



# **ANTI-DOPING RULES**

**January 2012**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTERNATIONAL POWERLIFTING FEDERATION (IPF) ANTI-DOPING RULES.....</b>	<b>3</b>
PREFACE .....	3
FUNDAMENTAL RATIONALE FOR THE <i>CODE</i> AND THE IPF'S ANTI-DOPING RULES .....	3
SCOPE .....	4
ARTICLE 1 DEFINITION OF DOPING .....	5
ARTICLE 2 ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS .....	5
ARTICLE 3 PROOF OF DOPING .....	8
ARTICLE 4 THE PROHIBITED LIST .....	9
ARTICLE 5 TESTING .....	11
ARTICLE 6 ANALYSIS OF <i>SAMPLES</i> .....	15
ARTICLE 7 RESULT MANAGEMENT .....	16
ARTICLE 8 RIGHT TO A FAIR HEARING .....	20
ARTICLE 9 AUTOMATIC <i>DISQUALIFICATION</i> OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS .....	22
ARTICLE 10 SANCTIONS ON INDIVIDUALS .....	22
ARTICLE 11 <i>CONSEQUENCES</i> TO TEAMS .....	34
ARTICLE 12 SANCTIONS AND COSTS ASSESSED AGAINST <i>NATIONAL FEDERATIONS</i> .....	35
ARTICLE 13 APPEALS .....	35
ARTICLE 14 NATIONAL FEDERATIONS' INCORPORATION OF THE IPF RULES, REPORTING AND RECOGNITION .....	38
ARTICLE 15 RECOGNITION OF DECISIONS BY OTHER ORGANISATIONS .....	39
ARTICLE 16 STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS .....	39
ARTICLE 17 IPF COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO WADA .....	40
ARTICLE 18 AMENDMENTS AND INTERPRETATION OF ANTI-DOPING RULES .....	40
APPENDIX 1 - DEFINITIONS .....	42
APPENDIX 2 - ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT .....	47
APPENDIX 3 - CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN THE IPF REGISTERED TESTING POOL .....	48
APPENDIX 4 - STANDARDS FOR TESTING, GUIDELINE FOR SAMPLE COLLECTION .....	49
APPENDIX 5 - THERAPEUTIC USE EXEMPTION (TUE) APPLICATION PROCESS .....	62

# INTERNATIONAL POWERLIFTING FEDERATION (IPF) ANTI-DOPING RULES

## INTRODUCTION

### Preface

At the IPF Congress held on 02/11/2008, the IPF accepted the revised (2009) World Anti-Doping Code (the "Code"). These Anti-Doping Rules are adopted and implemented in conformance with the IPF's responsibilities under the Code, and are in furtherance of the IPF's continuing efforts to eradicate doping in the sport of Powerlifting <sup>1</sup>.

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 the IPF'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.

<sup>1</sup> Wherever the term "sport of Powerlifting" or "Powerlifting" appears in these Anti-Doping Rules, it refers to Powerlifting and the certain disciplines within the sport of Powerlifting, including the Bench Press.

## Scope

These Anti-Doping Rules shall apply to the IPF, each *National Federation* of the IPF, and each *Participant* in the activities of the IPF or any of its *National Federations* by virtue of the *Participant's* membership, accreditation, or participation in the IPF, its *National Federations*, or their activities or *Events*.

To be eligible for participation in the IPF events, a competitor must have an IPF licence issued by his or her National Federation. The IPF licence will only be issued to competitors who have personally signed the Appendix 2 consent form, in the actual form approved by the IPF 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 IPF Licence accept the Rules of the IPF, including these IPF Anti-Doping Rules.

It is the responsibility of each *National Federation* to ensure that all national-level *Testing* on the *National Federation's Athletes* complies with these Anti-Doping Rules. In some countries, the *National Federation* itself will be conducting the *Doping Control* described in these Anti-Doping Rules. In other countries, many of the *Doping Control* responsibilities of the *National Federation* have been delegated or assigned by statute or agreement to a *National Anti-Doping Organization*. In those countries, references in these Anti-Doping Rules to the *National Federation* shall apply, as appropriate, to the *National Anti-Doping Organization*.

These Anti-Doping Rules shall apply to all *Doping Controls* over which the IPF and its *National Federations* have 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*<sup>2</sup>.

The following constitute anti-doping rule violations:

### 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), the IPF'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 the IPF'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: The IPF may in its discretion choose to have the B Sample analyzed even if the Athlete does not request the analysis of the B Sample.]*

<sup>2</sup> The *Prohibited List* in force is available on WADA's website at [www.wada-ama.org](http://www.wada-ama.org) and on the IPF website at [www.powerlifting-ipf.com](http://www.powerlifting-ipf.com)

**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 the IPF 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 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 required whereabouts information** in accordance with

Article 11.3 of the *International Standard for Testing*<sup>3</sup> (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 the IPF or any other Anti-Doping Organizations 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 the IPF 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 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 the IPF.]*

## **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 or other acceptable justification.

**2.6.2** Possession by an Athlete Support Personnel In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance, or Possession by an 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.

<sup>3</sup> The *International Standard for Testing* is available on WADA’s website at [www.wada-ama.org](http://www.wada-ama.org) and on the IPF’s website at [www.powerlifting-ipf.com](http://www.powerlifting-ipf.com)

## ARTICLE 3 PROOF OF DOPING

### 3.1 Burdens and Standards of Proof

The IPF and its *National Federations* shall have the burden of establishing that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. The standard of proof shall be whether the IPF or its *National Federation* 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 the IPF or its National Federation 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:

**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*.

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 the IPF or its *National Federation* 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 the IPF or its National Federation to prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that the departure did not cause the Adverse Analytical Finding.]*

**3.2.2** 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 the IPF or its *National Federation* 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.

**3.2.3** 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.

**3.2.4** 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*. The IPF will make the current *Prohibited List* available to each *National Federation* (available at [www.powerlifting-ipf.com](http://www.powerlifting-ipf.com)), 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](http://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 the IPF. As described in Article 4.2 of the *Code*, IPF may upon the recommendation of its Anti-Doping Commission request that WADA expand the *Prohibited List* for the sport of Powerlifting. IPF may also upon the recommendation of its Anti-Doping Commission request that WADA include additional substances or methods, which have the potential for abuse in the sport of Powerlifting, 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 the IPF.

*[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*<sup>4</sup> shall not be considered an anti-doping rule violation.

**4.4.2** *Athletes* who participate in an International Event identified by the IPF must obtain a TUE either from the IPF or their National Anti-Doping Organization. A TUE received from the National Federation's TUE Panel or equivalent National Federation's body will not be recognized by the IPF. The IPF recognizes the NADO TUEs also for the international-level athletes, except for *Athletes* included by the IPF in its *Registered Testing Pool* (RTP) who must obtain a TUE from the IPF (regardless of whether the *Athlete* in the IPF RTP has received a TUE at the national level). The application for a TUE must be made as soon as possible and in any event (save in emergency situations) no later than 30 days before the *Athlete* needs the approval (for instance, an *Event*). National Anti-Doping Organization shall promptly report any such TUE's to the IPF (Assistant Secretary Sabine Al-Zobaidi, email: [Sabine.Al-Zobaidi@powerlifting-ipf.com](mailto:Sabine.Al-Zobaidi@powerlifting-ipf.com)) and WADA. TUEs granted by the IPF shall be reported promptly to the *Athlete's* National Anti-Doping Organization and to WADA.

<sup>4</sup> The International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions is available on WADA's website at [www.wada-ama.org](http://www.wada-ama.org) and on the IPF's website at [www.powerlifting-ipf.com](http://www.powerlifting-ipf.com). For the comprehensive TUE application process, see also Appendix 5.

**Beta-2 agonists.** All beta-2 agonists (including both optical isomers where relevant) are prohibited, except salbutamol (maximum 1600 micrograms over 24 hours), **formoterol (maximum 36 micrograms over 24 hours)** and salmeterol when taken by inhalation in accordance with the manufacturers' recommended therapeutic regime.

The presence of salbutamol in urine in excess of 1000 ng/mL **or formoterol in excess of 30 ng/mL** is presumed not to be an intended therapeutic use of the substance and will be considered as an *Adverse Analytical Finding* unless the *Athlete* proves, through a controlled pharmacokinetic study, that the abnormal result was the consequence of the use of the therapeutic **inhaled dose up to the maximum indicated above.**

**4.4.2.1 Glucocorticosteroids.** All Glucocorticosteroids are prohibited when administered by oral, intravenous, intramuscular or rectal routes.

**4.4.3** The IPF Executive shall appoint a panel of physicians to consider requests for TUE's (the "TUE Panel"). The Chairman of the IPF Medical Committee shall also be the Chairman or the *TUE Panel*. Upon 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 members(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 the IPF in cases where the IPF TUE Panel considers the TUE requests.

**4.4.4** WADA, at the request of an *Athlete* or on its own initiation, may review the granting or denial of any TUE by the IPF or NADO. 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.

**4.4.5** The members of the TUE Panels and the administration of the Anti-Doping Organization involved will conduct all of their activities in strict confidence. All members of the TUE Panel and all staff involved will sign confidentiality agreements. In particular they shall keep the following information confidential:

- a. all medical information and data provided by the Athlete and physician(s) involved in the Athlete's care;
- b. all details of the application including the name of the physician(s) involved in the process.

## ARTICLE 5 TESTING

### 5.1 Authority to Test

All *Athletes* under the jurisdiction of a *National Federation* shall be subject to *In-Competition Testing* by the IPF, the *Athlete's National Federation*, and any other *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for *Testing* at a *Competition* or *Event* in which they participate. All *Athletes* under the jurisdiction of a *National Federation*, 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 the IPF, WADA, the *Athlete's National Federation*, the *National Anti-Doping Organization* of any country where the Athlete is present, 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 IPF Testing, Anti-Doping Commission, Duties of Anti-Doping Commission**

The IPF Anti-Doping Commission shall be responsible for drawing up a test distribution plan for the sport of Powerlifting 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 the IPF. Testing may be conducted by members of the Anti-Doping Commission or by other persons so authorized by the IPF.

**5.2.1** The Anti-Doping Commission consists of a Chair and a minimum of **five** and a maximum of **eight** other members with experience in anti-doping. The Anti-Doping Commission shall be elected by the Executive Committee.

**5.2.2** The Anti-Doping Commission shall arrange, coordinate and supervise doping testing for all IPF World Championships and other International Events where the IPF is the ruling body for the Event, and for Out-of-Competition Doping Control Sessions initiated by the IPF. The main duties of the Anti-Doping Commission are:

- a) to establish and maintain a system for collecting details regarding the Sample Collection Sessions;
- b) to establish criteria for who may be authorised to be present during a Sample Collection Sessions;
- c) to cooperate with the organisers/promoters of World Championships and other International Events where the IPF is the ruling body for the Event in preparing the Sample Collection Sessions;
- d) to ensure that the Doping Control Stations meet the minimum criteria prescribed in Clause 6.3.2 of the WADA International Standard for Testing ;
- e) to make contracts with an Anti-Doping Agencies/Organizations to carry out the sampling at all World Championships and other International Events where the IPF is the ruling body for the Event;
- f) to make contracts with an Anti-Doping Agencies/Organizations to carry out the sampling at Out-of-Competition Doping Control Sessions;
- g) to provide an appropriate sample collection equipment and documents to the Doping Control Stations, or to ensure that the appointed Doping Control Officer are equipped with relevant sampling kit and documents ;
- h) to ensure that Sample Collection Equipment used meets the minimum criteria prescribed in Clause 6.3.4 of the WADA International Standard for Testing;
- i) to ensure that the Sample Collection procedures, Security/Post-test administration and Transport of Samples and documentation substantially complies with the requirements prescribed in Clauses 7.0, 8.0 and 9.0 of the WADA International Standard for Testing.

**5.2.3** The Anti-Doping Commission shall also review and update the criteria for inclusion in a Registered Testing Pool; and

**5.2.4** Collect, maintain and monitor sufficient athlete whereabouts information;

**5.2.5** Develop and document a test distribution plan;

**5.2.6** Select athletes for Out-of-Competition doping control;

**5.2.7** Report to the WADA clearinghouse all In-Competition and Out-of-Competition tests on athletes included in the IPF Registered Testing Pool as soon as possible after such tests have been conducted.

**5.2.8** In the Regional Events where the ruling body for the Event is the IPF Region, the relevant body of the IPF Region concerned with shall, in consultation with the IPF Anti-Doping Commission, organize and supervise doping Testing for the Event.

### **5.3 Testing Standards**

*Testing* conducted by the IPF and its Regional or 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 haematological profiling (“the passport”).

### **5.4 Coordination of Testing**

The IPF and its *National Federations* shall promptly report completed tests through the WADA clearinghouse to avoid unnecessary duplication in *Testing*.

### **5.5 Athlete Whereabouts Requirements**

**5.5.1** The IPF shall identify a *Registered Testing Pool* of those *Athletes* who are required to comply with the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing* (available on WADA’s website at [www.wada-ama.org](http://www.wada-ama.org) and on the IPF’s website at [www.powerlifting-ipf.com](http://www.powerlifting-ipf.com) ), 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. IPF 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 appropriate in accordance with the set criteria. Each *Athlete* in the *Registered Testing Pool* (a) shall advise the IPF 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 that 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*.

**5.5.2** An *Athlete’s* failure to advise the IPF 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.

**5.5.3** 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.

**5.5.4** Each *National Federation* shall also assist its *National Anti-Doping Organization* in establishing a national level *Registered Testing Pool* of top level national *Athletes* to whom the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing* shall also apply. Where those *Athletes* are also in the IPF’s *Registered Testing Pool*, the IPF and the *National Anti-Doping Organization* will agree (with the assistance of WADA if required) on which of them will take responsibility for receiving whereabouts filings from the *Athlete* and sharing it with the other (and with other *Anti-Doping Organizations*) in accordance with Article 5.5.5.

**5.5.5** Whereabouts information provided pursuant to Articles 5.5.1 and 5.5.4 shall be shared with WADA and other *Anti-Doping Organizations* having jurisdiction to test an *Athlete* in accordance with Articles 11.7.1(d) and 11.7.3(d) of the *International*

*Standard for Testing*, including the strict condition that it be used only for *Doping Control* purposes.

## **5.6 Retirement and Return to Competition**

**5.6.1** An *Athlete* who has been identified by the IPF for inclusion in the IPF'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 the IPF that he or she has retired or until he or she no longer satisfies the criteria for inclusion in the IPF's *Registered Testing Pool* and has been so informed by the IPF.

**5.6.1.1** An *Athlete's* retirement date will be the date the IPF receives the notice.

**5.6.1.2** Retirement does not:

- a. excuse the *Athlete* from giving a Sample requested on or before his/her retirement date;
- b. prevent the analysis of a Sample given by the *Athlete* on or before his/her retirement date;
- c. affect the results of Testing under (a) and/or (b) above; or
- d. exempt the *Athlete* from these Anti-Doping Rules in relation to an Anti-Doping Rule violation committed on or before the retirement day of the *Athlete*.

**5.6.2** An *Athlete* who has given notice of retirement to the IPF may not resume competing unless he or she notifies the IPF at least six 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.

**5.6.2.1** Notification for reinstatement is taken to be made on the date the IPF receives such notice.

**5.6.2.2** These Anti-Doping Rules, including (but not limited to) the consequences for an Anti-Doping Rule violation(s), will apply to the *Athlete* from the date of reinstatement notification.

**5.6.2.3** The IPF will refuse an *Athlete's* reinstatement if there is any evidence available to the IPF that the *Athlete* has violated these Anti-Doping Rules or behaved against the policies of these Anti-Doping Rules at any time during the period of his/her retirement.

**5.6.3** *National Federations/National Anti-Doping Organizations* may establish similar requirements for retirement and returning to competition for *Athletes* in the national *Registered Testing Pool*.

## **5.7 Selection of Athletes to be Tested**

**5.7.1** At *International Events*, the Anti-Doping Commission shall determine the number of finishing placement tests and target tests to be performed in accordance with the IPF Test Distribution Plan adopted for the year in which each International Event take place. The particular selection of athletes for testing shall be carried out by the members of the Anti-Doping Commission present at that International Event, or by a delegate or delegates appointed by the Anti-Doping Commission for that International Event.

**5.7.1.1** Athletes so chosen for testing must include those achieving World Records in the Sub-Junior, Junior, Open and Master I age categories. Athletes achieving World Records in the Master II, Master III and Master IV age categories may be selected for testing on the determination of the members of the Anti-Doping Commission present, or on the determination of the delegate or delegates appointed by the Anti-Doping Commission for that International Event.

**5.7.1.2** In selecting athletes for testing at international events, the Anti-Doping Commission shall achieve the selection of a minimum of 5% of all athletes participating in international events for the entirety of a calendar year & the IPF Test Distribution Plan shall reflect that requirement.

**5.7.1.3** The specifications above in this article (5.7) shall apply to Equipped and Unequipped (Raw/Classic) international events.

**5.7.2** At *National Events*, each *National Federation* shall determine the number of Athletes selected for *Testing* in each *Competition* and the procedures for selecting the *Athletes for Testing*.

**5.7.3** 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*, and the *National Federation* at *National 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.

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

**5.8** *National Federations* and the organizing committees for *National Federation Events* shall provide access to *Independent Observers* at *Events* as directed by the IPF.

## **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**

The IPF 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 the IPF.

### **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 the IPF 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 the IPF 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.]

### **6.6 Doping Control Costs**

All costs arising from doping controls, both in-competition and out-of-competition, initiated by the IPF are borne by the IPF. This includes the expenses of Doping Control Officer (DCO) and his or her assistant(s) provided by independent testing agency assisting the DCO in sample collection, the costs due to the sampling kit, the costs due to the transport of samples to the WADA accredited laboratory, and the costs of sample-analysis as agreed with the laboratory.

## **ARTICLE 7 RESULT MANAGEMENT**

### **7.1 Results Management for Tests initiated by the IPF**

Result management for Tests initiated by the IPF (including tests performed by WADA pursuant to agreement with the IPF) shall proceed as set forth below:

**7.1.1** The results from all analyses must be sent to the IPF President 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 IPF Disciplinary Committee (DC) shall conduct a review to determine whether:

- (a) the *Adverse Analytical Finding* is consistent with an applicable TUE, or
- (b) there is any apparent departure from the *International Standard for Testing* or *International Standard for Laboratories* that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

**7.1.2.1** The DC consists of a Chair and two (2) other members with experience in anti-doping. Each DC member shall serve a term of four years. In each case the Chair of the DC shall appoint 1 or more members of the DC (which may include the Chair) to conduct the review discussed in Articles 7.1.2 and 7.1.8 and to

review any other potential violations of these Anti-Doping Rules as may be requested by the IPF.

**7.1.3** 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*, the IPF President 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 the IPF 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*. IPF shall also notify the *Athlete's National Anti-Doping Organization* and WADA. If the IPF decides not to bring forward the *Adverse Analytical Finding* as an anti-doping rule violation, it shall so notify the *Athlete*, the *Athlete's National Anti-Doping Organization* and WADA.

**7.1.4** Where requested by the *Athlete* or the IPF, arrangements shall be made for *Testing* the B *Sample* within the time period specified in the *International Standard for Testing*. An *Athlete* may accept the A *Sample* analytical results by waiving the requirement for B *Sample* analysis. IPF may nonetheless elect to proceed with the B *Sample* analysis.

**7.1.5** 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 the IPF shall be allowed to be present.

**7.1.6** If the B *Sample* proves negative, then (unless the IPF 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 the IPF (President) shall be so informed.

**7.1.7** If a *Prohibited Substance* or the *Use of a Prohibited Method* is identified, the findings shall be reported to the *Athlete*, his *National Federation*, the IPF (President), and to WADA.

**7.1.8** For apparent anti-doping rule violations that do not involve *Adverse Analytical Findings*, the IPF DC shall conduct any necessary follow-up investigation and, at such time as it is satisfied that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, the IPF President shall then promptly be notified and he in turn shall 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 the IPF, the IPF DC 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 the *IPF President* 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*, the IPF DC 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*, the IPF shall pursue the matter in accordance with Article 7.1.

**7.2.5** The IPF 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 the IPF 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 7.1.3 (c) to (f).
- (b) If the IPF 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 but the *Major Event Organization* or sports organization has a pending *Atypical Finding*, the IPF 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 the IPF.

### **7.4 Results Management for Tests initiated by *National Federations***

Results management conducted by *National Federations* shall be consistent with the general principles for effective and fair results management which underlie the detailed provisions set forth in Article 7. Results of all *Doping Controls* shall be reported to IPF and to WADA within 14 days of the conclusion of the *National Federation's* results management process. Any apparent anti-doping rule violation by an *Athlete* who is a member of that *National Federation* shall be promptly referred to an appropriate hearing panel established pursuant to the rules of the *National Federation* or national law. Apparent anti-doping rule violations by *Athletes* who are

members of another *National Federation* shall be referred to the *Athlete's National Federation* for hearing.

## **7.5 Result Management for Whereabouts Violations**

**7.5.1** Results management in respect of an apparent *Filing Failure* by an *Athlete* in the IPF's *Registered Testing Pool* shall be conducted by the IPF in accordance with Article 11.6.2 of the *International Standard for Testing* (unless it has been agreed in accordance with Article 5.5.4 that the *National Federation* or *National Anti-Doping Organization* shall take such responsibility).

**7.5.2** Results management in respect of an apparent Missed Test by an *Athlete* in the IPF's *Registered Testing Pool* as a result of an attempt to test the *Athlete* by or on behalf of the IPF shall be conducted by the IPF 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*.

**7.5.3** Where, in any eighteen-month period, an *Athlete* in the IPF'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*, the IPF shall bring them forward as an apparent anti-doping rule violation.

## **7.6 Provisional Suspensions**

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

**7.6.2** In any case not covered by Article 7.6.1 where the IPF decides to take the matter forward as an apparent anti-doping rule violation in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Article 7, the IPF Executive, after consultation with the IPF DC, may *Provisionally Suspend* the *Athlete* pending the hearing panel's determination of whether he/she has committed an anti-doping rule violation.

**7.6.3** Where a *Provisional Suspension* is imposed, whether pursuant to Article 7.6.1 or Article 7.6.2, 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*. *National Federations* shall impose *Provisional Suspensions* in accordance with the principles set forth in this Article 7.6.

**7.6.4** 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* 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* to be reinserted, the *Athlete* may continue to take part in the *Competition*.

*[Comment to Article 7.6: 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.]*

## **7.7 Retirement from Sport**

If an *Athlete* or other *Person* retires while a results management process is underway, the IPF retains jurisdiction to complete its results management process. If an *Athlete* or other *Person* retires before any results management process has begun and the IPF 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, the IPF has jurisdiction to conduct results management.

*[Comment to Article 7.7: 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 IPF Testing or Tests at International Events**

**8.1.1** The IPF Executive shall appoint a standing panel consisting of a Chair and four other experts with experience in anti-doping ("IPF Doping Hearing Panel"). The Chair shall be a lawyer. Each panel member shall be otherwise independent of IPF. Each panel member shall serve a term of four years.

**8.1.2** When it appears, following the Result Management process described in Article 7, that these Anti-Doping Rules have been violated in connection with IPF *Testing* or *Testing* at an *International Event* then the case shall be assigned to the IPF Doping Hearing Panel for adjudication.

**8.1.3** The Chair of the IPF 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 result 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** The IPF 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 the IPF. The right to a hearing may be waived either expressly or by the *Athlete's* or other *Person's* failure to challenge the IPF's assertion that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred within 14 (fourteen) days of receipt of the IPF's notice of an assertion. Where no hearing occurs, the IPF shall submit to the persons described in Article 13.2.3 a reasoned decision explaining the action taken.

**8.1.8** Decisions of the IPF Doping Hearing Panel may be appealed to Court of Arbitration for Sport, as provided in Article 13.

## **8.2 Hearings Arising Out of National Testing**

**8.2.1** When it appears, following the Results Management process described in Article 7, that these Anti-Doping Rules have been violated in connection with *Testing* other than in connection with the IPF *Testing* or *Testing* at an *International Event*, the *Athlete* or other *Person* involved shall be brought before a disciplinary panel of the *Athlete* or other *Person's National Federation* for a hearing to adjudicate whether a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules occurred and if so what *Consequences* should be imposed.

**8.2.2** Hearings pursuant to this Article 8.2 shall be completed expeditiously and in all cases within three months of the completion of the Results Management process described in Article 7. Hearings held in connection with *Events* may be conducted by an expedited process. If the completion of the hearing is delayed beyond three months, the IPF may elect to bring the case directly before the IPF Doping Hearing Panel at the responsibility and at the expense of the *National Federation*.

**8.2.3** National Federation shall keep the IPF and *WADA* fully apprised as to the status of pending cases and the results of all hearings.

**8.2.4** The IPF and *WADA* shall have the right to attend hearings as an observer.

**8.2.5** The *Athlete* or other *Person* may forego a hearing by acknowledging the violation of these Anti-Doping Rules and accepting *Consequences* consistent with Articles 9 and 10 as proposed by the *National Federation*. The right to a hearing may be waived either expressly or by the *Athlete's* or other *Person's* failure to challenge the *National Federation's* assertion that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred within 14 (fourteen) days of receipt of the *National Federation's* notice of an assertion. Where no hearing occurs, the *National Federation* shall submit to the persons described in Article 13.2.3 a reasoned decision explaining the action taken.

**8.2.6** Decisions by *National Federations*, whether as the result of a hearing or the *Athlete* or other *Person's* acceptance of *Consequences*, may be appealed as provided in Article 13.

**8.2.7** Hearing decisions by *the National Federation* shall not be subject to further administrative review at the national level except as provided in Article 13 or required by applicable national law.

## **8.3 Principles for a Fair Hearing**

All hearings pursuant to either Article 8.1 or 8.2 shall respect for 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 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.

## **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* result 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.

### **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* or *Attempted 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: The IPF'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 IPF Executive (EC) 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, the IPF EC 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 the IPF EC 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 the IPF EC 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 detectable 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), the IPF 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 the IPF 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, the IPF shall reinstate the period of Ineligibility which would otherwise be applicable. Decisions rendered by the IPF under this Article may be appealed pursuant Article 13.2.*

*This is the only circumstance under the IPF'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 the IPF 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 the IPF.

*[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 \ First Violation	RS	FFMT	NSF	St	AS	TRA
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 Article 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 IPF (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 the IPF (or its *National Federation*) made reasonable efforts to give notice, of the first anti-doping rule violation; if the IPF (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, the IPF discovers facts involving an anti-doping rule violation by the *Athlete* or other *Person* which occurred prior to notification regarding the first violation, then the IPF 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 the IPF 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 the IPF 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 the IPF 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 the IPF's specific rules.

*[Comment to Article 10.8.2: Nothing in the IPF'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 *IPF* 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 the *IPF*, 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 the *IPF* 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 the *IPF*

or any *National Federation* or a club or other member organization of the IPF or any *National Federation*, or in *Competitions* authorized or organized by any professional league or any international or national level *Event* organization.

This would preclude, but not be limited to:

- a) practising/training with a national team, or a club or other member organization of the IPF's member organization;
- b) acting as a coach or sport official;
- c) selection in any representative team;
- d) receiving, directly or indirectly, funding or assistance from National Federation;
- e) use of official National Federation or Member facilities;
- f) holding any position with the National Federation.

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 jurisdiction of the IPF and its *National Federations*, but only so long as the local sport event is not at a level that could otherwise qualify such *Person* directly or indirectly to compete in (or accumulate points toward) a national championship or *International Event*.

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

*[Comment to Article 10.10.1: For example, an ineligible Athlete cannot participate in a training camp, exhibition or practice organized by his or her National Federation or a club which is a member of that National Federation. Further, 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 or a non-Signatory national-level 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 the IPF.

*[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, the IPF 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 the IPF 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, the IPF 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 the IPF 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 the IPF, the applicable *National Federation*, 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 the IPF and the applicable *National Federation* 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 two tests must be conducted on the *Athlete* with at least three months between each test. The *National Federation* shall be responsible for conducting the necessary tests, but tests by any *Anti-Doping Organization* may be used to satisfy the requirement. The results of such tests shall be reported to IPF. In addition, immediately prior to the end of the period of *Ineligibility*, an *Athlete* must undergo *Testing* by the IPF 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 Penalty for allowing coaching or other assistance from suspended Athlete or other suspended Person**

Any *Athlete* participating at a competition shall not allow him or herself to receive coaching or other assistance from an *Athlete* or other *Person* who is subject to *Ineligibility* for a doping related offence.

Penalty for allowing coaching or other assistance from *Athlete* or other *Person* who is subject to *Ineligibility* for a doping related offence:

Six (6) months' *Ineligibility* commencing from the date of violation.

The determination of the applicability or otherwise of penalties under Article 10.12 shall be made by the IPF Disciplinary Committee. Prior to any such determination by the Disciplinary Committee, the IPF-EC may provisionally suspend the *Athlete*, such suspension to commence from the date of the alleged violation.

## **ARTICLE 11 CONSEQUENCES TO TEAMS**

**11.1** If a member of a team is found to have committed a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules during an *Event* where a team ranking is based on the addition of individual results (points), the points of the *Athlete* committing the violation will be subtracted from the team result and may not be replaced by the resulting points of another team member.

**11.1.1** If two or more members of a National team are found to have committed a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules during an *Event* where a team ranking is based on the addition of individual results (points), the team shall be eliminated from the ranking.

## **ARTICLE 12 SANCTIONS AND COSTS ASSESSED AGAINST NATIONAL FEDERATIONS**

**12.1** The IPF Executive 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** A National Federation shall be obligated to reimburse the IPF for all costs (including but not limited to laboratory fees, hearing expenses and travel) related to violation of these Anti-Doping Rules committed by an *Athlete* or other *Person* affiliated with that *National Federation*.

**12.3** The IPF may elect to take additional disciplinary action against National Federation 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** If 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 the IPF or Anti-Doping Organizations other than the *National Federation* or its *National Anti-Doping Organization*, then the IPF may at its discretion elect to:

- (a) ban all officials from that *National Federation* for participation in any IPF activities for a period of up to two years and/or
- (b) fine the *National Federation* in an amount up to EUR 5000. (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 the IPF or Anti-Doping Organizations other than the *National Federation* or its *National Anti-Doping Organization*, then the IPF may suspend that *National Federation's* membership for a period of up to 4 years.

**12.3.2** If one or more *Athlete* or other *Person* from a *National Federation* commits an *Anti-Doping Rule* violation during an *International Event*, then the IPF may fine that *National Federation* in an amount up to EUR 1500 for the each offence.

**12.3.3** A *National Federation* that have failed to make diligent efforts to keep the IPF informed about an *Athlete's* whereabouts after receiving a request for that information from the IPF, may be fined in an amount up to EUR 1000 per *Athlete* in addition to all of IPF costs incurred in *Testing* that *National Federation's Athletes*.

**12.4** Failure to pay fines, Participation

If any of the above fines are imposed the offending national federation shall not participate in any *International Event* until the fine is paid.

Fines imposed under this article shall be paid within 60 days of invoicing and if not so paid within 60 days the *National Federation* shall be suspended from participation in any IPF activities from that 60<sup>th</sup> day up until the time the fine is paid to the IPF.

## **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 IPF or its *National federation's* process, WADA may appeal such decision directly to CAS without having to exhaust other remedies in the IPF or its *National Federation's* process.

### **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 IPF or its *National Federation* lacks jurisdiction to rule on an alleged anti-doping rule violation or its *Consequences*; a decision by any *National Federation* not to bring forward an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or an *Atypical Finding* as an anti-doping rule violation, or a decision not to go forward with an anti-doping rule violation after an investigation under Article 7.4; and a decision to impose a *Provisional Suspension* as a result of a *Provisional Hearing* or otherwise in violation of Article 7.4] 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 participation 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** Appeals involving National-Level *Athletes*

In cases involving *Athletes* who do not have a right to appeal under Article 13.2.1, each *National Federation* shall have in place an appeal procedure that respects the following principles: a timely hearing, a fair and impartial hearing panel; the right to be represented by a counsel at the person's expense; and a timely, written, reasoned decision. IPF's rights of appeal with respect to these cases are set forth in Article 13.2.3 below.

#### **13.2.3** *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) the IPF 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.

In cases under Article 13.2.2, the parties having the right to appeal to the national-level reviewing body shall be as provided in the *National Federation's* rules but, at a minimum, shall include the following parties:

- (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) the IPF; and
- (d) WADA.

For cases under Article 13.2.2, WADA and the IPF shall also have the right to appeal to CAS with respect to the decision of the national-level reviewing body.

### **13.3 Failure to Render a Timely Decision by the IPF and its *National Federations***

Where, in a particular case, the IPF or its *National Federations* fail 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 the IPF or its *National Federations* 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 the IPF or its *National Federations*.

*[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 the IPF to render a decision before WADA may intervene by appealing directly to CAS. Before taking such action, however, WADA will consult with the IPF and give the IPF an opportunity to explain why it has not yet rendered a decision. Nothing in this rule prohibits the IPF from also having rules which authorize it to assume jurisdiction for matters in which the results management performed by one of its National Federations has been inappropriately delayed.]*

### **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*, the IPF, or *National Anti-Doping Organization* or other body designated by a *National Federation* which granted or denied the exemption. Decisions to deny TUE's, and which are not reversed by WADA, may be appealed by *International-Level Athletes* to CAS and by other *Athletes* to the national level reviewing body described in Article 13.2.2. If the national level reviewing body reverses the decision to deny a TUE, that decision may be appealed to CAS by WADA. When the IPF, *National Anti-Doping Organizations* or other bodies designated by *National Federations* fail 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 the IPF 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.

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 THE IPF RULES, REPORTING AND RECOGNITION**

### **14.1 Incorporation of the IPF Anti-Doping Rules**

All *National Federations* shall comply with these Anti-Doping Rules. These Anti-Doping Rules shall also be incorporated either directly or by reference into each *National Federations* Rules. All *National Federations* shall include in their regulations the procedural rules necessary to effectively implement these Anti-Doping Rules. Each *National Federation* shall obtain the written acknowledgement and agreement, in the form attached as Appendix 2, of all *Athletes* subject to *Doping Control* and *Athlete Support Personnel* for such *Athletes*. Notwithstanding whether or not the required form has been signed, the Rules of each *National Federation* shall specifically provide that all *Athletes*, *Athlete Support Personnel* and other *Persons* under the jurisdiction of the *National Federation* shall be bound by these Anti-Doping Rules.

### **14.2 Statistical Reporting**

**14.2.1** National Federations shall report to the IPF (President) not later than 31<sup>st</sup> of March each year results of all *Doping Controls* within their jurisdiction during the previous calendar year sorted by *Athlete* and identifying each date on which the *Athlete* was tested, the entity conducting the test, and whether the test was *In-Competition* or *Out-of-Competition*. The IPF may periodically publish *Testing* data received from *National Federations* as well as comparable data from *Testing* under the IPF's jurisdiction. A failure to report such results by 31<sup>st</sup> of March, will be fined with Euro 500. The national federation is suspended until the fine is paid and the national report is provided.

The regional federations collect all reports and send them latest 15<sup>th</sup> of April to the IPF.

**14.2.2** The IPF shall publish annually a general statistical report of its Doping Control activities during the calendar year with a copy provided to WADA.

### **14.3 Doping Control Information Clearinghouse**

When a *National Federation* has received an *Adverse Analytical Finding* on one of its *Athletes* it shall report the following information to the IPF and WADA within fourteen (14) days of the process described in Article 7.1: the *Athlete's* name, country, sport and discipline within the sport, whether the test was *In-Competition* or *Out-of-Competition*, the date of *Sample* collection and the analytical result reported by the laboratory. The *National Federation* shall also regularly update the IPF and WADA on the status and findings of any review or proceedings conducted pursuant to Article 7 (*Results Management*), Article 8 (*Right to a Fair Hearing*) or Article 13 (*Appeals*), and comparable information shall be provided to the IPF and WADA within 14 days of the notification described in Article 7.1.9, with respect to other violations of these Anti-Doping Rules. In any case in which the period of *Ineligibility* is eliminated under Article 10.5.1 (*No Fault or Negligence*) or reduced under Article 10.5.2 (*No Significant Fault or Negligence*), the IPF and WADA shall be provided with a written reasoned decision explaining the basis for the elimination or reduction. Neither the IPF nor WADA shall disclose this information beyond those persons within their organisations with a need to know until the *National Federation* has made public disclosure or has failed to make public disclosure as required in Article 14.4 below.

## **14.4 Public Disclosure**

**14.4.1** Neither the IPF nor its *National Federation* shall 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. Once a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules has been established, it shall be publicly reported within 20 days. IPF or its *National Federation* must also report within 20 days appeal decisions on an anti-doping rule violation. IPF or its *National Federation* shall also, within the time period for publication, send all hearing and appeal decisions to WADA.

**14.4.2** 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. IPF or its *National Federation* 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.

**14.4.3** Neither the IPF 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.

## **14.5 Recognition of Decisions by the IPF and National Federations**

Any decision of the IPF or a *National Federation* regarding a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules shall be recognized by all *National Federations*, which shall take all necessary action to render such results effective.

## **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 the IPF and its *National Federations*. IPF and its *National Federations* 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, the IPF or its National Federation 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 the IPF or its National Federation 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 against 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 IPF COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO WADA**

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

## **ARTICLE 18 AMENDMENTS AND INTERPRETATION OF ANTI-DOPING RULES**

- 18.1** These Anti-Doping Rules may be amended from time to time by the *IPF* 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 the IPF 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. Unless otherwise stated by the IPF, 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 the IPF and a National Federation 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 the IPF 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 the IPF for a reduction in the period of *Ineligibility* in light to

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*, WADA, International Federations, and *National Anti-Doping Organizations*.

Athlete. Any *Person* who participates in sport at the international level (as defined by each International Federation), the national level (as defined by each *National Anti-Doping Organization*, 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 and national-level competitors. Some *National Anti-Doping Organizations* may elect to test and apply anti-doping rules to recreational-level or masters competitors who are not current or potential national caliber competitors. *National Anti-Doping Organizations* are not required, however, to apply all aspects of the *Code* to such *Persons*. Specific national rules may be established for Doping Control for non-international-level or national-level competitors without being in conflict with the *Code*. Thus, a country could elect to test recreational-level competitors but not require TUE's or whereabouts information. In the same manner, a *Major Event Organization* holding an *Event* only for masters-level competitors could elect to test the competitors but not require advance TUE or whereabouts information. 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 and national-caliber athletes are subject to the anti-doping rules of the Code, with the precise definitions of international and national level sport to be set forth in the anti-doping rules of the IPF and National Anti-Doping Organizations, respectively. At the national level, anti-doping rules adopted pursuant to the Code shall apply, at a minimum, to all persons on national teams and all persons qualified to compete in any national championship in any sport. That does not mean, however, that all such Athletes must be included in a National Anti-Doping Organization's Registered Testing Pool. The definition also allows each National Anti-Doping Organization, if it chooses to do so, to expand its anti-doping control program beyond national-caliber athletes to competitors at lower levels of competition. 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 the IPF as the entity governing the IPF'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 the IPF and *National Anti-Doping Organization* who are subject to both *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition Testing* as part of the IPF or *National Anti-Doping Organization'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 4.4.4.

UNESCO Convention. The International Convention against Doping in Sport adopted by the 33<sup>rd</sup> 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 \_\_\_\_\_ Federation and/ or a participant in a \_\_\_\_\_ or IPF  
National Federation National Federation  
authorized or recognized event, hereby acknowledge and agree as follows:

1. I have received and had an opportunity to review the IPF Anti-Doping Rules.
2. I consent and agree to comply with and be bound by all of the provisions of the IPF 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 \_\_\_\_\_ and the IPF have jurisdiction to  
National Federation  
impose Sanctions as provided in the IPF Anti-Doping Rules.
4. I also acknowledge and agree that any dispute arising out of a decision made pursuant to the IPF Anti-Doping Rules, after exhaustion of the process expressly provided for in the IPF Anti-Doping Rules, may be appealed exclusively as provided in Article 13 of the IPF 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)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Received

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date and Place

\_\_\_\_\_  
Official's Signature (IPF)

### **APPENDIX 3 - Criteria for Inclusion in The IPF Registered Testing Pool**

The purpose of the IPF Registered Testing Pool is to identify top-level International Lifters in both Powerlifting and Bench Press who the IPF requires to provide up-to-date whereabouts information to facilitate Out-of-Competition Testing by the IPF and WADA.

Lifters may be included in the IPF Registered Testing Pool in accordance with the following criteria/principles:

- 1 Top-level International Lifters, men and women, based on their placing in the IPF World Rankings from the current calendar year and/or preceding calendar year as appropriate;
  - 2 Medallists from the previous year's World Championships and other International Events;
  - 3 Lifters whose performances have dramatically improved over a short period of time;
  - 4 Lifters serving periods of ineligibility who want to regain their eligibility at the end of ineligibility;
  - 5 Lifters who are returning from a period of retirement;
  - 6 Lifters whom the IPF wishes to target for Testing;
  - 7 Every National Federation shall report to the IPF President; Detlev Albrings, Lerchenauer Str. 124a, 80809 Munich, Germany, Fax: +49 89 35732243, Email: [albrings@t-online.de](mailto:albrings@t-online.de), name and address of every Lifter whose result at national championships within the current calendar year is better than or equal to the tenth (10<sup>th</sup>) best result of his or her bodyweight class in the IPF World Ranking from the preceding calendar year whether in Powerlifting or Bench Press.
- Decision for the number of lifters to be included in the IPF Registered Testing Pool is to be made by the IPF Anti-Doping Commission upon consult with the Executive Committee.
  - Based on the above-mentioned criteria, the IPF Anti-Doping Commission selects the lifters who are included in the IPF Registered Testing Pool.
  - The IPF Registered Testing Pool shall be reviewed and updated by the IPF Anti-Doping Commission on a regular basis.

As a minimum the following Athlete whereabouts information are collected from the lifters (and kept updated by the lifters) in the IPF Registered Testing Pool;

- Athlete Name
- Sport/discipline
- Mailing address
- Home address and times Athlete is usually at home
- For each day, one specific 60-minute time-slot where he/she will be available at a specific location for Testing
- Work location and times
- Training times and venues
- Training camps, with addresses
- Travel plans
- Competition schedule
- Temporary residence, including address (e.g. hotel address)
- Disability, if applicable, including the requirement for third party involvement in notification
- Once an Athlete has been named to the IPF Registered Testing Pool, the IPF President shall communicate this fact immediately to the Athlete, and inform him/her of the resultant responsibilities, including at a minimum with regard to TUEs and (in accordance with Articles 5.5 through 5.9.6, as applicable, of the IPF Anti-Doping Rules and clause 11 of the International Standard for Testing) with regard to declaring his/her whereabouts for Testing purposes.

## **APPENDIX 4 - Standards for Testing, Guideline for Sample Collection**

### **1 Requirements for selection of Athletes for Testing**

**1.1** In accordance with the number of Sample collections allocated to Out-of Competition control in each year by the Executive Committee, the Anti-Doping Commission shall select Athletes for Sample collection using Target Testing and Random Selection methods.

**1.2** The IPF shall ensure that a significant amount of Testing undertaken pursuant to the Test Distribution Plan is Target Testing, based on the intelligent assessment of the risk of doping and the most effective use of resources to ensure optimum detection and deterrence. The factors that will be relevant to determining who should be made the subject of Target Testing could include (without limitation) some or all of the following factors:

- a) Abnormal biological parameters (blood parameters, steroid profiles, etc);
- b) Injury;
- c) Withdrawal or absence from expected Competition;
- d) Going into or coming out of retirement;
- e) Behaviour indicating doping;
- f) Sudden major improvements in performance;
- g) Repeated failure to provide Athlete Whereabouts Filings;
- h) Whereabouts Filings that can indicate a potential increase in the risk of doping, including moving to a remote location;
- i) Athlete sport performance history;
- j) Athlete age, e.g. approaching retirement, move from junior to senior level;
- k) Athlete test history;
- l) Athlete reinstatement after a period of Ineligibility;
- m) Financial incentives for improved performance, such as prize money or sponsorship opportunities;
- n) Athlete association with a third party such as coach or doctor with history of involvement in doping; and
- o) Reliable information from a third party.

**1.3** Testing which is not Target Testing shall be determined by Random Selection, which shall be conducted using a documented system for such selection. Random Selection which is weighted shall be conducted according to clear criteria and may take into account the factors listed in Clause 1.2 above (as applicable) in order to ensure that a great percentage of 'at risk' Athletes is selected.

**1.4** As set out in Clause 11.2 of the International Standard for Testing:

- a) In addition to developing a Test Distribution Plan specific to the sport of Powerlifting, the IPF must define criteria for the inclusion of certain Athletes from its sport in an international Registered Testing Pool, to whom the whereabouts requirements of Section 11 of the International Standard for Testing will apply. For the avoidance of doubt, however, the IPF's Test Distribution Plan must encompass all relevant Athletes, not just Athletes included in the international Registered Testing Pool, and accordingly the IPF should select Athletes for Testing (including Out-of-Competition Testing) who are not included in its international Registered Testing Pool. However, an appropriate proportion of the Out-of-Competition tests specified in the Test Distribution Plan must be conducted on Athletes in the international Registered Testing Pool.
- b) In addition to developing a Test Distribution Plan that allocates its Testing resources among some or all the sports within its jurisdiction, NADO must identify criteria for the inclusion of certain Athletes from the sport of Powerlifting in a national Registered Testing Pool, to whom the whereabouts requirements of Section 11 of the International Standard

for Testing will apply. For the avoidance of doubt, however, the NADO's Test Distribution Plan must encompass all relevant Athletes from the sport of Powerlifting, not just Athletes included in the national Registered Testing Pool, and accordingly the NADO should select Athletes for Testing (including Out-of-Competition Testing) who are not included in the national Registered Testing Pool. However, where Athletes from the sport of Powerlifting, have been included in the national Registered Testing Pool, an appropriate proportion of the Out-of-Competition tests allocated to that sport in the NADO's test distribution plan must be conducted on those Athletes.

*[Comment: As further explained in Section 11 of the International Standard for Testing (IST), the main purpose of the Registered Testing Pool is to identify those Athletes from the relevant sport(s) who should be made subject to the whereabouts requirements of Section 11 of the IST. That decision will depend principally on an evaluation of the risk of Out-of-Competition doping in the sport(s) or discipline(s) in question: the greater that risk, the larger the Registered Testing Pool should be; the smaller that risk, the smaller the Registered Testing Pool can be. Accordingly, the number of Athletes in a Registered Testing Pool may vary considerably from sport to sport. In accordance with Clause 11.2 of the IST, however, there are certain minimum requirements for populating Registered Testing Pools, and pursuant to Clause 4.4.4 of the IST an appropriate number of the Out-of-Competition tests specified in the Test Distribution Plan must be carried out on Athletes in the Registered Testing Pool.*

*In the case of a NADO, the relevant sports for purposes of Clause 4.4.4(b) of the IST shall be those sports within its jurisdiction that it decides, based on the national policy requirements and priorities referenced in Clause 4.3.1 of the IST, as well as the risk assessment and other factors referred to in Clause 4.3.3 of the IST, to treat as "priority" sports for purposes of Out-of-Competition Testing. Based on those factors, a NADO may decide not to include any Athletes from a particular sport or sports in the national Registered Testing Pool. That decision should be reviewed regularly in accordance with Clause 4.3.11 of the IST. However, where the NADO does decide to include Athletes from a particular sport in the national Registered Testing Pool, an appropriate number of the Out-of-Competition tests allocated to that sport in the Test Distribution Plan must be conducted on those Athletes.]*

**1.5** Where the IPF or NADO authorizes a Doping Control Officer (DCO) to select Athletes for Sample collection, the IPF or NADO (as applicable) shall provide selection criteria to the DCO in accordance with the test distribution plan.

**1.6** Following the selection of an Athlete for Sample collection and prior to notification of the Athlete, the decision to select the Athlete for Testing shall be disclosed only to those who need to know in order to ensure that the Athlete can be notified and tested on a No Advance Notice basis.

1.6.1 For In-Competition Testing, placeholder selection may be known in advance. However, random Athlete/placeholder selection shall not be revealed to Athlete until notification.

1.6.2 All Out-of-Competition Testing shall be No Advance Notice save in exceptional and justifiable circumstances.

1.6.3 The IPF and NADOs shall ensure that the timing of Testing is planned to ensure optimum deterrence and detection of doping practices.

## **2 Notification of Athletes**

### **2.1 Objective**

The objective is to ensure that reasonable attempts are made to locate the Athlete, the selected Athlete is notified as outlined in Clause 3.1, the rights of the Athlete are maintained, there are no opportunities to manipulate the Sample to be provided, and the notification is documented.

## **2.2 General**

Notification of Athletes starts when the IPF or relevant NADO initiates the notification of the selected Athlete and ends when the Athlete arrives at the Doping Control Station or when the Athlete's possible failure to comply is brought to the IPF's or relevant NADO's attention.

2.2.1 The main activities are:

- a) Appointment of DCO's, Chaperones and other Sample Collection Personnel;
- b) Locating the Athlete and confirming his/her identity;
- c) Informing the Athlete that he/she has been selected to provide a Sample and of his/her rights and responsibilities;
- d) For No Advance Notice Sample collection, continuously chaperoning the Athlete from the time of notification to the arrival at the designated Doping Control Station; and
- e) Documenting the notification, or notification attempt.

## **2.3 Requirements prior to notification of Athletes**

2.3.1 Other than by exception, No Advance Notice shall be the notification method for Sample collection.

2.3.2 To conduct or assist with Sample Collection Sessions, the IPF or NADO, as applicable, shall appoint and authorise Sample Collection Personnel who have been trained for their assigned responsibilities, who do not have a conflict of interest in the outcome of the Sample collection, and who are not Minors.

2.3.3 Sample Collection Personnel shall have official authorisation documentation that is provided and controlled by the IPF or by other relevant Organization which has been delegated to conduct the Testing. In the case of DCOs, such documentation shall identify them by name. DCOs shall also carry complementary identification which includes their name and photograph (i.e. the IPF or other relevant Organization identification card, driver's licence, health card, passport or similar valid identification) and expiry date of the identification.

*[Comment: Chaperones do not have to carry documentation that identifies them by name or photograph. They only have to produce official authorisation documentation that is provided by the ADO, such as a Mission Order or an Authorisation Letter.]*

2.3.4 The Athlete selected to provide a Sample must show his/her identification whether by passport or other reliable identification card. This ensures the selected Athlete is the Athlete who is notified. The method of identification of the Athlete shall be recorded on the doping control documentation.

2.3.5 The IPF, NADO, DCO or Chaperone, as applicable, shall establish the location of the selected Athlete and plan the approach and timing of notification, taking into consideration the specific circumstances of the sport of Powerlifting/Competition/training session/etc. and the situation in question.

2.3.6 The Athlete shall be the first one notified that he/she has been selected for Sample collection except where prior contact with a third party is required as specified in Clause 2.3.7.

2.3.7 The IPF/NADO/DCO/Chaperone, as applicable, shall consider whether a third party is required to be notified prior to notification of the Athlete when the Athlete is a Minor as provided for in WADA International Standard for Testing -

Annex C - Modifications for Athletes who are Minors), or where required by an Athlete's disability as provided for in WADA International Standard for Testing – Annex B - Modifications for Athletes with disabilities), or in situations where an interpreter is required and available for the notification.

*[Comment: In the case of In-Competition Testing, it is permissible to notify third parties that Testing will be conducted, where required to help the Sample Collection Personnel to identify the Athlete(s) to be tested and to notify such Athlete(s) that he/she is required to provide a Sample. However, there is no requirement to notify any third party (e.g. a team doctor) of the Doping Control mission where such assistance is not needed.]*

### **3 Requirements for notification of Athletes**

**3.1** When initial contact is made, the IPF, NADO, DCO or Chaperone, as applicable, shall ensure that the Athlete and/or a third party if required in accordance with Clause 2.3.7, is informed:

- a) That the Athlete is required to undergo a Sample collection;
- b) Of the authority under which the Sample collection is to be conducted;
- c) Of the type of Sample collection and any conditions that need to be adhered to prior to the Sample collection;
- d) Of the Athletes rights, including the right to:
  - i. Have a representative and, if available, an interpreter;
  - ii. Ask for additional information about the Sample collection process;
  - iii. Request a delay in reporting to the Doping Control Station for valid reasons; and
  - iv. Request modifications as provided for in WADA International Standard for Testing - Annex B - Modifications for Athletes with disabilities.
- e) Of the Athlete's responsibilities, including the requirements to:
  - i. Remain within direct observation of the DCO/Chaperone at all times from the point of notification by the DCO/Chaperone until the completion of the Sample collection procedure;
  - ii. Produce identification in accordance with Clause 2.3.4, and
  - iii. Comply with Sample collection procedures (the Athlete should be advised of the possible consequences of Failure to Comply); and
  - iv. Report immediately for a test, unless there are valid reasons for a delay, as determined in accordance with Clause 3.4.
- f) Of the location of the Doping Control Station.
- g) That should the Athlete choose to consume food or fluids prior to providing a Sample, he/she does so at his/her own risk, and should in any event avoid excessive rehydration, having in mind the requirement to produce a Sample with a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.
- h) That the Sample provided by the Athlete to the Sample Collection Personnel should be the first urine passed by the Athlete subsequent to notification, i.e., he/she should not pass urine in the shower or otherwise prior to providing a Sample to the Sample Collection Personnel.

**3.2** When contact is made, the DCO/Chaperone shall:

- a) From this time until the Athlete leaves the Doping Control Station at the end of his/her Sample Collection Session, keep the Athlete under observation at all times;

- b) Identify themselves to the Athlete using the documentation referred to in Clause 2.3.3.
- c) Confirm the Athlete's identity as per the criteria established in Clause 2.3.4. Confirmation of the Athlete's identity by any other method, or failure to confirm the identity of the Athlete shall be documented and reported to the IPF or other relevant ADO, as applicable.
- d) In cases where the Athlete's identity cannot be confirmed as per the criteria established in Clause 2.3.4, the IPF or other relevant ADO, as applicable, shall decide whether it is appropriate to follow up in accordance with WADA International Standard for Testing - Annex A - Investigating a possible failure to comply.

**3.3** The Chaperone/DCO shall then have the Athlete sign an appropriate form to acknowledge and accept the notification. If the Athlete refuses to sign that he/she has been notified, or evades the notification, the Chaperone/DCO shall if possible inform the Athlete of the consequences of refusing or failing to comply, and the Chaperone (if not the DCO) shall immediately report all relevant facts to the DCO. When possible the DCO shall continue to collect a Sample. The DCO shall document the facts in a detailed report and report the circumstances to the IPF (or to the relevant ADO which initiated the Test). The ADO shall follow the steps prescribed in WADA International Standard for Testing - Annex A - Investigating a Possible Failure to Comply.

**3.4** The DCO/Chaperone shall consider any reasonable third party requirement or any request by the Athlete for permission to delay reporting to the Doping Control Station following acknowledgement and acceptance of notification, and/or to leave the Doping Control Station temporarily after arrival, and may grant such permission if the Athlete can be continuously chaperoned and kept under direct observation during the delay and if the request relates to the following activities:

For In-Competition Testing:

- a) Participation in a victory ceremony;
- b) Fulfilment of media commitments;
- c) Performing a warm down;
- d) Obtaining necessary medical treatment;
- e) Locating a representative and/or interpreter;
- f) Obtaining photo identification; or
- g) Any other exceptional circumstances which may be justified, and which shall be documented.

For Out-of-Competition Testing:

- a) Locating a representative;
- b) Completing a training session;
- c) Receiving necessary medical treatment;
- d) Obtaining photo identification;
- e) Any other exceptional circumstances which may be justified, and which shall be documented.

**3.5** The DCO or other authorised Sample Collection Personnel shall document any reasons for delay in reporting to the Doping Control Station and/or reasons for leaving the Doping Control Station that may require further investigation by the IPF (or other relevant ADO initiating the Testing). Any failure of the Athlete to remain under constant observation should also be recorded.

**3.6** A DCO/Chaperone shall reject a request for delay from an Athlete if it will not be possible for the Athlete to be continuously chaperoned.

**3.7** If the Athlete delays reporting to the Doping Control Station other than in accordance with Clause 3.4 but arrives prior to the DCO's departure, the DCO shall decide whether to

process a possible Failure to Comply. If at all possible the DCO shall proceed with collecting a Sample, and shall document the details of the delay in the Athlete reporting to the Doping Control Station.

**3.8** If, while keeping the Athlete under observation, Sample Collection Personnel observe any matter with potential to compromise the test, the circumstances shall be reported and documented by the DCO. If deemed appropriate by the DCO, the DCO shall follow the requirements of WADA International Standard for Testing - Annex A - Investigating a Possible Failure to Comply, and/or consider if it is appropriate to collect an additional sample from the Athlete.

## **4 Preparing for the Sample Collection Session**

### **4.1 Objective**

To prepare for the Sample Collection Session in a manner that ensures that the session can be conducted efficiently and effectively.

## **5 Requirements for preparing for the Sample Collection Session**

**5.1** The DCO shall use a Doping Control Station which, at a minimum, ensures the Athlete's privacy and where possible is used solely as a Doping Control Station for the duration of the Sample Collection Session. The DCO shall record any significant deviations from these criteria.

**5.2** The IPF's criteria for who may be authorised to present during the Sample Collection Session in addition to the Sample Collection Personnel includes at a minimum the following:

- a) An Athlete's entitlement to be accompanied by a representative and/or interpreter during the Sample Collection Session except when the Athlete is passing a urine Sample;
- b) A Minor Athlete's entitlement (as provided for in the International Standard for Testing - Annex C - Modifications for Athletes who are Minors), and the witnessing DCO/Chaperone's entitlement to have a representative observe the witnessing DCO/Chaperone when the Minor Athlete is passing a urine Sample, but without the representative directly observing the passing of the Sample unless requested to do so by the Minor Athlete;
- c) The entitlement of an Athlete with a disability to be accompanied by a representative as provided for in WADA International Standard for Testing - Annex B - Modifications for Athletes with disabilities;
- d) A WADA Independent Observer where applicable under the Independent Observer Program. The WADA Independent Observer shall not directly observe the passing of a urine Sample;
- e) The news media shall not be admitted to the Doping Control Station. The doors of the station must not be left open. No photography shall be permitted in the Doping control station during the hours of operation.

**5.3** Sample Collection Equipment shall, as a minimum, meet the following criteria. They shall:

- a) Have a unique numbering system incorporated into all bottles, containers, tubes or any other item used to seal the Sample;
- b) Have a sealing system that is tamper evident;
- c) Ensure the identity of the Athlete is not evident from the equipment itself; and
- d) Ensure that all equipment is clean and sealed prior to use by the Athlete.

## **6 Conducting the Sample Collection Session**

### **6.1 Objective**

The Sample Collection Session shall be conducted in a manner that ensures the integrity, security and identity of the Sample and respects the privacy of the Athlete.

### **6.2 General**

The Sample Collection Session starts with defining overall responsibility for the conduct of the Sample Collection Session and ends once the Sample collection documentation is complete.

The main activities are:

- a) Preparing for collecting the Sample;
- b) Collecting and securing the Sample; and
- c) Documenting the Sample collection.

### **6.3 Requirements prior Sample collection**

- 6.3.1 The IPF when initiated the Testing shall be responsible for the overall conduct of the Sample Collection Session with specific responsibilities delegated to the DCO.
- 6.3.2 The DCO shall ensure that the Athlete is informed of his/her rights and responsibilities as specified in Clause 3.1.
- 6.3.3 The DCO shall provide the Athlete with the opportunity to hydrate. The Athlete should avoid excessive rehydration, having in mind the requirement to provide a Sample with a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.
- 6.3.4 The Athlete shall only leave the Doping Control Station under continuous observation by the DCO/Chaperone and with the approval of the DCO. The DCO shall consider any reasonable request by the Athlete to leave the Doping Control Station, as specified in Clauses 3.5 and 3.6, until the Athlete is able to provide a Sample.
- 6.3.5 If the DCO gives approval for the Athlete to leave the Doping Control Station, the DCO shall agree with the Athlete on the following conditions of leave:
  - a) The purpose of the Athlete leaving the Doping Control Station; and
  - b) The time of return (or return upon completion of an agreed activity); and
  - c) That the athlete must remain under observation at all times; and
  - d) That the Athlete shall not pass urine until he/she gets back to the Doping Control Station; and

The DCO shall document the actual time of the Athlete's departure and return.

### **6.4 Requirements for Sample collection**

- 6.4.1 The DCO shall collect the Sample from the Athlete according to the following protocol/s for the specific type of Sample collection:
  - a) International Standard for Testing - Annex D: Collection of urine Samples.
  - b) International Standard for Testing - Annex E: Collection of blood Samples.
- 6.4.2 Any behaviour by the Athlete and/or persons associated with the Athlete or anomalies with potential to compromise the Sample collection shall be recorded in detail by the DCO. If appropriate, the IPF shall institute the

International Standard for Testing - Annex A - Investigating a possible Failure to Comply.

- 6.4.3 If there are doubts as to the origin or authenticity of the Sample, the Athlete shall be asked to provide an additional Sample. If the Athlete refuses to provide an additional Sample, the DCO shall document in detail the circumstances around the refusal, and the IPF shall institute the International Standard for Testing - Annex A - Investigating a possible Failure to Comply.
- 6.4.4 The DCO shall provide the Athlete with opportunity to document any concerns he/she may have about how the Sample Collection Session was conducted.
- 6.4.5 In conducting the Sample Collection Session the following information shall be recorded as a minimum:
- a) Date, time and type of notification (No-Advance Notice **or** advance notice;
  - b) Arrival time at Doping Control Station;
  - c) Date and time of Sample provision;
  - d) The name of the Athlete;
  - e) The date of birth of the Athlete;
  - f) The gender of the Athlete;
  - g) The Athlete's home address and telephone number;
  - h) The Athlete's sport and discipline;
  - i) The name of the Athlete's coach and doctor;
  - j) The Sample code number;
  - k) **The type of the Sample (urine, blood, etc.);**
  - l) **The type of the test (In-Competition or Out-of Competition);**
  - m) The name and signature of the witnessing DCO/Chaperone;
  - n) The name and signature of the Blood Collection Officer (where applicable);
  - o) Required laboratory information on the Sample;
  - p) Medications and supplements taken and recent blood transfusion details (if applicable), within the timeframe specified by the laboratory, as declared by the Athlete;
  - q) Any irregularities in procedures;
  - r) Athlete comments or concerns regarding the conduct of the Sample Collection Session, if provided;
  - s) Athlete consent for the processing of test data in ADAMS;
  - t) Athlete consent or otherwise for use of the Sample(s) for research purposes;
  - u) The name and signature of the Athlete's representative (if applicable) as per Clause 6.4.6; ~~and~~
  - v) The name and signature of the Athlete; ~~and~~
  - w) The name and signature of the DCO;
  - x) **The name of the Testing Authority; and**
  - y) **The name of the Sample Collection Authority.**
- 6.4.6 At the conclusion of the Sample Collection Session the Athlete and DCO shall sign appropriate documentation to indicate their satisfaction that the documentation accurately reflects the details of the Athlete's Sample Collection Session, including any concerns recorded by the Athlete. The Athlete's representative (if any) and the Athlete shall both sign the documentation if the Athlete is a Minor. Other persons present who had a formal role during the Athlete's Sample Collection Session may sign the documentation as a witness of the proceedings.
- 6.4.7 The DCO shall provide the Athlete with a copy of the records of the Sample Collection Session that have been signed by the Athlete, and

- a) the original to be retained by or sent to the IPF (President);
- b) a special copy, that shall not identify the Athlete, to be sent to the laboratory which is to conduct the analysis.
- c) a copy to be retained by the relevant testing authority.

## **7 Collection of urine Samples**

### **7.1 Objective**

To collect an Athlete's urine Sample in a manner that ensures:

- b) Consistency with relevant principles of internationally recognised standard precautions in healthcare settings so that the health and safety of the Athlete and Sample Collection Personnel are not compromised;
- c) The Sample meets the Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis and the Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis. Failure of a Sample to meet these requirements in no way invalidates the suitability of the Sample for analysis. The determination of a Sample's suitability for analysis is the decision of the relevant laboratory, in consultation with the IPF.
- d) The Sample has not been manipulated, substituted, contaminated or otherwise tampered with any way.
- e) The Sample is clearly and accurately identified; and
- f) The Sample is securely sealed in a tamper-evident kit.

### **7.2 Scope**

The collection of a urine Sample begins with ensuring the Athlete is informed of the Sample collection requirements and ends with discarding any residual urine remaining at the end of the Athlete's Sample Collection Session.

### **7.3 Responsibility**

The DCO has the responsibility for ensuring that each Sample is properly collected, identified and sealed.

The DCO/Chaperone has the responsibility for directly witnessing the passing of the urine Sample.

### **7.4 Requirements**

- 7.4.1 The DCO shall ensure that the Athlete is informed of the requirements of the requirements of the Sample Collection Session, including any modifications as provided for in the International Standard for Testing - Annex B - Modifications for Athletes with disabilities.
- 7.4.2 The DCO shall ensure that the Athlete is offered a choice of appropriate equipment for collecting the Sample. If the nature of an Athlete's disability requires that he/she must use additional or other equipment as provided for in the International Standard for Testing - Annex B - Modifications for Athletes with disabilities, the DCO shall inspect that equipment to ensure that it will not affect the identity or integrity of the Sample.
- 7.4.3 The DCO shall instruct the Athlete to select a collection vessel.
- 7.4.4 When the Athlete selects a collection vessel and for selection of all other Sample Collection Equipment that directly holds the urine Sample, the DCO will instruct the Athlete to check that all seals on the selected equipment are intact and the equipment has not been tampered with. If the Athlete is not

satisfied with the selected equipment, he/she may select another. If the Athlete is not satisfied with any of the equipment available for selection, this shall be recorded by the DCO.

If the DCO does not agree with the Athlete that all of the equipment available for the selection is unsatisfactory, the DCO shall instruct the Athlete to proceed with the Sample Collection Session.

If the DCO agrees with the Athlete that all of the equipment available for the selection is unsatisfactory, the DCO shall terminate the collection of the Athlete's urine Sample and this shall be recorded by the DCO.

- 7.4.5 The Athlete shall retain control of the collection vessel and any Sample provided until the Sample is sealed, unless assistance is required by an Athlete's disability as provided for in the International Standard for Testing - Annex B - Modifications for Athletes with disabilities. Additional assistance may be provided in exceptional circumstances to any Athlete by the Athlete's representative or Sample Collection Personnel during the Sample Collection Session where authorised by the Athlete and agreed to by the DCO.
- 7.4.6 The DCO/Chaperone who witnesses the passing of the Sample shall be the same gender as the Athlete providing the Sample.
- 7.4.7 The DCO/Chaperone should where practicable ensure the Athlete thoroughly washes his or her hands prior to the provision of the Sample.
- 7.4.8 The DCO/Chaperone and Athlete shall proceed to an area of privacy to collect a Sample.
- 7.4.9 The DCO/Chaperone shall ensure an unobstructed view of the Sample leaving the Athlete's body and must continue to observe the Sample after provision until the Sample is securely sealed, and the DCO/Chaperone shall record the witnessing in writing. In order to ensure a clear and unobstructed view of the passing of the Sample, the DCO/Chaperone shall instruct the Athlete to remove or adjust clothing which restricts the clear view of Sample provision. Once the Sample has been provided, the DCO/Chaperone shall ensure that no additional volume is passed by the athlete at the time of provision, which could have been secured in the collection vessel.
- 7.4.10 The DCO shall verify, in full view of the Athlete, that the Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis has been provided.
- 7.4.11 Where the volume of urine is insufficient, the DCO shall conduct a partial Sample collection procedure as prescribed in the International Standard for Testing - Annex F - Urine Samples - insufficient volume.
- 7.4.12 The DCO shall instruct the Athlete to select a Sample collection kit containing A and B bottles in accordance with Clause 7.4.4.
- 7.4.13 Once a Sample collection kit has been selected, the DCO and the Athlete shall check that all code numbers match and that this code number is recorded accurately by the DCO.

If the Athlete or DCO finds that the numbers are not the same, the DCO shall instruct the Athlete to choose another kit in accordance with Clause 7.4.4. The DCO shall record the matter.

- 7.4.14 The Athlete shall pour the minimum Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis into the B bottle (to a minimum of 30 mL), and then pour the remainder of the urine into the A bottle (to a minimum of 60 mL). If more than the minimum Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis has been provided, the DCO shall ensure that the Athlete fills the A bottle to capacity as per the

recommendation of the equipment manufacture. Should there still be urine remaining, the DCO shall ensure that the Athlete fills the B bottle to capacity as per the recommendation of the equipment manufacture. The DCO shall instruct the Athlete to ensure that a small amount of urine is left in the collection vessel, explaining that this is to enable the DCO to test that residual urine in accordance with Clause 7.4.17.

- 7.4.15 Urine should only be discarded when both A and B bottles have been filled to capacity in accordance with Clause 7.4.14, and after the residual urine has been tested in accordance with Clause 7.4.17. The Suitable Volume of Urine for Analysis shall be viewed as an absolute minimum.
- 7.4.16 The Athlete shall seal the bottles as directed by the DCO. The DCO shall check, in full view of the Athlete, that the bottles have been properly sealed.
- 7.4.17 The DCO shall test the residual urine in the collection vessel to determine if the Sample has a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis. If the DCO's field reading indicates that the Sample does not have a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis, then the DCO shall follow the International Standard for Testing - Annex G - Urine Samples that do not meet requirements for Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis.
- 7.4.18 The DCO shall ensure that the Athlete has been given the option of requiring that any residual urine that will not be sent for analysis is discarded in full view of the Athlete.

## **8 Requirements for security/post-test administration**

**8.1** Any Sample shall be stored in a manner that protects its integrity, identity and security prior to transport from the Doping Control Station. The DCO shall ensure that any Sample is stored in accordance with these criteria.

**8.2** The IPF/DCO shall develop a system to ensure that the documentation for each Sample is completed and securely handled.

**8.3** Where required, instructions for the type of analysis to be conducted shall be provided to the WADA-accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by WADA. **In addition, the IPF shall provide the WADA-accredited laboratory with information as required under Clause 6.4.5 f), h), j), k), l), o), p), x) and y) for result reporting and statistical purposes.**

## **9 Transport of Samples and documentation**

### **9.1 Objective**

- a) To ensure that Samples and related documentation arrive at the WADA accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by WADA in proper condition to do the necessary analysis, and
- b) To ensure the Sample Collection Session documentation is sent by the DCO to the IPF (President) in a secure and timely manner.

### **9.2 General**

Transport starts when the Samples and related documentation leave the Doping Control Station and ends with the confirmed receipt of the Samples and Sample Collection Session documentation at their intended destinations.

The main activities are arranging for the secure transport of Samples and related documentation to the WADA accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by WADA, and arranging for the secure transport of Sample Collection Session documentation to the IPF (President).

### **9.3 Requirements for transport and storage of Samples and documentation**

- 9.3.1 A transportation system shall be used that ensures that Samples and documentation will be transported to the laboratory in a manner that protects their integrity, identity and security.
- 9.3.2 Samples shall always be transported to the WADA-accredited laboratory (or as otherwise approved by WADA), using the IPF's authorised transport method, as soon as practicable after the completion of the Sample Collection Session. Samples shall be transported in a manner which minimizes the potential for Sample degradation due to factors such as time delays and extreme temperature variations.

*[9.3.2 Comment: ADOs should discuss transportation requirements for particular missions with the laboratory they are using for analysis of the Samples, to establish what is necessary (e.g., whether refrigeration of freezing of Samples is necessary) in the particular circumstances of such mission(s).]*

- 9.3.3 Documentation identifying the Athlete shall not be included with the Samples or documentation sent to the WADA accredited laboratory or as otherwise approved by WADA.
- 9.3.4 The DCO shall send all relevant Sample Collection Session documentation to the IPF President using the IPF's authorized transport method as soon as practicable after the completion of the Sample Collection Session.
- 9.3.5 Chain of Custody shall be checked by the IPF President if receipt of either the Samples with accompanying documentation or Sample Collection Session documentation is not confirmed at their intended destination or a Sample's integrity or identity may have been compromised during transport. In this instance, the IPF shall consider whether the Sample should be voided.
- 9.3.6 Documentation related to a Sample Collection Session and/or an anti-doping rule violation shall be stored by the IPF for a minimum of 8 years as per *Code* Article 17.
- 9.3.7 Upon request, the IPF shall collect and furnish to WADA, adverse sample profile information to supplement the mandatory provisions of *Code* article 14.1.2. This information regarding the circumstances surrounding Adverse and Atypical findings, shall be determined by WADA and may include, but is not limited to:
- a) The status of Athlete with respect to their Competition level;
  - b) The status of Athlete with respect to whereabouts information;
  - c) The timing of the test relative to training and competition schedules;  
and
  - d) Other such profile information as determined by WADA.

## **10 Ownership of Samples**

**10.1** The ADO which initiates Testing on the Athlete owns the Samples collected from the Athlete.

**10.2** The ADO which initiates Testing on the Athlete may transfer ownership of the Samples to the ADO exercising results management authority in relation to such Testing.

See [www.wada-ama.org](http://www.wada-ama.org) for the most up-to-date *International Standard for Testing* and its Annexes.

See [www.wada-ama.org](http://www.wada-ama.org) for the most up-to-date *Guideline for Urine Sample Collection*.

See [www.wada-ama.org](http://www.wada-ama.org) for the most up-to-date *Guideline for Out-of-Competition Testing*.

## APPENDIX 5 - Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) Application Process

### 1 Criteria for Granting a Therapeutic Use Exemption

A therapeutic use exemption (TUE) may be granted to an *Athlete* permitting the Use of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method*. An application for a TUE will be reviewed by the IPF TUE Panel or NADO.

**1.1** A TUE will be granted only in strict accordance with the following criteria:

- a. The Athlete would experience a significant impairment to health if the *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* were to be withheld in the course of treating an acute or chronic medical condition.
- b. The Therapeutic Use of the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method would produce no additional enhancement of performance other than that which might be anticipated by a return to a state of normal health following the treatment of a legitimate medical condition. The Use of any *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* to increase "low-normal" levels of any endogenous hormone is not considered an acceptable Therapeutic intervention.
- c. There is no reasonable Therapeutic alternative to the Use of the otherwise *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method*.
- d. The necessity for the Use of the otherwise *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* cannot be a consequence, wholly or in part, of the prior Use, without a TUE, of a substance or method which was prohibited at the time of Use.

**1.2** The TUE will be cancelled, if:

- a. The *Athlete* does not promptly comply with any requirements or conditions imposed by the *Anti-Doping Organization* granting the exemption.
- b. The term for which the TUE was granted has expired.
- c. The *Athlete* is advised that the TUE has been withdrawn by the *Anti-Doping Organization*.
- d. A decision granting a TUE has been reversed by WADA or CAS.

*[Comment: Each TUE will have a specified duration upon by the TUEC. There may be cases when a TUE has expired or has been withdrawn and the Prohibited Substance subject to the TUE is still present in the Athlete's body. In such cases, the Anti-Doping Organization conducting the initial review of an Adverse Analytical Finding will consider whether the finding is consistent with expiry or withdrawal of the TUE.]*

**1.3** An application for a TUE will not be considered for retroactive approval except in cases where:

- a. Emergency treatment or treatment of an acute medical condition was necessary, or
- b. Due to exceptional circumstances, there was insufficient time or opportunity for an applicant to submit, or a TUEC to consider, an application prior to Doping Control.

*[Comment: Medical emergencies or acute medical situations requiring administration of an otherwise Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method before an application for a TUE can be made, are uncommon. Similarly, circumstances requiring expedited consideration of an application for a TUE due to imminent competition are infrequent. Anti-Doping Organizations granting TUEs should have internal procedures that permit such situations to be addressed.]*

## 2 Confidentiality of information

- 2.1** The collection, storage, processing, disclosure and retention of Personal Information in the TUE process by *Anti-Doping Organizations* and WADA shall comply with the *International Standard* for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information.
- 2.2** An *Athlete* applying for a TUE shall provide written consent for the transmission of all information pertaining to the application to members of all TUECs with authority under the *Code* to review the file and, as required, other independent medical or scientific experts, and to all necessary staff involved in the management, review or appeal of TUEs, and WADA. The applicant shall also provide written consent for the decision of the TUEC to be distributed to other relevant *Anti-Doping Organizations* and National Federations under the provisions of the *Code*.

[Comment to 2.2: Prior to collecting Personal Information or obtaining consent from an *Athlete*, the *Anti-Doping Organization* shall communicate to the *Athlete* the information set forth in Article 7.1 of the *International Standard* for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information.]

Should the assistance of external, independent experts be required, all details of the application will be circulated without identifying the *Athlete* concerned.

- 2.3** The members of the *TUECs*, *independent experts* and the staff of the Anti-Doping Organization involved, will conduct all of their activities in strict confidence and will sign confidentiality agreements. In particular they will keep the following information confidential:
- a. All medical information and data provided by the *Athlete* and physician(s) involved in the *Athlete's* care.
  - b. All details of the application including the name of the physician(s) involved in the process.

Should the *Athlete* wish to revoke the right of any TUEC to obtain any health information on his/her behalf, the *Athlete* shall notify his/her medical practitioner in writing of the fact. As a consequence of such a decision, the *Athlete* will not receive approval for a TUE or renewal of an existing TUE.

- 2.4** *Anti-Doping Organizations* shall ensure that Personal Information obtained in the TUE process is retained for a period of eight (8) years, and thereafter only for as long as necessary to fulfil their obligations under the *Code* or where otherwise required by applicable law, regulation or compulsory legal process.

## 3 IPF and NADO TUE Panels - WADA TUEC

The IPF and NADO TUE Panels shall be constituted and act in accordance with the following guidelines:

- 3.1** The IPF TUE Panel should include at least three (3) physicians with experience in the care and treatment of *Athletes* and a sound knowledge of clinical, sports and exercise medicine. In order to ensure a level of independence of decisions, the majority of the members of any TUE Panel should be free of conflicts of interest or political responsibility in the *IPF* and/or *National Federation*. All members of the TUE Panel will sign a conflict of interest agreement. In applications involving *Athletes* with disabilities, at least one TUE Panel member must possess specific experience with the care and treatment of *Athletes* with disabilities.
- 3.2** The TUE Panel may seek whatever medical or scientific expertise they deem appropriate in reviewing the circumstances of any application for a TUE.
- 3.3** The WADA TUEC shall be composed following the criteria set out in article 6.1 of the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ISTUE). The WADA TUEC is

established to review the granting or denial of TUEs for International-Level *Athletes*, *Athletes* entered in an International event as described under 7.1(b) of the ISTUE, or *Athletes* in their *National Anti-Doping Organization's Registered Testing Pool* as set forth in Article 4.4 of the *Code*. In normal circumstances, the WADA TUEC shall render a decision within 30 days of receipt of all requested information.

### **3.4 Responsibilities of International Federations and National Anti-Doping Organizations**

See Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of the ISTUE.

## **4 Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) Application Process**

- 4.1** The *Athlete* should submit an application for a TUE no less than thirty (30) days before he/she needs the approval (for instance, an *Event*).
- 4.2** A TUE will only be considered following the receipt of a completed application form that must include all relevant documents (see [www.powerlifting-ipf.com](http://www.powerlifting-ipf.com) where the IPF TUE application form is available). The application process must be dealt with in strict accordance with the principles of medical confidentiality.
- 4.3** The TUE application form(s), as set out in Annex 1 of the ISTUE, see also [www.powerlifting-ipf.com](http://www.powerlifting-ipf.com) , can be modified by the *IPF* or *NADOs* to include additional requests for information, but no sections or items shall be removed.
- 4.4** The TUE application form(s) may be translated into other language(s) by the *IPF* or *NADOs*, but the English or French must remain on the application form(s)
- 4.5** The application shall identify the *Athlete's level of competition (e.g., International Federation Registered Testing Pool), sport and, where appropriate, discipline and specific position or role.*
- 4.6** The application shall list any previous and/or current TUE requests, the body to whom that request was made, the decision of that body, and the decisions of any other body on review or appeal.
- 4.7** The application shall include a comprehensive medical history and the results of all examinations, laboratory investigations and imaging studies relevant to the application. The arguments related to the diagnosis and treatment, as well as duration of validity, should be guided by the *WADA "Medical Information to Support the Decision of TUECs"*.
- 4.8** Any additional relevant investigations, examinations or imaging studies requested by the TUEC of the *Anti-Doping Organization* before approval will be undertaken at the expense of the applicant.

*[Comment to 4.8: In some cases, the applicant's National Federation may elect to pay this expense.]*

- 4.9** The application shall include a statement by an appropriately qualified physician attesting to the necessity of the otherwise *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* in the treatment of the *Athlete* and describing why an alternative, permitted medication cannot, or could not, be used in the treatment of this condition.
- 4.10** The substance or method, dose, frequency, route and duration of administration of the otherwise *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* in question shall be specified. In case of change, a new application should be submitted.
- 4.11** In normal circumstances, decisions of the *NADO* or *IPF TUE Panel* should be completed within thirty (30) days of receipt of all relevant documentation and will be conveyed in writing to the *Athlete* by the relevant *TUE Panel*. In case of a TUE

application made in a reasonable time limit prior to an *Event* the TUE Panel should use its best endeavours to complete the TUE process before the start of the *Event*.

[Comment to 4.11: When an Anti-Doping Organization has failed to act on an Athlete's TUE application within a reasonable time, the Athlete may seek review by WADA as if the application was denied.]

## **5 Review of TUE Decisions by WADA**

- 5.1** The WADA TUEC may, at any time, review the grant of a TUE to an *Athlete* in the International Federation *Registered Testing Pool*, entered in an international event as described in 7.1(b) of the ISTUE, or *National Anti-Doping Organization Registered Testing Pool*. In addition to the information to be provided as set forth in Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of the ISTUE, the WADA TUEC may also seek additional information from the *Athlete*, including further studies as described in Article 8.10 of the ISTUE. If a decision granting a TUE is reversed by WADA upon review, the reversal shall not apply retroactively and shall not disqualify the *Athlete's* results during the period for which the TUE has been granted and shall take effect no later than fourteen (14) days following notification of the decision to the *Athlete*.
- 5.2** An *Athlete* in an International Federation *Registered Testing Pool*, entered in an international event as described in 7.1(b) of the ISTUE, or *National Anti-Doping Organization Registered Testing Pool* may request that WADA review the denial of a TUE by submitting a written request for review to WADA within twenty-one (21) days of the date of the denial. An *Athlete* submitting such a request for review to WADA shall pay an application fee as established by WADA and shall provide to the WADA TUEC copies of all information that the *Athlete* submitted to the *Anti-Doping Organization* in connection with the TUE application. The WADA TUEC will assess the request based on the file that was available to the ADO that has denied the TUE but may, for the sake of clarification, seek additional information from the *Athlete*, including further studies as described in Article 8.10 of the ISTUE. Until the WADA review process has been completed, the original TUE denial remains effect. If WADA reverses the denial of a TUE, the TUE shall immediately go into effect in accordance with the conditions set forth in the WADA decision.
- 5.3** Decisions by WADA to affirm or reverse the TUE decisions of an *Anti-Doping Organization* may be appealed to CAS as provided in Article 13 of the Code.

## **6 Previously Granted Abbreviated Therapeutic Use Exemptions (ATUEs)**

- 6.1** All previously granted ATUEs that have not already expired or been cancelled shall expire on December 31, 2009.

### **Name and address of the IPF TUE Panel Chairman:**

Prof. Marek Kruszewski

Email: [marek.kruszewski@awf.edu.pl](mailto:marek.kruszewski@awf.edu.pl) or [dr.makrus@wp.pl](mailto:dr.makrus@wp.pl)

Address:

ul. Swietego Wincentego 40 m 41

03-526 Warsaw, Poland

Phone numbers: +48 22 678-46-76, mobile: +48 501-332-357