combined with (post-Effective Date) Missed Tests; and
- c) a filing failure or missed test declared by any Anti-Doping Organization other than IF prior to the Effective Date may not be combined with any Filing Failure or Missed Test declared under these Anti-Doping Rules.]

18.7.3 Where a period of Ineligibility imposed by IF under rules in force prior to the Effective Date has not yet expired as of the Effective Date, the Person who is Ineligible may apply to IF for a reduction in the period of Ineligibility in light of the amendments made to the Code as from the Effective Date. To be valid, such application must be made before the period of Ineligibility has expired.

18.7.4 Subject always to Article 10.7.5, anti-doping rule violations committed under rules in force prior to the Effective Date shall be taken into account as prior offences for purposes of determining sanctions under Article 10.7. Where such pre-Effective Date anti-doping rule violation involved a substance that would be treated as a Specified Substance under these Anti-Doping Rules, for which a period of Ineligibility of less than two years was imposed, such violation shall be considered a Reduced Sanction violation for purposes of Article 10.7.1.

APPENDIX 1 - DEFINITIONS

Adverse Analytical Finding. A report from a laboratory or other approved Testing entity that identifies in a Sample the presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers (including elevated quantities of endogenous substances) or evidence of the Use of a Prohibited Method.

Anti-Doping Organization. A Signatory that is responsible for adopting rules for initiating, implementing or enforcing any part of the Doping Control process. This includes, for example, the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, other Major Event Organizations that conduct Testing at their Events, and WADA.

Athlete. Any Person who participates in sport at the international level (as defined by each International Federation), , including but not limited to those Persons in its Registered Testing Pool), and any other competitor in sport who is otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of any Signatory or other sports organization accepting the Code. All provisions of the Code, including, for example, Testing, and TUE's must be applied to international competitors. For purposes of Article 2.8 (Administration or Attempted Administration) and for purposes of anti-doping information and education, any Person who participates in sport under the authority of any Signatory, government, or other sports organization accepting the Code is an Athlete.

[Comment to Athlete: This definition makes it clear that all international athletes are subject to the anti-doping rules of the Code, with the precise definitions of international sport to be set forth in the anti-doping rules of the IFs Anti-Doping Organization. Competitors at all levels of competition should receive the benefit of anti-doping information and education.]

Athlete Support Personnel. Any coach, trainer, manager, agent, team staff, official, medical, paramedical personnel, parent or any other Person working with, treating or assisting an Athlete participating in or preparing for sports Competition.

Attempt. Purposely engaging in conduct that constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in the commission of an anti-doping rule violation. Provided, however, there shall be no anti-doping rule violation based solely on an Attempt to commit a violation if the Person renounces the attempt prior to it being discovered by a third party not involved in the Attempt.

Atypical Finding. A report from a laboratory or other WADA-approved entity which requires further investigation as provided by the International Standard for Laboratories or related Technical Documents prior to the determination of an Adverse Analytical Finding.

CAS. The Court of Arbitration for Sport.

Code. The World Anti-Doping Code.

Competition. A single race, match, game or singular athletic contest. For example, a basketball game or the finals of the Olympic 100-meter dash in athletics. For stage races and other athletic contests where prizes are awarded on a daily or other interim basis the distinction between a Competition and an Event will be as provided in the rules of the applicable International Federation.

Consequences of anti-doping rule violations. An Athlete's or other Person's violation of an anti-doping rule may result in one or more of the following:

- a) Disqualification means the Athlete's results in a particular Competition or Event are invalidated, with all resulting consequences including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes;
- b) Ineligibility means the Athlete or other Person is barred for a specified period of time from participating in any Competition or other activity or funding as provided in Article 10.9; and
- c) Provisional Suspension means the Athlete or other Person is barred temporarily from participating in any Competition prior to the final decision at a hearing conducted under Article 8 (Right to a Fair Hearing).

Disqualification. See Consequences of anti-doping rule violations, above.

Doping Control. All steps and processes from test distribution planning through to ultimate disposition of any appeal including all steps and processes in between such as provision of whereabouts information, sample collection and handling, laboratory analysis, TUE's, results management and hearings.

Event. A series of individual Competitions conducted together under one ruling body (e.g., the Olympic Games, FINA World Championships, or Pan American Games).

Event Period. The time between the beginning and end of an Event, as established by the ruling body of the Event.

In-Competition. Unless provided otherwise in the rules of an International Federation or other relevant Anti-Doping Organization, "In-Competition" means the period commencing twelve hours before a Competition in which the Athlete is scheduled to participate through the end of such Competition and the Sample collection process related to such Competition.

Independent Observer Program. A team of observers, under the supervision of WADA, who observe and may provide guidance on the Doping Control process at certain Events and report on their observations.

Individual Sport. Any sport that is not a Team Sport.

Ineligibility. See Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations above.

International Event. An Event where the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, an International Federation, a Major Event Organization, or another international sport organization is the ruling body for the Event or appoints the technical officials for the Event.

International-Level Athlete. Athletes designated by one or more International Federations as being within the Registered Testing Pool for an International Federation.

International Standard. A standard adopted by WADA in support of the Code. Compliance with an International Standard (as opposed to another alternative standard, practice or procedure) shall be sufficient to conclude that the procedures addressed by the International Standard were performed properly. International Standards shall include any Technical Documents issued pursuant to the International Standard.

Major Event Organizations. The continental associations of National Olympic Committees and other international multi-sport organizations that function as the ruling body for any continental, regional or other International Event.

Marker. A compound, group of compounds or biological parameter(s) that indicates the Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.

Metabolite. Any substance produced by a biotransformation process.

Minor. A natural Person who has not reached the age of majority as established by the applicable laws of his or her country of residence.

National Anti-Doping Organization. The entity(ies) designated by each country as possessing the primary authority and responsibility to adopt and implement anti-doping rules, direct the collection of Samples, the management of test results, and the conduct of hearings, all at the national level. This includes an entity which may be designated by multiple countries to serve as regional Anti-Doping Organization for such countries. If this designation has not been made by the competent public authority(ies), the entity shall be the country's National Olympic Committee or its designee.

National Event. A sport Event involving international or national-level Athletes that is not an International Event.

National Federation. A national or regional entity which is a member of or is recognized by IF as the entity governing the IF's sport in that nation or region.

National Olympic Committee. The organization recognized by the International Olympic Committee. The term National Olympic Committee shall also include the National Sport Confederation in those countries where the National Sport Confederation assumes typical National Olympic Committee responsibilities in the anti-doping area.

No Advance Notice. A Doping Control which takes place with no advance warning to the Athlete and where the Athlete is continuously chaperoned from the moment of notification through Sample provision.

No Fault or Negligence. The Athlete's establishing that he or she did not know or suspect, and could not reasonably have known or suspected even with the exercise of utmost caution, that he or she had Used or been administered the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.

No Significant Fault or Negligence. The Athlete's establishing that his or her fault or negligence, when viewed in the totality of the circumstances and taking into account the criteria for No Fault or Negligence, was not significant in relationship to the anti-doping rule violation.

Out-of-Competition. Any Doping Control which is not In-Competition.

Participant. Any Athlete or Athlete Support Personnel.

Person. A natural Person or an organization or other entity.

Possession. The actual, physical possession, or the constructive possession (which shall be found only if the person has exclusive control over the Prohibited Substance/Method or the premises in which a Prohibited Substance/Method exists); provided, however, that if the person does not have exclusive control over the Prohibited Substance/Method or the premises in which a Prohibited Substance/Method exists, constructive possession shall only be found if the person knew about the presence of the **Prohibited Substance/Method and intended to exercise control over it**. Provided, however, there shall be no anti-doping rule violation based solely on possession if, prior to receiving notification of any kind that the Person has committed an anti-doping rule violation, the Person has taken concrete action demonstrating that the Person never intended to have possession and has renounced possession by explicitly declaring it to an Anti-Doping Organization. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this definition, the purchase (including by any electronic or other means) of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method constitutes possession by the Person who makes the purchase.

[Comment: Under this definition, steroids found in an Athlete's car would constitute a violation unless the Athlete establishes that someone else used the car; in that event, the Anti-Doping Organization must establish that, even though the Athlete did not have exclusive control over the car, the Athlete knew about the steroids and intended to have control over the steroids. Similarly, in the example of steroids found in a home medicine cabinet under the joint control of an Athlete and spouse, the Anti-Doping Organization must establish that the Athlete knew the steroids were in the cabinet and that the Athlete intended to exercise control over the steroids.]

Prohibited List. The List identifying the Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods.

Prohibited Method. Any method so described on the Prohibited List.

Prohibited Substance. Any substance so described on the Prohibited List.

Provisional Hearing. For purposes of Article 7.6, an expedited abbreviated hearing occurring prior to a hearing under Article 8 (Right to a Fair Hearing) that provides the Athlete with notice and an opportunity to be heard in either written or oral form.

Provisional Suspension. See Consequences above.

Publicly Disclose or Publicly Report. To disseminate or distribute information to the general public or persons beyond those persons entitled to earlier notification in accordance with Article 14.

Registered Testing Pool. The pool of top level Athletes established separately by International Federation who are subject to both In-Competition and Out-of-Competition Testing as part of that International Federation's test distribution plan.

Retroactive TUE. As defined in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions.

Sample. Any biological material collected for the purposes of Doping Control.

[Comment to Sample: It has sometimes been claimed that the collection of blood samples violates the tenets of certain religious or cultural groups. It has been determined that there is no basis for any such claim.]

Signatories. Those entities signing the Code and agreeing to comply with the Code, including the International Olympic Committee, International Federations, International Paralympic Committee, National Olympic Committees, National Paralympic Committees, Major Event Organizations, National Anti-Doping Organizations, and WADA.

Specified Substances. As defined in Article 4.2.2.

Substantial Assistance. For purposes of Article 10.5.3, a Person providing Substantial Assistance must: (1) fully disclose in a signed written statement all information he or she possesses in relation to anti-doping rule violations, and (2) fully cooperate with the investigation and adjudication of any case related to that information, including, for example, presenting testimony at a hearing if requested to do so by an Anti-Doping Organization or hearing panel. Further, the information provided must be credible and must comprise an important part of any case which is initiated or, if no case is initiated, must have provided a sufficient basis on which a case could have been brought.

Tampering. Altering for an improper purpose or in an improper way; bringing improper influence to bear; interfering improperly; obstructing, misleading or engaging in any fraudulent conduct to alter results or prevent normal procedures from occurring; or providing fraudulent information to an Anti-Doping Organization.

Target Testing. Selection of Athletes for Testing where specific Athletes or groups of Athletes are selected on a non-random basis for Testing at a specified time.

Team Sport. A sport in which the substitution of players is permitted during a Competition.

Testing. The parts of the Doping Control process involving test distribution planning, Sample collection, Sample handling, and Sample transport to the laboratory.

Trafficking. Selling, giving, transporting, sending, delivering or distributing a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method (either physically or by any electronic or other means) by an Athlete, Athlete Support Personnel or any other Person subject to the jurisdiction of an Anti-Doping Organization to any third party; provided, however, this definition shall not include the actions of bona fide medical personnel involving a Prohibited Substance used for genuine and legal therapeutic purposes or other acceptable justification, and shall not include actions involving Prohibited Substances which are not prohibited in Out-of-Competition Testing unless the circumstances as a whole demonstrate such Prohibited Substances are not intended for genuine and legal therapeutic purposes.

TUE. As defined in Article 2.6.1.

TUE Panel. As defined in Article 4.4.5.

UNESCO Convention. The International Convention against Doping in Sport adopted by the 33rd session of the UNESCO General Conference on 19 October 2005 including any and all amendments adopted by the States Parties to the Convention and the Conference of Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport.

Use. The utilization, application, ingestion, injection or consumption by any means whatsoever of any Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.

WADA. The World Anti-Doping Agency.

APPENDIX 2 - Acknowledgment and Agreement

I, as a member of [National Federation] and/or a participant in an IF authorized or recognized event, hereby acknowledge and agree as follows:

1. I have received and had an opportunity to review the [IF] Anti-Doping Rules.
2. I consent and agree to comply with and be bound by all of the provisions of the [IF] Anti-Doping Rules, including but not limited to, all amendments to the Anti-Doping Rules and all International Standards incorporated in the Anti-Doping Rules.
3. I acknowledge and agree that IF has jurisdiction to impose sanctions as provided in the IF Anti-Doping Rules.
4. I also acknowledge and agree that any dispute arising out of a decision made pursuant to the [IF] Anti-Doping Rules, after exhaustion of the process expressly provided for in the [IF] Anti-Doping Rules, may be appealed exclusively as provided in Article 13 of the [IF] Anti-Doping Rules to an appellate body for final and binding arbitration, which in the case of International-Level Athletes is the Court of Arbitration for Sport.
5. I acknowledge and agree that the decisions of the arbitral appellate body referenced above shall be final and enforceable, and that I will not bring any claim, arbitration, lawsuit or litigation in any other court or tribunal.
6. I have read and understand this Acknowledgement and Agreement.

Date

Print Name (Last Name, First Name)

Date of Birth
(Day/Month/Year)

Signature (or, if a minor, signature of
legal guardian)