

IBU ANTI-DOPING RULES

LIST OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----|
| | Preface | 3 |
| | Fundamental Rationale for the Code and IBU Anti-Doping Rules | 3 |
| | Scope | 4 |
| Article 1 | Definition of Doping | 5 |
| Article 2 | Anti-Doping Rule Violations | 5 |
| Article 3 | Proof of Doping | 10 |
| Article 4 | The Prohibited List | 13 |
| Article 5 | Testing and Investigations | 18 |
| Article 6 | Analysis of Samples | 24 |
| Article 7 | Results Management | 26 |
| Article 8 | Right to a Fair Hearing (IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel) | 33 |
| Article 9 | Automatic Disqualification of Individual Results | 36 |
| Article 10 | Sanctions on Individuals | 36 |
| Article 11 | Consequences to Teams | 50 |
| Article 12 | Sanctions and Costs assessed against Member Federations | 51 |
| Article 13 | Appeals | 52 |
| Article 14 | Confidentiality and Reporting | 57 |
| Article 15 | Application and Recognition of Decisions | 61 |
| Article 16 | Incorporation of IBU Anti-Doping Rules and Obligations of National Federations | 62 |
| Article 17 | Statute of Limitations | 63 |
| Article 18 | IBU Compliance Reports to WADA | 63 |
| Article 19 | Education | 63 |
| Article 20 | Amendment and Interpretation of Anti-Doping Rules | 63 |
| Article 21 | Interpretation of the Code | 65 |
| Article 22 | Additional Roles and Responsibilities of Athletes and other Persons | 66 |
| Article 23 | Implementation of the Olympic Movement Medical Code | 67 |
| Article 24 | Divergences | 68 |
| Article 25 | Entry into Force | 68 |
| Appendix 1 | Definitions | 69 |

PREFACE

The IBU is subject to the World Anti-Doping Code and cooperates with the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) concerning its application and implementation.

The IBU will automatically follow any amendments of the World Anti-Doping Code or any WADA Bylaw applicable to the IBU, according to the decision of the IBU Congress on September 7 2012.

The definitions contained in Appendix 1 to the World Anti-Doping Code are integral parts of these Rules.

These Anti-Doping Rules have been adopted and implemented in conformity with the IBU's responsibilities under the Code, and are in furtherance of the IBU's continuing efforts to eradicate doping in the sport of biathlon.

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 will be bound by them.

FUNDAMENTAL RATIONALE FOR THE CODE AND IBU ANTI-DOPING RULES

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

- Ethics, fair play and honesty
- Health
- Excellence in performance

- Character and education
- Fun and joy
- Teamwork
- Dedication and commitment
- Respect for rules and laws
- Respect for self and other participants
- Courage
- Community and solidarity

Doping is fundamentally contrary to the spirit of sport.

SCOPE

These Anti-Doping Rules shall apply to the IBU and to each of its member federations. They also apply to the following athletes, athlete support personnel and other persons, each of whom is deemed, as a condition of his/her membership, accreditation and/or participation in the sport, to have agreed to be bound by these Anti-Doping Rules, and to have submitted to the authority of the IBU to enforce these Anti-Doping Rules and to the jurisdiction of the hearing panels specified in Article 8 and Article 13 to hear and determine cases and appeals brought under these Anti-Doping Rules:

- all athletes and athlete support personnel who are members of the IBU, or of any member federation, or of any member or affiliate organization of any member federation (including any clubs, teams, associations or leagues);
- all athletes and athlete support personnel participating in such capacity in events, competitions and other activities organized, convened, authorized or recognized by the IBU, or any member federation, or any member or affiliate organization of any member federation (including any clubs, teams, associations or leagues), wherever held;
- any other athlete or athlete support personnel or other person who, by virtue of an accreditation, a license or other contractual arrangement, or otherwise, is subject to the jurisdiction of the IBU, or of any member federation, or of any member or affiliate organization of any member federation (including any clubs, teams, associations or leagues), for purposes of anti-doping;

Within the overall pool of athletes set out above who are bound by and required to comply with these Anti-Doping Rules, the following athletes shall be considered to be international-level athletes for purposes of these Anti-Doping Rules, and therefore the specific provisions in these Anti-Doping Rules applicable to international-level athletes (as regards testing but also as regards TUEs, whereabouts information, results management, and appeals) shall apply to all athletes participating in any event organized by the IBU or where the IBU is the ruling body for the event.

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 to Article 2.10 of these Anti-Doping Rules.

2. Anti-Doping Rule Violations

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

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

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: An anti-doping rule violation is committed under this Article without regard to an athlete's fault. This rule has been referred to in various CAS decisions as "Strict Liability". An athlete's fault is taken into consideration in determining the consequences of this anti-doping rule violation under Article 10. This principle has consistently been upheld by CAS.]

- 2.1.2 Sufficient proof of an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 is established by any 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; or, where the athlete's B sample is split into two bottles and the analysis of the second bottle confirms the presence of the prohibited substance or its metabolites or markers found in the first bottle.

[Comment to Article 2.1.2: The IBU or the anti-doping organization with results management responsibility, where relevant, may at its discretion choose to have the B sample analyzed even if the athlete does not request the analysis of the B sample.]

- 2.1.3 Excepting those substances for which a quantitative threshold is specifically identified in the Prohibited List, the presence of any quantity of a prohibited substance or its metabolites or markers in an athlete's sample will 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. As noted in the Comment to Article 3.2, 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, including data collected as part of the athlete biological passport, or other analytical information that 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 IBU or relevant anti-doping organization 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 and that no prohibited method is used. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing use on the athlete’s part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping rule violation for use of a prohibited substance or a prohibited method.
- 2.2.2** The success or failure of the use of a prohibited substance or prohibited method is not material. It is sufficient that the prohibited substance or prohibited method was used or attempted to be used for an anti-doping rule violation to be committed.
[Comment to Article 2.2.2: Demonstrating the “attempted use” of a prohibited substance requires proof of intent on the athlete’s part. The fact that intent may be required to prove this particular anti-doping rule violation does not undermine the strict liability principle established for violations of Article 2.1 and violations of Article 2.2 in respect of use of a prohibited substance or prohibited method.
An athlete’s “use” of a prohibited substance constitutes an anti-doping rule violation unless such substance is not prohibited out-of-competition and the athlete’s use takes place out-of-competition. (However, the presence of a prohibited substance or its metabolites or markers in a sample collected in competition will be a violation of Article 2.1, regardless of when that substance might have been administered.)]
- 2.3** Evading, Refusing or Failing to Submit to Sample Collection
Evading sample collection, or without compelling justification refusing or failing to submit to sample collection after notification as authorized in these Anti-Doping Rules or other applicable anti-doping rules.
[Comment to Article 2.3: For example, it would be an anti-doping rule violation of “evading sample collection” if it were established that an athlete was deliberately avoiding a doping control official to evade notification or testing. A violation of “failing to submit to sample collection” may be based on either intentional or negligent conduct of the athlete, while “evading” or “refusing” sample collection contemplates intentional conduct by the athlete.]
- 2.4** Whereabouts Failures
Any combination of three missed tests and/or filing failures, as defined in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations, within a twelve-month period by an athlete in a registered testing pool.
- 2.5** Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any Part of Doping Control
Conduct which subverts the doping control process but which would not otherwise be included in the definition of prohibited methods. Tampering shall include, without limitation, intentionally interfering or attempting to interfere with a doping control official, providing fraudulent information to an anti-doping organization, or intimidating or attempting to intimidate a potential witness.
[Comment to Article 2.5: For example, this Article would prohibit altering identification numbers on a doping control form during testing, breaking the B bottle at the time of B sample analysis, or altering a sample by the addition of a foreign substance. Offensive conduct towards a doping control official or other person involved in doping control which does not otherwise constitute tampering shall be addressed in the disciplinary rules of sport organizations.]
- 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 out-of-competition 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 athlete support person in-competition of any prohibited method or any prohibited substance, or possession by athlete support person 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 person establishes that the possession is pursuant to a TUE granted to an athlete in accordance with Article 4.4, 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

2.9 Complicity

Assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, conspiring, covering up or any other type of intentional complicity involving an anti-doping rule violation, attempted anti-doping rule violation or violation of Article 10.12.1 by another person.

2.10 Prohibited Association

Association by an athlete or other person subject to the authority of an anti-doping organization in a professional or sport-related capacity with any athlete support person who:

2.10.1 If subject to the authority of an anti-doping organization, is serving a period of ineligibility; or

2.10.2 If not subject to the authority of an anti-doping organization and where ineligibility has not been addressed in a results management process pursuant to the Code, has been convicted or found in a criminal, disciplinary or professional proceeding to have engaged in conduct which would have constituted a violation of anti-doping rules if Code-compliant rules had been applicable to such person. The disqualifying status of such person shall be in force for the longer of six years from the criminal, professional or disciplinary decision or the duration of the criminal, disciplinary or professional sanction imposed; or

2.10.3 Is serving as a front or intermediary for an individual described in Article 2.10.1 or 2.10.2.

In order for this provision to apply, it is necessary that the athlete or other person has previously been advised in writing by an anti-doping organization with jurisdiction over the athlete or other person, or by WADA, of the athlete support person's disqualifying status and the potential consequence of prohibited association and that the athlete or other person can reasonably avoid the association. The anti-doping organization must also use reasonable efforts to advise the athlete support person who is the subject of the notice to the athlete or other person that the criteria described in Articles 2.10.1 and 2.10.2 do not apply to him or her. (Notwithstanding Article 17, this Article applies even when the athlete support person's disqualifying conduct occurred prior to the effective date provided in Article 20.7.)

The burden shall be on the athlete or other person to establish that any association with athlete support personnel described in Article 2.10.1 or 2.10.2 is not in a professional or sport-related capacity.

Anti-doping organizations that are aware of athlete support personnel who meet the criteria described in Article 2.10.1, 2.10.2, or 2.10.3 shall submit that information to WADA.

[Comment to Article 2.10: athletes and other persons must not work with coaches, trainers, physicians or other athlete support personnel who are ineligible on account of an anti-doping rule violation or who have been criminally convicted or professionally disciplined in relation to doping. Some examples of the types of association which are prohibited include: obtaining training, strategy, technique, nutrition or medical advice; obtaining therapy, treatment or prescriptions; providing any bodily products for analysis; or allowing the athlete support person to serve as an agent or representative. Prohibited association need not involve any form of compensation.]

3. Proof of Doping

3.1 Burdens and Standards of Proof

The IBU and its member federations shall have the burden of establishing that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. The standard of proof will be whether the IBU or its member federation have established an anti-doping rule violation to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel, bearing in mind the seriousness of the allegation that has been 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 Anti-Doping 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.

[Comment to Article 3.1: This standard of proof required to be met by the IBU or its member federation is comparable to the standard that is applied in most countries to cases involving professional misconduct.]

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 will be applicable in doping cases:

[Comment to Article 3.2: For example, the IBU or its member federation may establish an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.2 (Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method) based on the athlete's admissions, the credible testimony of third persons, reliable documentary evidence, reliable analytical data from either an A or B sample as provided in the comments to Article 2.2, or conclusions drawn from the profile of a series of the athlete's blood or urine samples.]

3.2.1 Analytical methods or decision limits approved by WADA after consultation within the relevant scientific community and

which have been the subject of peer review are presumed to be scientifically valid. Any athlete or other person seeking to rebut this presumption of scientific validity shall, as a condition precedent to any such challenge, first notify WADA of the challenge and the basis of the challenge. CAS on its own initiative may also inform WADA of any such challenge. At WADA's request, the CAS panel shall appoint an appropriate scientific expert to assist the panel in its evaluation of the challenge. Within 10 days of WADA's receipt of such notice, and WADA's receipt of the CAS file, WADA shall also have the right to intervene as a party, appear amicus curiae, or otherwise provide evidence in such proceeding.

- 3.2.2** WADA-accredited laboratories and other laboratories approved by WADA are presumed to have conducted sample analysis and custodial procedures in accordance with the WADA International Standard for Laboratories. The athlete or other person may rebut this presumption by establishing that a departure from the International Standard for Laboratories occurred that 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 that could reasonably have caused the adverse analytical finding, then the IBU will have the burden of establishing that such departure did not cause the adverse analytical finding.

[Comment to Article 3.2.2: 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 IBU or its member federation to prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that the departure did not cause the adverse analytical finding.]

- 3.2.3** Departures from any other international standard or other anti-doping rule or policy set forth in the Code or these Anti-Doping Rules which did not cause an adverse analytical finding or other anti-doping rule violation will 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 that could reasonably have caused an anti-doping rule violation based on an adverse analytical finding or other anti-doping rule violation occurred, then the IBU will have the burden of establishing that such a departure did not cause the adverse analytical finding or the factual basis for the anti-doping rule violation.

- 3.2.4** The facts established by a decision of a court or professional disciplinary tribunal of competent jurisdiction that are not the subject of a pending appeal will be irrefutable evidence against the athlete or other person to whom the decision pertained of those facts, unless the athlete or other person establishes that the decision violated principles of natural justice.

- 3.2.5** The hearing panel in a hearing on an anti-doping rule violation may draw an inference adverse to the athlete or other person who is asserted to have committed an anti-doping rule violation based on the athlete's or other person's refusal, after a request made in a reasonable time in advance of the hearing, to appear at the hearing (either in person or by telephone 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.

4. The Prohibited List

4.1 Incorporation of the WADA Prohibited List

These Anti-Doping Rules incorporate the WADA Prohibited List, which is published and revised by WADA as described in Article 4.1 of the Code.

4.2 Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods Identified on the WADA 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 IBU. All athletes and other persons shall be bound by the Prohibited List and any revisions thereto, from the date they go into effect, without further formality. It is the responsibility of all athletes and other persons to familiarize themselves with the most up-to-date version of the Prohibited List and all revisions thereto.

As described in Article 4.2 of the Code, the IBU may upon the recommendation of its Medical Committee request that WADA expand the Prohibited List for the sport of biathlon. The IBU may also upon the recommendation of its Medical Committee request that WADA include additional substances or methods, which have the potential for abuse in the sport of biathlon, in the monitoring program described in Article 4.5 of the WADA Code. As provided in the Code, WADA will make the final decision on such requests by IBU.

4.2.2 Specified Substances

For purposes of the application of Article 10 (Sanctions on Individuals), all prohibited substances shall be "specified substances" except substances in the classes of anabolic agents and hormones; and those stimulants and hormone antagonists and modulators so identified on the Prohibited List. The category of specified substances shall not include prohibited methods.

[Comment to Article 4.2.2: The specified substances identified in Article 4.2.2 should not in any way be considered less important or less dangerous than other doping substances. Rather, they are simply substances which are more likely to have been consumed by an athlete for a purpose other than the enhancement of sport performance.]

4.3 WADA's Determination of the Prohibited List

WADA's determination of the prohibited substances and prohibited methods that will be included on the Prohibited List, the classification of substances into categories on the Prohibited List, and the classification of a substance as prohibited at all

times or in-competition only, 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.

4.4 Therapeutic Use Exemptions (“TUEs”)

4.4.1 The presence of a prohibited substance or its metabolites or markers (Article 2.1), and/or 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), shall not be considered an anti-doping rule violation if it is consistent with the provisions of a TUE granted in accordance with the WADA International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions.

4.4.2 If an international-level athlete is using a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method for therapeutic reasons:

4.4.2.1 Where the athlete already has a TUE granted by his or her national anti-doping organization for the substance or method in question, that TUE is not automatically valid for international-level competition. Any such athlete who want to compete in international-level competitions **must** apply to the IBU to recognize their TUE in accordance with Article 7 of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions. If that TUE meets the criteria set out in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, then the IBU shall recognize it for purposes of international-level competition as well. If the IBU considers that the TUE does not meet those criteria and so refuses to recognize it, the IBU shall notify the athlete and his or her national anti-doping organization promptly, with reasons. The athlete and the national anti-doping organization shall have 21 days from such notification to refer the matter to WADA for review in accordance with Article 4.4.6. If the matter is referred to WADA for review, the TUE granted by the national anti-doping organization remains valid for national-level competition and out-of-competition testing (but is not valid for international-level competition) pending WADA’s decision. If the matter is not referred to WADA for review, the TUE becomes invalid for any purpose when the 21-day review deadline expires.

[Comment to Article 4.4.2.1: Further to Articles 5.6 and 7.1(a) of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, the IBU may publish notice on its website (www.biathlonworld.com) that it will automatically recognize TUE decisions (or categories of such decisions, e.g., as to particular substances or methods) made by national anti-doping organizations. If an athlete’s TUE falls into a category of automatically recognized TUEs, then he/she does not need to apply to the IBU for recognition of that TUE.

If the IBU refuses to recognize a TUE granted by a national anti-doping organization only because medical records or other information are missing that are needed to demonstrate satisfaction of the criteria in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, the matter should not be referred to WADA. Instead, the file should be completed and re-submitted to the IBU.]

4.4.2.2 If the athlete does not already have a TUE granted by his/her national anti-doping organization for the substance or method in question, the athlete must apply directly to the IBU for a TUE in accordance with the process set out in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions [using the form posted on IBU’s website (www.biathlonworld.com)]. If the IBU denies the athlete’s application, it must notify the athlete promptly, with reasons. If the IBU grants the athlete’s application, it must notify not only the athlete but also his/her national anti-doping organization. If the national anti-doping organization considers that the TUE granted by the IBU does not meet the criteria set out in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, it has 21 days from such notification to refer the matter to WADA for review in accordance with Article 4.4.6. If the national anti-doping organization refers the matter to WADA for review, the TUE granted by the IBU remains valid for international-level competition and out-of-competition testing (but is not valid for national-level competition) pending WADA’s decision. If the national anti-doping organization does not refer the matter to WADA for review, the TUE granted by the IBU becomes valid for national-level competition as well when the 21-day review deadline expires.

[Comment to Article 4.4.2: The IBU may agree with a national anti-doping organization that the national anti-doping organization will consider TUE applications on behalf of the IBU.]

4.4.3 If the IBU chooses to test an athlete who is not an international-level athlete, the IBU shall recognize a TUE granted to that athlete by his or her national anti-doping organization. If the IBU chooses to test an athlete who is not an international-level or a national-level athlete, the IBU shall permit that athlete to apply for a retroactive TUE for any prohibited substance or prohibited method that he/she is using for therapeutic reasons.

4.4.4 An application to the IBU for grant or recognition of a TUE must be made as soon as the need arises and in any event (save in emergency or exceptional situations or where Article 4.3 of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions applies) at least 30 days before the athlete’s next competition. The IBU shall appoint a panel to consider applications for the grant or recognition of TUEs (the “TUE Committee”). The TUE Committee shall promptly evaluate and decide upon the application in accordance with the relevant provisions of the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions [and the specific IBU’s protocols posted on its website]. Subject to Article 4.4.6 of these Rules, its decision shall be the final decision of the IBU, and shall be reported to WADA and other relevant anti-doping organizations, including the athlete’s national anti-doping organization, through ADAMS, in accordance with the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions.

[Comment to Article 4.4.4: The submission of false or misleadingly incomplete information in support of a TUE application (including but not limited to the failure to advise of the unsuccessful outcome of a prior application to another anti-doping organization for such a TUE) may result in a charge of tampering or attempted tampering under Article 2.5.

An athlete should not assume that his/her application for grant or recognition of a TUE (or for renewal of a TUE) will be

granted. Any use or possession or administration of a prohibited substance or prohibited method before an application has been granted is entirely at the athlete's own risk.]

4.4.5 Expiration, Cancellation, Withdrawal or Reversal of a TUE

4.4.5.1 A TUE granted pursuant to these Anti-Doping Rules:

(a) shall expire automatically at the end of any term for which it was granted, without the need for any further notice or other formality;

(b) may be cancelled if the athlete does not promptly comply with any requirements or conditions imposed by the TUE Committee upon grant of the TUE;

(c) may be withdrawn by the TUE Committee if it is subsequently determined that the criteria for grant of a TUE are not in fact met; or

(d) may be reversed on review by WADA or on appeal.

4.4.5.2

In such event, the athlete shall not be subject to any consequences based on his/her use or possession or administration of the prohibited substance or prohibited method in question in accordance with the TUE prior to the effective date of expiry, cancellation, withdrawal or reversal of the TUE. The review pursuant to Article 7.2 of any subsequent adverse analytical finding shall include consideration of whether such finding is consistent with use of the prohibited substance or prohibited method prior to that date, in which event no anti-doping rule violation shall be asserted.

4.4.6 Reviews and Appeals of TUE Decisions

4.4.6.1 WADA shall review any decision by the IBU not to recognize a TUE granted by the national anti-doping organization that is referred to WADA by the athlete or the athlete's national anti-doping organization. In addition, WADA shall review any decision by the IBU to grant a TUE that is referred to WADA by the athlete's national anti-doping organization. WADA may review any other TUE decisions at any time, whether upon request by those affected or on its own initiative. If the TUE decision being reviewed meets the criteria set out in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, WADA will not interfere with it. If the TUE decision does not meet those criteria, WADA will reverse it.

4.4.6.2 Any TUE decision by the IBU (or by a national anti-doping organization where it has agreed to consider the application on behalf of the IBU) that is not reviewed by WADA, or that is reviewed by WADA but is not reversed upon review, may be appealed by the athlete and/or the athlete's national anti-doping organization exclusively to CAS, in accordance with Article 13.

[Comment to Article 4.4.6.2: In such cases, the decision being appealed is the IBU's TUE decision, not WADA's decision not to review the TUE decision or (having reviewed it) not to reverse the TUE decision. However, the deadline to appeal the TUE decision does not begin to run until the date that WADA communicates its decision. In any event, whether the decision has been reviewed by WADA or not, WADA shall be given notice of the appeal so that it may participate if it sees fit.]

4.4.6.3 A decision by WADA to reverse a TUE decision may be appealed by the athlete, the national anti-doping organization and/or the IBU exclusively to CAS, in accordance with Article 13.

4.4.6.4 A failure to take action within a reasonable time on a properly submitted application for grant or recognition of a TUE or for review of a TUE decision shall be considered a denial of the application.

5. Testing and Investigations

5.1 Purpose of Testing and Investigations

Testing and investigations shall only be undertaken for anti-doping purposes. They shall be conducted in conformity with the provisions of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations and the specific protocols of the IBU supplementing that International Standard.

5.1.1 Testing shall be undertaken to obtain analytical evidence as to the athlete's compliance (or non-compliance) with the strict Code prohibition on the presence/Use of a prohibited substance or prohibited method. Test distribution planning, testing, post-testing activity and all related activities conducted by the IBU shall be in conformity with the International Standard for Testing and Investigations. The IBU shall determine the number of finishing placement tests, random tests and target tests to be performed, in accordance with the criteria established by the International Standard for Testing and Investigations. All provisions of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations shall apply automatically in respect of all such testing.

5.1.2 Investigations shall be undertaken:

5.1.2.1 in relation to atypical findings, atypical passport findings and adverse passport findings, in accordance with Articles 7.4 and 7.5 respectively, gathering intelligence or evidence (including, in particular, analytical evidence) in order to determine whether an anti-doping rule violation has occurred under Article 2.1 and/or Article 2.2; and

5.1.2.2 in relation to other indications of potential anti-doping rule violations, in accordance with Articles 7.6 and 7.7, gathering intelligence or evidence (including, in particular, non-analytical evidence) in order to determine whether an anti-doping rule violation has occurred under any of Articles 2.2 to 2.10.

5.1.3 The IBU may obtain, assess and process anti-doping intelligence from all available sources, to inform the development of an effective, intelligent and proportionate test distribution plan, to plan target testing, and/or to form the basis of an investigation into a possible anti-doping rule violation(s).

5.2 Authority to Conduct Testing

5.2.1 Subject to the jurisdictional limitations for event testing set out in Article 5.3 of the Code, the IBU shall have in-competition and out-of-competition testing authority over all of the athletes specified in the Introduction to these Anti-Doping Rules (under the heading "Scope").

5.2.2 The IBU may require any athlete over whom it has testing authority (including any athlete serving a period of ineligibility) to provide a sample at any time and at any place.

[Comment to Article 5.2.2: Unless the athlete has identified a 60-minute time-slot for testing between the hours of 11pm and 6am, or has otherwise consented to testing during that period, the IBU will not test an athlete during that period unless it has a serious and specific suspicion that the athlete may be engaged in doping. A challenge to whether the IBU had sufficient suspicion for testing in that period shall not be a defense to an anti-doping rule violation based on such test or attempted test.]

5.2.3 WADA shall have in-competition and out-of-competition testing authority as set out in Article 20.7.8 of the Code.

5.2.4 If the IBU delegates or contracts any part of testing to a national anti-doping organization (directly or through a national federation), that national anti-doping organization may collect additional samples or direct the laboratory to perform additional types of analysis at the national anti-doping organization's expense. If additional samples are collected or additional types of analysis are performed, the IBU shall be notified.

5.3 Event Testing

5.3.1 Except as provided in Article 5.3 of the Code, only a single organization should be responsible for initiating and directing testing at event venues during an event period. At international events, the collection of samples shall be initiated and directed by the IBU (or any other international organization which is the ruling body for the event). At the request of the IBU (or any other international organization which is the ruling body for an event), any testing during the event period outside of the event venues shall be coordinated with the IBU (or the relevant ruling body of the event).

5.3.2 If an anti-doping organization which would otherwise have testing authority but is not responsible for initiating and directing testing at an event desires to conduct testing of athletes at the event venues during the event period, the anti-doping organization shall first confer with the IBU (or any other international organization which is the ruling body of the event) to obtain permission to conduct and coordinate such testing. If the anti-doping organization is not satisfied with the response from the IBU (or any other international organization which is the ruling body of the event), the anti-doping organization may ask WADA for permission to conduct testing and to determine how to coordinate such testing, in accordance with the procedures set out in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations. WADA shall not grant approval for such testing before consulting with and informing the IBU (or any other international organization which is the ruling body for the event). WADA's decision shall be final and not subject to appeal. Unless otherwise provided in the authorization to conduct testing, such tests shall be considered out-of-competition tests. Results management for any such test shall be the responsibility of the anti-doping organization initiating the test unless provided otherwise in the rules of the ruling body of the event.

5.4 Test Distribution Planning

Consistent with the International Standard for Testing and Investigations, and in coordination with other anti-doping organizations conducting testing on the same athletes, the IBU shall develop and implement an effective, intelligent and proportionate test distribution plan that prioritizes appropriately between disciplines, categories of athletes, types of testing, types of samples collected, and types of sample analysis, all in compliance with the requirements of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations. The IBU shall provide WADA upon request with a copy of its current test distribution plan.

5.5 Coordination of Testing

Where reasonably feasible, testing shall be coordinated through ADAMS or another system approved by WADA in order to maximize the effectiveness of the combined testing effort and to avoid unnecessary repetitive testing.

5.6 Athlete Whereabouts Requirements

5.6.1 Registered Testing Pool

A minimum of 30 male and 30 female athletes will comprise the IBU Registered Testing Pool (IBU RTP). These athletes are required to comply with the whereabouts requirements of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations. They are selected based on the prior year's World Cup Final Score. Athletes may be added to the IBU RTP under the following circumstances:

(a) by virtue of their placing in the top twenty of any IBU World Cup ranking competition.

(b) when a change in performance or hematological and/or steroidal profile is deemed significant when evaluated by the MC.

(c) athletes who are serving periods of ineligibility as consequences of anti-doping rule violations are to be part of the IBURTP.

(d) athletes who apply for hemoglobin exemption will be added automatically to the IBU RTP.

(e) Athletes transferring into biathlon from other international sporting federations

(f) An athlete can, in exceptional circumstances, apply to the IBU Medical Committee for consideration of exclusion from the RTP for a limited period of time, based on exceptional medical circumstances.

(g) any other athlete that the IBU wishes to test out of competition regularly for any reason other than those described herein.

The IBU shall coordinate with national anti-doping organizations the identification of such athletes and the collection of their whereabouts information. The IBU 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. Athletes shall be notified before they are included in a registered testing pool and when they are removed from that pool.

Each athlete in the registered testing pool shall do the following, in each case in accordance with Annex I to the International Standard for Testing and Investigation:

(a) must advise the IBU of his/her whereabouts on a quarterly basis by 25 December, March, June and September respectively;

(b) must update that information as necessary, so that it remains accurate and complete at all times;

(c) must make him-/herself available for testing at such whereabouts.

5.6.2 For purposes of Article 2.4, an athlete's failure to comply with the requirements of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations shall be deemed a filing failure or a missed test (as defined in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations) where the conditions set forth in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations for declaring a filing failure or missed test are met.

5.6.3 An athlete in the IBU's registered testing pool shall continue to be subject to the obligation to comply with the whereabouts requirements of Annex I to the International Standard for Testing and Investigations unless and until (a) the athlete gives written notice to the IBU that he/she has retired or (b) the IBU has informed him or her that he/she no longer satisfies the criteria for inclusion in IBU's registered testing pool.

5.6.4 Whereabouts information relating to an athlete shall be shared (through ADAMS) with WADA and other anti-doping organizations having authority to test that athlete, shall be maintained in strict confidence at all times, shall be used exclusively for the purposes set out in Article 5.6 of the Code, and shall be destroyed in accordance with the International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information once it is no longer relevant for these purposes.

5.7 Retired Athletes Returning to Competition

5.7.1 An athlete in the IBU's registered testing pool who has given notice of retirement to the IBU may not resume competing in international events or National events until he/she has given the IBU written notice of his/her intent to resume competing and has made him/herself available for testing for a period of six months before returning to competition, including (if requested) complying with the whereabouts requirements of Annex I to the International Standard for Testing and Investigations. WADA, in consultation with the IBU and the athlete's national anti-doping organization, may grant an exemption to the six-month written notice rule where the strict application of that rule would be manifestly unfair to an athlete. This decision may be appealed under Article 13. Any competitive results obtained in violation of this Article 5.7.1 shall be disqualified.

5.7.2 If an athlete retires from sport while subject to a period of ineligibility, the athlete shall not resume competing in international events or national events until the athlete has given six months prior written notice (or notice equivalent to the period of ineligibility remaining as of the date the athlete retired, if that period was longer than six months) to the IBU and to his/her national anti-doping organization of his/her intent to resume competing and has made him/herself available for testing for that notice period, including (if requested) complying with the whereabouts requirements of Annex I to the International Standard for Testing and Investigations.

5.7.3 An athlete who is not in the IBU's Registered Testing Pool who has given notice of retirement to the IBU may not resume competing unless he/she notifies the IBU and his/her national anti-doping organization at least six (6) months before he/she wishes to return to competition and makes him/herself available for unannounced out-of-competition testing, including (if requested) complying with the whereabouts requirements of Annex I to the International Standard for Testing and Investigations, during the period before actual return to competition.

5.8 Independent Observer Program

The IBU and the organizing committees for IBU events, as well as the national federations and the organizing committees for national events, shall authorize and facilitate the independent observer program at such events.

6. Analysis of Samples

Samples shall be analyzed in accordance with the following principles:

6.1 Use of Accredited and Approved Laboratories

For purposes of Article 2.1, samples shall be analyzed only in laboratories accredited or as otherwise approved by WADA. The choice of the WADA-accredited laboratory or WADA-approved laboratory) used for the sample analysis shall be determined exclusively by the IBU.

[Comment to Article 6.1: Violations of Article 2.1 may be established only by sample analysis performed by a laboratory accredited or otherwise approved by WADA. Violations of other Articles may be established using analytical results from other laboratories so long as the results are reliable.]

6.2 Purpose of Analysis of Samples

6.2.1 Samples shall be analyzed to detect prohibited substances and prohibited methods 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 IBU in profiling relevant parameters in an athlete's urine, blood or other matrix, including DNA or genomic profiling, for any other legitimate anti-doping purposes. Samples may be collected and stored for future analysis.

[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.]

6.2.2 The IBU shall ask laboratories to analyze samples in conformity with Article 6.4 of the Code and Article 4.7 of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations.

6.3 Research on Samples

No sample may be used for research 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 so that they cannot be traced back to a particular athlete.

6.4 Standards for Sample Analysis and Reporting

Laboratories shall analyze samples and report results in conformity with the WADA International Standard for Laboratories. To ensure effective testing, the Technical Document referenced at Article 5.4.1 of the Code will establish risk assessment-based sample analysis menus appropriate for particular sports and sport disciplines, and laboratories shall analyze samples in conformity with those menus, except as follows:

6.4.1 The IBU may request that laboratories analyze its samples using more extensive menus than those described in the Technical Document.

6.4.2 The IBU may request that laboratories analyze its samples using less extensive menus than those described in the Technical Document only if it has satisfied WADA that, because of the particular circumstances of its sport, as set out in its test distribution plan, less extensive analysis would be appropriate.

6.4.3 As provided in the International Standard for Laboratories, laboratories at their own initiative and expense may analyze samples for prohibited substances or prohibited methods not included on the sample analysis menu described in the Technical Document or specified by the testing authority. Results from any such analysis shall be reported and have the same validity and consequence as any other analytical result.

[Comment to Article 6.4: The objective of this Article is to extend the principle of "intelligent testing" to the sample analysis menu so as to most effectively and efficiently detect doping. It is recognized that the resources available to fight doping are limited and that increasing the sample analysis menu may, in some sports and countries, reduce the number of samples which can be analyzed.]

6.5 Further Analysis of Samples

Any sample may be stored and subsequently subjected to further analysis for the purposes set out in Article 6.2: (a) by WADA at any time; and/or (b) by the IBU at any time before both the A and B sample analytical results (or A sample result where B sample analysis has been waived or will not be performed) have been communicated by the IBU to the athlete as the asserted basis for an Article 2.1 anti-doping rule violation. Such further analysis of samples shall conform with the requirements of the International Standard for Laboratories and the International Standard for Testing and Investigations.

7. Results Management

7.1 Responsibility for Conducting Results Management

The circumstances in which the IBU shall take responsibility for conducting results management in respect of anti-doping rule violations involving athletes and other persons under its jurisdiction shall be determined by reference to and in accordance with Article 7 of the Code.

7.2 Review of Adverse Analytical Findings From Tests Initiated by the IBU

Results management in respect of the results of tests initiated by the IBU (including tests performed by WADA pursuant to agreement with the IBU) shall proceed as set forth below:

7.2.1 The results from all analyses must be sent to the IBU in encoded form, in a report signed by an authorized representative of the laboratory. All communication must be conducted in confidentiality and in conformity with ADAMS.

7.2.2 Upon receipt of an A sample adverse analytical finding, the IBU Anti-Doping Administrator will conduct a review to determine whether:

- a. an applicable TUE has been granted or will be granted as provided in the International Standards for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, or
- b. there is any apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations or International Standard for Laboratories that caused the adverse analytical finding.

7.3 Notification After Review Regarding Adverse Analytical Findings

7.3.1 If the review of an adverse analytical finding under Article 7.2.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE or entitlement to a TUE as provided in the International Standards for TUEs, or departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations or the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the adverse analytical finding, the IBU shall

promptly notify the athlete, and simultaneously the athlete's national anti-doping organization and WADA, in the manner set out in Article 14.1, 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 if the athlete or the IBU 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 in accordance with the International Standard for Laboratories if such analysis is requested; and

(f) the athlete's right to request copies of the A and B sample laboratory documentation package, which includes information as required by the International Standard for Laboratories.

If the IBU decides not to bring forward the adverse analytical finding as an anti-doping rule violation, it will so notify the athlete, the athlete's national anti-doping organization and WADA.

Notification of the athlete means that the IBU notifies the member federation of the athlete, which is responsible to inform the athlete.

7.3.2 Where requested by the athlete or the IBU, arrangements shall be made to analyze the B sample in accordance with the International Standard for Laboratories. An athlete may accept the A sample analytical results by waiving the requirement for B sample analysis. The IBU may nonetheless elect to proceed with the B sample analysis.

7.3.3 The athlete and/or his representative shall be allowed to be present at the analysis of the B sample. A representative of the athlete's member federation and a representative of the IBU will also be allowed to be present.

7.3.4 If the B sample analysis does not confirm the A sample analysis, then (unless the IBU 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 or her member federation and the IBU will be so informed.

7.3.5 If the B sample analysis confirms the A sample analysis, the findings shall be reported to the athlete, the athlete's national anti-doping organization and to WADA.

7.4 Review of Atypical Findings

7.4.1 As provided in the International Standards for Laboratories, in some circumstances laboratories are directed to report the presence of prohibited substances which may also be produced endogenously as atypical findings, i.e., as findings that are subject to further investigation.

7.4.2 Upon receipt of an atypical finding, the IBU shall conduct a review to determine whether:

(a) an applicable TUE that has been granted or will be granted as provided in the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, or

(b) there is any apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations or International Standard for Laboratories that caused the atypical finding.

7.4.3 If the review of an atypical finding under Article 7.4.2 reveals an applicable TUE or departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigation or the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the atypical finding, the entire test shall be considered negative and the athlete, the athlete's national anti-doping organization, his member federation, and WADA shall be so informed.

7.4.4 If the initial review of an atypical finding does not reveal an applicable TUE or departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations or the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the atypical finding, the IBU shall conduct the required investigation or cause it to be conducted.

After the investigation is completed, either the atypical finding will be brought forward as an adverse analytical finding, in accordance with Article 7.3.1, or else the athlete, the athlete's national anti-doping organization and WADA shall be notified that the atypical finding will not be brought forward as an adverse analytical finding.

7.4.5 The IBU 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:

7.4.5.1 If the IBU determines the B sample should be analyzed prior to the conclusion of its 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 7.3.1 (d) to (f).

7.4.5.2 If the IBU is asked (a) by a major event organization shortly before one of its international events, or (b) by a sports organization responsible for meeting an imminent deadline for selecting team members for an international event, to disclose whether any athlete identified on a list provided by the major event organization or sports organization has a pending atypical finding, the IBU shall so advise the major event organization or sports organization after first providing notice of the atypical finding to the athlete.

7.5 Results Management for Tests Initiated During Other International Events

Results management and the conduct of hearings from a test by the International Olympic Committee or a major event

organization will be managed, as far as sanctions beyond disqualification from the event or the results of the event, by the IBU. The IBU accepts the Arbitration Rules of the CAS Anti-Doping Division for the Olympic Games.

7.6 Results Management for Tests initiated by Member Federations

Results management conducted by member federations must be consistent with the general principles for effective and fair results management that underlie the detailed provisions set forth in Article 7. Results of all doping controls must be reported to the IBU and to WADA within 14 days of the conclusion of the member federation's results management process. Any apparent anti-doping rule violation by an athlete who is a member of that member federation must be promptly referred to an appropriate hearing panel established pursuant to the rules of the member federation or national law. Apparent anti-doping rule violations by athletes who are members of another member federation will be referred to the athlete's national federation for hearing.

7.7 Review of Atypical Passport Findings and Adverse Passport Findings

Review of Atypical passport findings and adverse passport findings shall take place as provided in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations and International Standard for Laboratories. At such time as the IBU is satisfied that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, it shall promptly give the athlete (and simultaneously the athlete's national anti-doping organization and WADA) notice of the anti-doping rule violation asserted and the basis of that assertion.

7.8 Review of Whereabouts Failures

The IBU shall review potential filing failures and missed tests, as defined in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations, in respect of athletes who file their whereabouts information with the IBU, in accordance with Annex I to the International Standard for Testing and Investigations. At such time as the IBU is satisfied that an Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation has occurred, it shall promptly give the athlete (and simultaneously the athlete's national anti-doping organization and WADA) notice that it is asserting a violation of Article 2.4 and the basis of that assertion.

7.9 Review of Other Anti-Doping Rule Violations Not Covered by Articles 7.2–7.8

The IBU shall conduct any follow-up investigation required into a possible anti-doping rule violation not covered by Articles 7.2- 7.8. At such time as the IBU is satisfied that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, it shall promptly give the athlete or other person (and simultaneously the athlete's or other person's national anti-doping organization and WADA) notice of the anti-doping rule violation asserted and the basis of that assertion.

7.10 Identification of Prior Anti-Doping Rule Violations

Before giving an athlete or other person notice of an asserted anti-doping rule violation as provided above, the IBU shall refer to ADAMS and contact WADA and other relevant anti-doping organizations to determine whether any prior anti-doping rule violation exists.

7.11 Provisional Suspensions

7.11.1 Mandatory Provisional Suspension

If analysis of an A sample has resulted in an adverse analytical finding for a prohibited substance that is not a specified substance, or for a prohibited method, and a review in accordance with Article 7.2.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE or departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations or the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the adverse analytical finding, a provisional suspension shall be imposed upon, or promptly after, the notification described in Articles 7.2, 7.3 or 7.7.

7.11.2 Optional Provisional Suspension

In case of an adverse analytical finding for a specified substance, or in the case of any other anti-doping rule violations not covered by Article 7.11.1, the IBU may impose a provisional suspension on the athlete or other person against whom the anti-doping rule violation is asserted at any time after the review and notification described in Articles 7.2–7.7 and prior to the final hearing as described in Article 8.

7.11.3 Where a provisional suspension is imposed, pursuant to Article 7.11.1 or Article 7.11.2, the athlete or other person shall be given either:

(a) an opportunity for a provisional hearing either before or on a timely basis after imposition of the provisional suspension;
or

(b) an opportunity for an expedited final hearing in accordance with Article 8 (on a timely basis after imposition of a provisional suspension.) Furthermore, the athlete or other person has a right to appeal from the provisional suspension in accordance with Article 13.2 (except as set out in Article 7.11.3.1).

7.11.3.1 The provisional suspension may be lifted if the athlete demonstrates to the hearing panel that the violation is likely to have involved a contaminated product. A hearing panel's decision not to lift a mandatory provisional suspension on account of the athlete's assertion regarding a contaminated product shall not be appealable.

7.11.4 If a provisional suspension is imposed based on an A sample adverse analytical finding and any subsequent analysis of the B sample 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. In circumstances where the athlete (or the athlete's team) 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, then if it is still possible for the athlete or team to be reinserted, without otherwise affecting the competition, the athlete or team may continue to take part in the competition. In addition, the athlete or team may

thereafter take part in other competitions in the same event.

- 7.11.5** In all cases where an athlete or other person has been notified of an anti-doping rule violation but a provisional suspension has not been imposed on him or her, the athlete or other person shall be offered the opportunity to accept a provisional suspension voluntarily pending the resolution of the matter.

[Comment to Article 7.11: athletes and other persons shall receive credit for a provisional suspension against any period of ineligibility which is ultimately imposed. See Articles 10.11.3.1 and 10.11.3.2.]

7.12 Resolution Without a Hearing

- 7.12.1** An athlete or other person against whom an anti-doping rule violation is asserted may admit that violation at any time, waive a hearing, and accept the consequences that are mandated by these Anti-Doping Rules or (where some discretion as to consequences exists under these Anti-Doping Rules) that have been offered by the IBU.

- 7.12.2** Alternatively, if the athlete or other person against whom an anti-doping rule violation is asserted fails to dispute that assertion within the deadline specified in the notice sent by the IBU asserting the violation, then he/she shall be deemed to have admitted the violation, to have waived a hearing, and to have accepted the consequences that are mandated by these Anti-Doping Rules or (where some discretion as to consequences exists under these Anti-Doping Rules) that have been offered by the IBU.

- 7.12.3** In cases where Article 7.12.1 or Article 7.12.2 applies, a hearing before a hearing panel shall not be required. Instead the IBU shall promptly issue a written decision confirming the commission of the anti-doping rule violation and the consequences imposed as a result, and setting out the full reasons for any period of ineligibility imposed, including (if applicable) a justification for why the maximum potential period of ineligibility was not imposed. The IBU shall send copies of that decision to other anti-doping organizations with a right to appeal under Article 13.2.3, and shall publicly disclose that decision in accordance with Article 14.3.2.

7.13 Notification of Results Management Decisions

In all cases where the IBU has asserted the commission of an anti-doping rule violation, withdrawn the assertion of an anti-doping rule violation, imposed a provisional suspension, or agreed with an athlete or other person on the imposition of consequences without a hearing, the IBU shall give notice thereof in accordance with Article 14.2.1 to other anti-doping organizations with a right to appeal under Article 13.2.3.

7.14. Retirement from Sport

If an athlete or other person retires while the IBU is conducting the results management process, the IBU retains jurisdiction to complete its results management process. If an athlete or other person retires before any results management process has begun and the IBU would have had results management authority over the athlete or other person at the time the athlete or other person committed an anti-doping rule violation, the IBU has authority to conduct results management in respect of that anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 7.12: 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.]

- 7.15** The IBU sends all notification or communication to athletes or other persons to their respective member federation. The member federation is solely responsible to forward the documents to the athlete or other person.

8. Right to a Fair Hearing (IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel)

8.1 Principles for a Fair Hearing

- 8.1.1** When the IBU sends a notice to an athlete or other person asserting an anti-doping rule violation, and the athlete or other person does not waive a hearing in accordance with Article 7.10.1 or Article 7.10.2, then the case shall be referred to the IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel ("IBU ADHP") for hearing and adjudication.

- 8.1.2** The IBU Executive Board will appoint members for an open list of medical and legal experts who are eligible to serve as panel members. The IBU member federations may nominate candidates for the open list for the IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel (ADHP).

The Chair must be a law expert. Each panel member must be otherwise independent of the IBU.

- 8.1.3** If it appears, following the results management process described in Article 7, that these Anti-Doping Rules have been violated in connection with IBU testing or testing at an international event, the case will be assigned to the IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel for adjudication. Following that, the IBU will become a party of the result management process.

The Hearing Panel has its office at the chairperson's place of residence.

- 8.1.4** The time and location of the hearings and the timelines for submissions are to be defined by the chairperson.

- 8.1.5** The chairperson of the IBU ADHP will appoint three members from the open list (which may include the chairperson) to hear each case. At least one appointed member must also be a law expert. The appointed members must have had no prior involvement with the case and must not have the same nationality as the athlete or other person alleged to have violated these Anti-Doping Rules.

- 8.1.6** The member federation of the athlete or other person alleged to have violated these Anti-Doping Rules may attend the hearing as an observer.

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 IBU. The right to a hearing may be waived either expressly or by the athlete's or other person's failure to challenge within 2 weeks the IBU's assertion that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. Where no hearing occurs, the IBU will submit to the persons described in Article 13.2.3 a reasoned decision explaining the action taken.

8.1.8 WADA and the national federation of the athlete or other person may attend the hearing as observers. In any event, the IBU shall keep WADA fully apprised as to the status of pending cases and the result of all hearings.

8.1.9 The IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel shall act in a fair and impartial manner towards all parties at all times.

8.2 Decisions

8.2.1 At the end of the hearing, or on a timely basis thereafter, the IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel shall issue a written decision that includes the full reasons for the decision and for any period of ineligibility imposed, including (if applicable) a justification for why the greatest potential consequences were not imposed.

8.2.2 The decision may be appealed to the CAS as provided in Article 13. Copies of the decision shall be provided to the athlete or other person and to other anti-doping organizations with a right to appeal under Article 13.2.3.

8.2.3 If no appeal is brought against the decision, then (a) if the decision is that an anti-doping rule violation was committed, the decision shall be publicly disclosed as provided in Article 14.3.2; but (b) if the decision is that no anti-doping rule violation was committed, then the decision shall only be publicly disclosed with the consent of the athlete or other person who is the subject of the decision. The IBU 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.

The principles contained at Article 14.3.6 shall be applied in cases involving a minor.

8.3 Single Hearing Before CAS

Cases asserting anti-doping rule violations may be heard directly at CAS, with no requirement for a prior hearing, with the consent of the athlete, the IBU, WADA, and any other anti-doping organization that would have had a right to appeal a first instance hearing decision to CAS.

[Comment to Article 8.3: Where all of the parties identified in this Article are satisfied that their interests will be adequately protected in a single hearing, there is no need to incur the extra expense of two hearings. An anti-doping organization that wants to participate in the CAS hearing as a party or as an observer may condition its approval of a single hearing on being granted that right.]

9. Automatic Disqualification of Individual Results

A anti-doping rule violation in individual sports (such as biathlon) 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. This also applies for team disciplines.

[Comment to Article 9: For team sports, any awards received by individual players will be disqualified. However, disqualification of the team will be as provided in Article 11. In sports which are not team sports but where awards are given to teams, disqualification or other disciplinary action against the team when one or more team members have committed an anti-doping rule violation shall be taken as provided in the applicable rules of the international federation.]

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, upon the decision of the ruling body of the event, 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.

Factors to be included in considering whether to disqualify other results in an event might include, for example, the seriousness of the athlete's anti-doping rule violation and whether the athlete tested negative in the other competitions.

[Comment to Article 10.1: Whereas Article 9 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.]

10.1.1 If the athlete establishes that he or she bears no fault or negligence for the violation, the athlete's individual results in the other competition shall not be disqualified unless the athlete's results in competition other than the competition in which the anti-doping rule violation occurred were likely to have been affected by the athlete's anti-doping rule violation.

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

The period of ineligibility for a violation of Article 2.1, Article 2.2 or Article 2.6 shall be as follows, subject to potential reduction or suspension pursuant to Articles 10.4, 10.5 or 10.6:

10.2.1 The period of ineligibility shall be four years where:

10.2.1.1 The anti-doping rule violation does not involve a specified substance, unless the athlete or other person can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional.

10.2.1.2 The anti-doping rule violation involves a specified substance and the IBU can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was

intentional.

10.2.2 If Article 10.2.1 does not apply, the period of ineligibility shall be two years.

10.2.3 As used in Articles 10.2 and 10.3, the term “intentional” is meant to identify those athletes who cheat. The term therefore requires that the athlete or other person engaged in conduct which he or she knew constituted an anti-doping rule violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the conduct might constitute or result in an anti-doping rule violation and manifestly disregarded that risk. An anti-doping rule violation resulting from an adverse analytical finding for a substance which is only prohibited in competition shall be rebuttably presumed to be not intentional if the substance is a specified substance and the athlete can establish that the prohibited substance was used out of competition. An anti-doping rule violation resulting from an adverse analytical finding for a substance which is only prohibited in competition shall not be considered intentional if the substance is not a specified substance and the athlete can establish that the prohibited substance was used out of competition in a context unrelated to sport performance.

10.3 Ineligibility for Other Anti-Doping Rule Violations

The period of ineligibility for anti-doping rule violations other than as provided in Article 10.2 shall be as follows, unless Articles 10.5 or 10.6 are applicable:

10.3.1 For violations of Article 2.3 or Article 2.5, the period of ineligibility shall be four years unless, in the case of failing to submit to sample collection, the athlete can establish that the commission of the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional (as defined in Article 10.2.3), in which case the period of ineligibility shall be two years.

10.3.2 For violations of Article 2.4, the period of ineligibility shall be two years, subject to reduction down to a minimum of one year, depending on the athlete’s degree of fault. The flexibility between two years and one year of ineligibility in this Article is not available to athletes where a pattern of last-minute whereabouts changes or other conduct raises a serious suspicion that the athlete was trying to avoid being available for testing.

10.3.3 For violations of Article 2.7 or Article 2.8 the period of ineligibility imposed will be a minimum of four (4) years up to lifetime ineligibility, depending on the seriousness of the violation. An Article 2.7 or Article 2.8 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 athlete support personnel. In addition, significant violations of article 2.7 or 2.8 which also violate non-sporting laws and regulations, will be reported to the competent administrative, professional or judicial authorities.

[Comment to Article 10.3.3: 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.]

10.3.4 For violations of Article 2.9, the period of ineligibility imposed shall be a minimum of two years, up to four years, depending on the seriousness of the violation.

10.3.5 For violations of Article 2.10, the period of ineligibility shall be two years, subject to reduction down to a minimum of one year, depending on the athlete or other person’s degree of fault and other circumstances of the case.

[Comment to Article 10.3.5: Where the “other person” referenced in Article 2.10 is an entity and not an individual, that entity may be disciplined as provided in Article 12.]

10.4 Elimination of the Period of Ineligibility where there is No Fault or Negligence

If an athlete or other person establishes in an individual case that he or she bears no fault or negligence, the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility will be eliminated.

[Comment to Article 10.4: This Article and Article 10.5.2 apply only to the imposition of sanctions; they are not applicable to the determination of whether an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. They will only apply in exceptional circumstances, for example where an athlete could prove that, despite all due care, he or she was sabotaged by a competitor. Conversely, no fault or negligence would not apply in the following circumstances: (a) a positive test resulting from a mislabeled 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 under Article 10.5 based on no significant fault or negligence.]

10.5 Reduction of the Period of Ineligibility based on No Significant Fault or Negligence

10.5.1 Reduction of Sanctions for Specified Substances or Contaminated Products for Violations of Article 2.1, 2.2 or 2.6.

10.5.1.1 Specified Substances

Where the anti-doping rule violation involves a specified substance, and the athlete or other person can establish no significant fault or negligence, then the period of ineligibility shall be, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of ineligibility, and at a maximum, two years of ineligibility, depending on the athlete’s or other person’s degree of fault.

10.5.1.2 Contaminated Products

In cases where the athlete or other person can establish no significant fault or negligence and that the detected prohibited substance came from a contaminated product, then the period of ineligibility shall be, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of ineligibility, and at a maximum, two years ineligibility, depending on the athlete's or other person's degree of fault.

[Comment to Article 10.5.1.2: In assessing that athlete's degree of fault, it would, for example, be favorable for the athlete if the athlete had declared the product which was subsequently determined to be contaminated on his or her doping control form.]

10.5.2 Application of No Significant Fault or Negligence beyond the Application of Article 10.5.1

If an athlete or other person establishes in an individual case where Article 10.5.1 is not applicable that he or she bears no significant fault or negligence, then, subject to further reduction or elimination as provided in Article 10.6, the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility may be reduced based on the athlete or other person's degree of fault, 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 Article may be no less than eight years.

[Comment to Article 10.5.2: Article 10.5.2 may be applied to any anti-doping rule violation except those Articles where intent is an element of the anti-doping rule violation (e.g., Article 2.5, 2.7, 2.8 or 2.9) or an element of a particular sanction (e.g., Article 10.2.1) or a range of ineligibility is already provided in an Article based on the athlete or other person's degree of fault.]

10.6 Elimination, Reduction, or Suspension of Period of Ineligibility or other Consequences for Reasons Other than Fault

10.6.1 Substantial assistance in discovering or establishing anti-doping rule violations

10.6.1.1 The IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel 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: (i) the anti-doping organization discovering or bringing forward an anti-doping rule violation by another person, or (ii) which results in a criminal or disciplinary body discovering or bringing forward a criminal offense or the breach of professional rules committed by another person and the information provided by the person providing substantial assistance is made available to the IBU. After a final appellate decision under Article 13 or the expiration of time to appeal, the IBU may only suspend a part of the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility with the approval of WADA. The extent to which the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility may be suspended will 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 athlete or other person fails to continue to cooperate and to provide the complete and credible substantial assistance upon which a suspension of the period of ineligibility was based, the IBU shall reinstate the original period of ineligibility. If the IBU decides to reinstate a suspended period of ineligibility, that decision may be appealed by any person entitled to appeal under Article 13.

10.6.1.2 To further encourage athletes and other persons to provide substantial assistance to anti-doping organizations, at the request of the IBU or at the request of the athlete or other person who has (or has been asserted to have) committed an anti-doping rule violation, WADA may agree at any stage of the results management process, including after a final appellate decision under Article 13, to what it considers to be an appropriate suspension of the otherwise-applicable period of ineligibility and other consequences. In exceptional circumstances, WADA may agree to suspensions of the period of ineligibility and other consequences for substantial assistance greater than those otherwise provided in this Article, or even no period of ineligibility, and/or no return of prize money or payment of fines or costs. WADA's approval shall be subject to reinstatement of sanction, as otherwise provided in this Article. Notwithstanding Article 13, WADA's decisions in the context of this Article may not be appealed by any other anti-doping organization.

10.6.1.3 If the IBU suspends any part of an otherwise applicable sanction because of substantial assistance, then notice providing justification for the decision shall be provided to the other anti-doping organizations with a right to appeal under Article 13.2.3 as provided in Article 14.2. In unique circumstances where WADA determines that it would be in the best interest of anti-doping, WADA may authorize the IBU to enter into appropriate confidentiality agreements limiting or delaying the disclosure of the substantial assistance agreement or the nature of substantial assistance being provided.

[Comment to Article 10.6.1: 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. This is the only circumstance under the Code where the suspension of an otherwise applicable period of ineligibility is authorized.]

10.6.2 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 that 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 10.6.2: 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 believes he or she is about to be caught. The amount by which ineligibility is reduced should be based on the likelihood that the athlete or other person would have been caught had he/she not come forward voluntarily.]

10.6.3 Prompt Admission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation after being Confronted with a Violation Sanctionable under Article 10.2.1 or Article 10.3.1

An athlete or other person potentially subject to a four-year sanction under Article 10.2.1 or 10.3.1 (for evading or refusing sample collection or tampering with sample collection), by promptly admitting the asserted anti-doping rule violation after being confronted by the IBU, and also upon the approval and at the discretion of both WADA and the IBU may receive a reduction in the period of ineligibility down to a minimum of two years, depending on the seriousness of the violation and the athlete or other person's degree of fault.

10.6.4 Application of Multiple Grounds for Reduction of a Sanction

Where an athlete or other person establishes entitlement to reduction in sanction under more than one provision of Article 10.4, 10.5 or 10.6, before applying any reduction or suspension under Article 10.6, the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility shall be determined in accordance with Articles 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, and 10.5. If the athlete or other person establishes entitlement to a reduction or suspension of the period of ineligibility under Article 10.6, then the period of ineligibility may be reduced or suspended, but not below one-fourth of the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility.

[Comment to Article 10.6.4: The appropriate sanction is determined in a sequence of four steps. First, the hearing panel determines which of the basic sanctions (Articles 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, or 10.5) apply to the particular anti-doping rule violation. Second, if the basic sanction provides for a range of sanctions, the hearing panel must determine the applicable sanction within that range according to the athlete or other person's degree of fault. In a third step, the hearing panel establishes whether there is a basis for elimination, suspension, or reduction of the sanction (Article 10.6). Finally, the hearing panel decides on the commencement of the period of ineligibility under Article 10.11. Several examples of how Article 10 is to be applied are found in Appendix 2.]

10.7 Multiple Violations

10.7.1 For an athlete or other person's second anti-doping rule violation, the period of ineligibility shall be the greater of:

- a. six months;
- b. one-half of the period of ineligibility imposed for the first anti-doping rule violation without taking into account any reduction under Article 10.6; or
- c. twice the period of ineligibility otherwise applicable to the second anti-doping rule violation treated as if it were a first violation, without taking into account any reduction under Article 10.6.

The period of ineligibility established above may then be further reduced by the application of Article 10.6.

10.7.2 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 fulfills the condition for elimination or reduction of the period of ineligibility under Article 10.4 or 10.5, or involves a violation of Article 2.4 (filing failures and/or missed tests). In these particular cases, the period of ineligibility will be from eight (8) years to lifetime ineligibility.

10.7.3 An anti-doping rule violation for which an athlete or other person has established no fault or negligence shall not be considered a prior violation for purposes of this Article.

10.7.4 Additional Rules for Certain Potential Multiple Violations

10.7.4.1 For purposes of imposing sanctions under Article 10.7, an anti-doping rule violation will only be considered a second violation if the IBU 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, or after the IBU made reasonable efforts to give notice, of the first anti-doping rule violation; if the IBU cannot establish this, the violations shall be considered together as one single first violation, and the sanction imposed will be based on the violation that carries the more severe sanction.

10.7.4.2 If, after the imposition of a sanction for a first anti-doping rule violation, the IBU 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 IBU shall impose an additional sanction based on the sanction that could have been imposed if the two violations had 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.

10.7.5 Multiple Anti-Doping Rule Violations During Ten-Year Period

For purposes of Article 10.7, each anti-doping rule violation must take place within the same ten-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 that produced the positive sample under Article 9, 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.

[Comment to Article 10.8.: Nothing in the IBU 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 Allocation of CAS Cost Awards and Forfeited Prize Money

10.9.1 The priority for repayment of CAS cost awards and forfeited prize money shall be: first, payment of costs awarded by CAS; second, reallocation of forfeited prize money to other athletes; and third, reimbursement of the expenses of the IBU.

10.10 Financial Consequences

Where an athlete or other person commits an anti-doping rule violation, the IBU may, in its discretion and subject to the principle of proportionality, elect to

(a) recover from the athlete or other person costs associated with the anti-doping rule violation, regardless of the period of ineligibility imposed and/or

(b) fine the athlete or other person according to the IBU Disciplinary Rules, only in cases where the maximum period of ineligibility otherwise applicable has already been imposed.

The imposition of a financial sanction or the IBU's recovery of costs shall not be considered a basis for reducing the ineligibility or other sanction which would otherwise be applicable under these Anti-Doping Rules or the Code.

10.11 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 or there is no hearing, on the date ineligibility is accepted or otherwise imposed.

10.11.1 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 IBU 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. All competitive results achieved during the period of ineligibility, including retroactive ineligibility, shall be disqualified.

[Comment to Article 10.11.1: In cases of anti-doping rule violations other than under Article 2.1, the time required for an anti-doping organization to discover and develop facts sufficient to establish an anti-doping rule violation may be lengthy, particularly where the athlete or other person has taken affirmative action to avoid detection. In these circumstances, the flexibility provided in this Article to start the sanction at an earlier date should not be used.]

10.11.2 Timely Admission

Where the athlete or other person promptly (which in all events for an athlete means before the athlete competes again) admits the anti-doping rule violation after being confronted with the anti-doping rule violation by the IBU, 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.

This article shall not apply where the period of ineligibility already has been reduced under Article 10.6.3

10.11.3 Credit for Provisional Suspension or Period of Ineligibility Served

10.11.3.1 If a provisional suspension is imposed and respected by the athlete or other person, then the athlete or other person shall receive a credit for such period of provisional suspension against any period of ineligibility that may ultimately be imposed. If a period of ineligibility is served pursuant to a decision that is subsequently appealed, then the athlete or other person shall receive a credit for such period of ineligibility served against any period of ineligibility which may ultimately be imposed on appeal.

10.11.3.2 If an athlete or other person voluntarily accepts a provisional suspension in writing from the IBU and thereafter respects the provisional suspension, the athlete or other person 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 or other person's voluntary acceptance of a provisional suspension shall be provided promptly to each party entitled to receive notice of an asserted anti-doping rule violation under Article 14.1.

[Comment to Article 10.11.3.2: 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.]

10.11.3.3 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 10.11: Article 10.11 makes 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.]

10.12 Status During Ineligibility

10.12.1 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 a competition or activity (other than authorized anti-doping education or rehabilitation programs) authorized or organized by any signatory, signatory's member organization, or a club or other member organization of a signatory's member organization, or in competitions authorized or organized by any professional league or any international- or national-level event organization or any elite or national-level sporting activity funded by a governmental agency.

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 as an athlete in local sport events not sanctioned or otherwise under jurisdictions of a Code signatory or member of a Code signatory, but only so long as the local sport event is not at a level that could otherwise qualify such athlete or other person directly or indirectly to compete in (or accumulate points toward) a national championship or international event, and does not involve the athlete or other person working in any capacity with minors.

An athlete or other person subject to a period of ineligibility will remain subject to testing.

[Comment to Article 10.12.1 : For example, subject to Article 10.12.2 below, an ineligible athlete cannot participate in a training camp, exhibition or practice organized by his or her national federation or a club that is a member of that national federation or which is funded by a governmental agency. 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 10.12.3. The term "activity" also includes, for example, administrative activities, such as serving as an official, director, officer, employee, or volunteer of the organization described in this Article. Sanctions in biathlon will also be recognized by other sports (see Article 15).]

10.12.2 Return to Training

As an exception to Article 10.12.1, an athlete may return to train with a team or to use the facilities of a club or other member organization of IBU's member organization during the shorter of:

- (1) the last two months of the athlete's period of ineligibility, or
- (2) the last one-quarter of the period of ineligibility imposed.

[Comment to Article 10.12.2: In many team sports and some individual sports (e.g., ski jumping and gymnastics), an athlete cannot effectively train on his/her own so as to be ready to compete at the end of the athlete's period of ineligibility. During the training period described in this Article, an ineligible athlete may not compete or engage in any activity described in Article 10.12.1 other than training.]

10.12.3 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 10.12.1, the results of such participation shall be disqualified and a new period of ineligibility equal in length up to the original period of ineligibility shall be added to the end of the original period of ineligibility.

The new period of ineligibility may be adjusted based on the athlete or other person's degree of fault and other circumstances of the case. The determination of whether an athlete or other person has violated the prohibition against participation, and whether an adjustment is appropriate, shall be made by the anti-doping organization whose results management led to the imposition of the initial period of ineligibility. This decision may be appealed under Article 13.

Where an athlete support person or other person assists a person in violating the prohibition against participation during ineligibility, the IBU shall impose sanctions for a violation of Article 2.9 for such assistance.

10.12.4 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 or 10.5, some or all sport-related financial support or other sport-related benefits received by such person will be withheld by the IBU and its member federations.

10.13 Automatic Publication of Sanction

A mandatory part of each sanction shall include automatic publication, as provided in Article 14.3.

[Comment to Article 10: Harmonization of sanctions has been one of the most discussed and debated areas of anti-doping. Harmonization means that the same rules and criteria are applied to assess the unique facts of each case. Arguments against requiring harmonization of sanctions are based on differences between sports including, for example, the following: in some sports the athletes are professionals making a sizable income from the sport and in others the athletes are true amateurs; in those sports where an athlete's career is short, a standard period of ineligibility has a much more significant effect on the athlete than in sports where careers are traditionally much longer. A primary argument in favor of harmonization is that it is simply not right that two athletes from the same country who test positive for the same Prohibited Substance under similar circumstances should receive different sanctions only because they participate in different sports. In addition, flexibility in sanctioning has often been viewed as an unacceptable opportunity for some sporting organizations to be more lenient with dopers. The lack of harmonization of sanctions has also frequently been the source of jurisdictional conflicts between international federations and national anti-doping organizations.]

11. Consequences to Teams

11.1 If a member of a relay team is found to have committed a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules during a competition, the

relay team will be disqualified from the competition with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes.

11.2 Where more than one member of a relay team has been notified of an Anti-Doping Rule violation under Article 7 in connection with an event, the ruling body for the event shall conduct appropriate target testing of the team during the event period.

12. Sanctions and Costs Assessed Against Member Federations

12.1 The IBU has the authority to withhold some or all funding or other non-financial support to member federations that are not in compliance with these Anti-Doping Rules.

12.2 Member federations are obligated to reimburse the IBU for all costs (including but not limited to laboratory fees, hearing expenses and travel) related to a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules committed by an athlete or other person affiliated with that member federation.

12.3 The IBU shall take the following additional action against member federations:

12.3.1 If two athletes or other persons affiliated with the same member federation are declared ineligible for more than six months by the IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel for having committed, within a 12-month period, an Anti-Doping Rule violation (hereinafter "ADRV"), the IBU shall reduce by two (2) the applicable start quota (including Wild Cards) of that member federation for the subsequent competition season in the highest competition series (WCH – WC series; IBU Cup – OECH – SB WCH series; Junior Cup – OEJCH – YJWCH series) for which the athletes or persons declared ineligible had been registered.

12.3.1.1 The reduction of the applicable start quota shall also be applicable for Olympic Winter Games (OWG) if they take place during the subsequent competition season.

12.3.1.2 Relay competitions are not affected by the start quota reduction.

12.3.1.3 The reduction of the start quota may be imposed on the male gender or female gender only or equally on both genders, depending on the gender of the athletes or persons who have been declared ineligible.

12.3.1.4 In addition the IBU may ban officials from that member federation from participation in any IBU activities for a period of up to two years (2) and/or fine that member federation in accordance with the IBU Disciplinary Rules.

12.3.1.5 The IBU may refrain from sanctioning the member federation concerned if that member federation establishes that it bears no Fault or Negligence (within the meaning of Art. 10.4 of the WADA-Code) and could not reasonably avoid by all means the ADRV.

12.3.2 If three or more athletes or other persons affiliated with the same member federation are declared ineligible for more than six months by the IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel for having committed, within a 12-month period, an ADRV, the IBU shall increase the start quota reduction as defined in 12.3.1 to two subsequent competition seasons (including OWG if they take place in the two subsequent competition seasons).

12.3.2.1 In addition the IBU may ban officials from that member federation from participation in any IBU activities for a period of up to three years (3) and/or fine that member federation in accordance with the IBU Disciplinary Rules.

12.3.3 If six or more athletes or other persons affiliated with the same member federation are declared ineligible for more than six months by the IBU Anti-Doping Hearing Panel for having committed, within a 12-month period, an ADRV, the IBU shall suspend that federation's membership for a period of 2-4 years, depending on the seriousness of the ADRV and the lack of care of that federation.

12.3.4 In the event that a member federation has failed to make diligent efforts to keep the IBU informed about an athlete's whereabouts after receiving a request for that information from the IBU, the IBU may fine the member federation an amount in accordance with the IBU Disciplinary Rules per athlete in addition to all costs incurred by the IBU in testing that member federation's athletes.

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 13.7 or as otherwise provided in these Anti-Doping Rule, the Code or the International Standards. Such decisions shall remain in effect while under appeal unless the appellate body orders otherwise. Before an appeal is commenced, any post-decision review provided in the anti-doping organization's rules must be exhausted, provided that such review respects the principles set forth in Article 13.2.2 (except as provided in Article 13.1.3).

13.1.1 Scope of Review Not Limited

The scope of review on appeal includes all issues relevant to the matter and is expressly not limited to the issues or scope of review before the initial decision maker.

13.1.2 CAS Shall Not Defer to the Findings Being Appealed

In making its decision, CAS need not give deference to the discretion exercised by the body whose decision is being appealed. *[Comment to Article 13.1.2: CAS proceedings are de novo. Prior proceedings do not limit the evidence or carry weight in the hearing before CAS.]*

13.1.3 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 IBU's process, WADA may appeal such decision directly to CAS without having to exhaust other remedies in the IBU's process.

[Comment to Article 13.1.3: Where a decision has been rendered before the final stage of the IBU process (for example, a first hearing) and no party elects to appeal that decision to the next level of the IBU process (e.g. the Executive Board), then WADA may bypass the remaining steps in the IBU's internal process and appeal directly to the CAS.]

13.2 Appeals against Decisions Regarding Anti-Doping Rule Violations, Consequences, Provisional Suspensions, Recognition of Decisions and Jurisdiction

A decision that an anti-doping rule violation was committed, a decision imposing consequences or not 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 by WADA not to grant an exception to the six-months' notice requirement for a retired athlete to return to competition under Article 5.7.1; a decision by WADA assigning results management under Article 7.1 of the Code; a decision by the IBU 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 7.7; a decision to impose a provisional suspension as a result of a provisional hearing; [the IBU's] failure to comply with Article 7.9; a decision that the IBU lacks jurisdiction to rule on an alleged anti-doping rule violation or its consequences; a decision to suspend, or not suspend, a period of ineligibility or to reinstate, or not reinstate, a suspended period of ineligibility under Article 10.6.1; a decision under Article 10.12.3; and a decision by the IBU not to recognize another anti-doping organization's decision under Article 15, may be appealed exclusively as provided in Articles 13.2 – 13.7.

13.2.1 Appeals involving International-Level Athletes or International Events

In cases arising from competition in an international event or in cases involving international-level athletes, the decision may be appealed exclusively to CAS.

[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 other Athletes or other Persons

In cases where Article 13.2.1 is not applicable, the decision may be appealed to a national-level appeal body, being an independent and impartial body established in accordance with rules adopted by the national anti-doping organization having jurisdiction over the athlete or other person. The rules for such appeal shall respect the following principles: a timely hearing; a fair and impartial hearing panel; the right to be represented by counsel at the person's own expense; and a timely, written, reasoned decision. If the national anti-doping organization has not established such a body, the decision may be appealed to CAS in accordance with the provisions applicable before such court.

13.2.3 Persons Entitled to Appeal

In cases under Article 13.2.1, the following parties will 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 IBU;
- (d) the national anti-doping organization of the person's country of residence or countries where the person is a national or license holder;
- (e) 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
- (f) WADA.

In cases under Article 13.2.2, the parties having the right to appeal to the national-level appeal body shall be as provided in the national anti-doping organization'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 IBU;
- (d) the national anti-doping organization of the person's country of residence;
- (e) 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
- (f) WADA.

For cases under Article 13.2.2, WADA, the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee and the IBU shall also have the right to appeal to CAS with respect to the decision of the national-level appeal body. Any party filing an appeal shall be entitled to assistance from CAS to obtain all relevant information from the anti-doping organization whose decision is being appealed and the information shall be provided if CAS so directs.

Notwithstanding any other provision herein, the only person who may appeal against a provisional suspension is the athlete or other person upon whom the provisional suspension is imposed.

13.2.4 Cross-Appeals and other Subsequent Appeals Allowed

Cross-appeals and other subsequent appeals by any respondent named in cases brought to CAS under the Code are specifically permitted. Any party with a right to appeal under this Article 13 must file a cross-appeal or subsequent appeal at the latest with the party's answer.

[Comment to Article 13.2.4: This provision is necessary because since 2011, CAS rules no longer permit an athlete the right to cross-appeal when an anti-doping organization appeals a decision after the athlete's time for appeal has expired. This provision permits a full hearing for all parties.]

13.3 Failure to Render a Timely Decision

Where, in a particular case, the IBU fails 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 the CAS as if the IBU 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 attorney fees in prosecuting the appeal shall be reimbursed to WADA by the IBU.

[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 IBU to render a decision before WADA may intervene by appealing directly to CAS. Before taking such action, however, WADA will consult with the IBU and give the IBU an opportunity to explain why it has not yet rendered a decision.]

13.4 Appeals Relating to TUEs

TUE decisions may be appealed exclusively as provided in Article 4.4.

13.5 Notification of Appeal Decisions

Any anti-doping organization that is a party to an appeal must promptly provide the appeal decision to the athlete or other person and to the other anti-doping organizations that would have been entitled to appeal under Article 13.2.3 as provided under Article 14.2.

13.6 Appeal against Decisions Pursuant to Article 12

Decisions by IBU pursuant to Article 12 may be appealed exclusively to the CAS by the member federation.

13.7 Time for Filing Appeals

13.7.1 Appeals to CAS

The time to file an appeal to the CAS will 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 led to the decision being appealed:

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

The above notwithstanding, the filing deadline for an appeal filed by WADA will 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.

13.7.2 Appeals Under Article 13.2.2

The time to file an appeal to an independent and impartial body established at national level in accordance with rules established by the national anti-doping organization shall be indicated by the same rules of the national anti-doping organization.

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.

14. Confidentiality and Reporting

14.1 Information Concerning Adverse Analytical Findings, Atypical Findings, and Other Asserted Anti-Doping Rule Violations

14.1.1 Notice of Anti-Doping Rule Violations to Athletes and other Persons

Notice to athletes or other persons of anti-doping rule violations asserted against them shall occur as provided under Articles 7 and 14 of these Anti-Doping Rules. Notice to an athlete or other person who is a member of a member federation may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the member federation.

14.1.2 Notice of Anti-Doping Rule Violations to National Anti-Doping Organizations and WADA

Notice of the assertion of an anti-doping rule violation to national anti-doping organizations and WADA shall occur as provided under Articles 7 and 14 of these Anti-Doping Rules, simultaneously with the notice to the athlete or other person.

14.1.3 Content of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation Notice

Notification of an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 shall include: the athlete's name, country, sport and discipline within the sport, the athlete's competitive level, whether the test was in-competition or out-of-competition, the date of sample collection, the analytical result reported by the laboratory, and other information as required by the International Standard for Testing and Investigations.

Notice of anti-doping rule violations other than under Article 2.1 shall include the rule violated and the basis of the asserted violation.

14.1.4 Status Reports

Except with respect to investigations which have not resulted in notice of an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Article 14.1.1, national anti-doping organizations and WADA shall be regularly updated on the status and findings of any review or proceedings conducted pursuant to Article 7, 8 or 13 and shall be provided with a prompt written reasoned explanation or decision explaining the resolution of the matter.

14.1.5 Confidentiality

The recipient organizations shall not disclose this information beyond those persons with a need to know (which would include the appropriate personnel at the applicable National Olympic Committee, member federation, and team in a team sport) until the IBU has made public disclosure or has failed to make public disclosure as required in Article 14.3.

14.2 Notice of Anti-Doping Rule Violation Decisions and Request for Files

14.2.1 Anti-doping rule violation decisions rendered pursuant to Article 7.11, 8.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.12.3 or 13.5 shall include the full reasons for the decision, including, if applicable, a justification for why the greatest possible consequences were not imposed. Where the decision is not in English or French, the IBU shall provide a short English or French summary of the decision and the supporting reasons.

14.2.2 An anti-doping organization having a right to appeal a decision received pursuant to Article 14.2.1 may, within fifteen days of receipt, request a copy of the full case file pertaining to the decision.

14.3 Public Disclosure

14.3.1 The identity of any athlete or other person who is asserted by the IBU to have committed an anti-doping rule violation may be publicly disclosed by the IBU only after notice has been provided to the athlete or other person in accordance with Article 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 or 7.7 and simultaneously to WADA and the national anti-doping organization of the athlete or other person in accordance with Article 14.1.2.

14.3.2 No later than twenty days after it has been determined in a final appellate decision under Article 13.2.1 or 13.2.2, or such appeal has been waived, or a hearing in accordance with Article 8 has been waived, or the assertion of an anti-doping rule violation has not been timely challenged, IBU must publicly report the disposition of the matter, including the sport, the anti-doping rule violated, the name of the athlete or other person committing the violation, the prohibited substance or prohibited method involved (if any), and the consequences imposed. The IBU must also publicly report within twenty one (21) days the results of final appeal decisions concerning anti-doping rule violations, including the information described above.

14.3.3 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 publicly disclosed only with the consent of the athlete or other person who is the subject of the decision. The IBU shall use reasonable efforts to obtain such consent. If consent is obtained, the IBU shall publicly disclose the decision in its entirety or in such redacted form as the athlete or other person may approve.

14.3.4 Publication shall be accomplished at a minimum by placing the required information on the IBU's website or publishing it through other means and leaving the information up for the longer of one month or the duration of any period of ineligibility.

14.3.5 Neither the IBU, nor its member federations, nor any official of either body, shall publicly comment on the specific facts of any pending case (as opposed to general description of process and science) except in response to public comments attributed to the athlete or other person against whom an anti-doping rule violation is asserted, or their representatives.

- 14.3.6 The mandatory public reporting required in Article 14.3.2 shall not be required where the athlete or other person who has been found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation is a minor. Any optional public reporting in a case involving a minor shall be proportionate to the facts and circumstances of the case.
- 14.4 Statistical Reporting
- The IBU shall publish at least annually a general statistical report of its doping control activities with a copy provided to WADA. The IBU may also publish reports showing the name of each athlete tested and the date of each testing.
- 14.5 Doping Control Information Clearinghouse
- To facilitate coordinated test distribution planning and to avoid unnecessary duplication in testing by the various anti-doping organizations, the IBU shall report all in-competition and out-of-competition tests on such athletes to the WADA clearinghouse, using ADAMS, as soon as possible after such tests have been conducted. This information will be made accessible, where appropriate and in accordance with the applicable rules, to the athlete, the athlete's national anti-doping organization and any other anti-doping organizations with testing authority over the athlete.
- 14.6 Data Privacy
- 14.6.1 The IBU may collect, store, process or disclose personal information relating to athletes and other persons where necessary and appropriate to conduct their anti-doping activities under the Code, the International Standards (including specifically the International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information) and these Anti-Doping Rules.
- 14.6.2 Any participant who submits information including personal data to any person in accordance with these Anti-Doping Rules shall be deemed to have agreed, pursuant to applicable data protection laws and otherwise, that such information may be collected, processed, disclosed and used by such person for the purposes of the implementation of these Anti-Doping Rules, in accordance with the International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information and otherwise as required to implement these Anti-Doping Rules.
15. Application and Recognition of Decisions
- 15.1 Subject to the right to appeal provided in Article 13, the testing, 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 applicable worldwide and shall be recognized and respected by the IBU and its member federations.
- [Comment to Article 15.1: The extent of recognition of TUE decisions of other anti-doping organizations shall be determined by Article 4.4 and the International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions.]*
- 15.2 The IBU and its member federations shall recognize the measures taken by other bodies which have not accepted the Code if the rules of those bodies are otherwise consistent with the Code.
- [Comment to Article 15.2: 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 IBU and its national federations shall 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 or her body but the period of ineligibility applied is shorter than the period provided for in these Anti-Doping Rules, then the IBU shall recognize the finding of an anti-doping rule violation and may conduct a hearing consistent with Article 8 to determine whether the longer period of ineligibility provided in these Anti-Doping Rules should be imposed.]*
- 15.3 Subject to the right to appeal provided in Article 13, any decision by the IBU regarding a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules shall be recognized by all national federations, which shall take all necessary action to render such decision effective.
16. Incorporation of the IBU Anti-Doping Rules and Obligations of National Federations
- 16.1 All national federations and their members shall comply with these Anti-Doping Rules. All national federations and other members shall include in their regulations the provisions necessary to ensure that the IBU may enforce these Anti-Doping Rules directly against athletes under their anti-doping jurisdiction (including national-level athletes). These Anti-Doping Rules shall also be incorporated either directly or by reference into each national federation's rules so that the national federation may enforce them itself directly against athletes under its anti-doping jurisdiction (including national-level athletes).
- 16.2 All member federations shall establish rules requiring all athletes and each athlete support personnel who participates as coach, trainer, manager, team staff, official, medical or paramedical personnel in a competition or activity authorized or organized by a national federation or one of its member organizations to agree to be bound by these Anti-Doping Rules and to submit to the results management authority of the anti-doping organization responsible under the Code as a condition of such participation.
- 16.3 All member federations shall report any information suggesting or relating to an anti-doping rule violation to the IBU and to their national anti-doping organizations, and shall cooperate with investigations conducted by any anti-doping organization with authority to conduct the investigation.
- 16.4 All member federations shall have disciplinary rules in place to prevent athlete support personnel who are using prohibited substances or prohibited methods without valid justification from providing support to athletes under the jurisdiction of the IBU or the national federation.
- 16.5 All member federations shall be required to conduct anti-doping education in coordination with their national anti-doping organizations.

17. Statute of Limitations

No anti-doping rule violation proceeding may be commenced against an athlete or other person unless he or she has been notified of the anti-doping rule violation as provided in Article 7, or notification has been reasonably attempted, within ten years from the date the violation is asserted to have occurred.

18. IBU Compliance Reports to WADA

The IBU will report to WADA on the IBU's compliance with the Code in accordance with Article 23.5.2 of the Code.

19. Education

The IBU shall plan, implement, evaluate and monitor information, education and prevention programs for doping-free sport on at least the issues listed at Article 18.2 of the Code, and shall support active participation by athletes and athlete support personnel in such programs.

20. Amendment and Interpretation of Anti-Doping Rules

20.1 These Anti-Doping Rules may be amended from time to time by the IBU Executive Board.

20.2 These Anti-Doping Rules will be interpreted as an independent and autonomous text and not by reference to existing law or statutes.

20.3 The headings used for the various parts and articles of these Anti-Doping Rules are for convenience only and will 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.

20.4 The Code and the International Standards shall be considered integral parts of these Anti-Doping Rules and shall prevail in case of conflict.

20.5 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 Introduction shall be considered an integral part of these Anti-Doping Rules.

20.6 The comments annotating various provisions of the Code and these Anti-Doping Rules shall be used to interpret these Anti-Doping Rules.

20.7 These Anti-Doping Rules will come into full force and effect on 1 January 2015 (the "effective date"). They shall not apply retroactively to matters pending before the effective date; provided, however, that:

20.7.1 Anti-doping rule violations taking place prior to the effective date count as "first violations" or "second violations" for purposes of determining sanctions under Article 10 for violations taking place after the effective date.

20.7.2 The retrospective periods in which prior violations can be considered for purposes of multiple violations under Article 10.7.5 and the statute of limitations set forth in Article 17 are procedural rules and should be applied retroactively; provided, however, that Article 17 shall only be applied retroactively if the statute of limitations period has not already expired by the effective date. Otherwise, with respect to any anti-doping rule violation case which is pending as of the effective date and any anti-doping rule violation case brought after the effective date based on an anti-doping rule violation which occurred prior to the effective date, the case shall be governed by the substantive anti-doping rules in effect at the time the alleged anti-doping rule violation occurred unless the panel hearing the case determines the principle of "lex mitior" appropriately applies under the circumstances of the case.

20.7.3 Any Article 2.4 whereabouts failure (whether a filing failure or a missed test, as those terms are defined in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations) prior to the effective date shall be carried forward and may be relied upon, prior to expiry, in accordance with the International Standard for Testing and Investigation, but it shall be deemed to have expired 12 months after it occurred.

20.7.4 With respect to cases where a final decision finding an anti-doping rule violation has been rendered prior to the effective date, but the athlete or other person is still serving the period of ineligibility as of the effective date, the athlete or other person may apply to the anti-doping organization which had results management responsibility for the anti-doping rule violation to consider a reduction in the period of ineligibility in light of these Anti-Doping Rules. Such application must be made before the period of ineligibility has expired. The decision rendered may be appealed pursuant to Article 13.2. These Anti-Doping Rules shall have no application to any case where a final decision finding an anti-doping rule violation has been rendered and the period of ineligibility has expired.

20.7.5 For purposes of assessing the period of ineligibility for a second violation under Article 10.7.1, where the sanction for the first violation was determined based on rules in force prior to the effective date, the period of ineligibility which would have been assessed for that first violation, had these Anti-Doping Rules been applicable, shall be applied.

21. Interpretation of the Code

21.1 The official text of the Code shall be maintained by WADA and shall be published in English and French. In the event of any conflict between the English and French versions, the English version shall prevail.

21.2 The comments annotating various provisions of the Code shall be used to interpret the Code.

21.3 The Code shall be interpreted as an independent and autonomous text and not by reference to the existing law or statutes of the signatories or governments.

- 21.4 The headings used for the various parts and Articles of the Code are for convenience only and shall not be deemed part of the substance of the Code or to affect in any way the language of the provisions to which they refer.
- 21.5 The Code shall not apply retroactively to matters pending before the date the Code is accepted by a signatory and implemented in its rules. However, pre-Code anti-doping rule violations would continue to count as “first violations” or “second violations” for purposes of determining sanctions under Article 10 for subsequent post-Code violations.
- 21.6 The Purpose, Scope and Organization of the World Anti-Doping Program and the Code and Appendix 1, Definitions, and Appendix 2, Examples of the Application of Article 10, shall be considered integral parts of the Code.
- 22. Additional Roles and Responsibilities of Athletes and other Persons**
- 22.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Athletes**
- 22.1.1 To be knowledgeable of and comply with these Anti-Doping Rules.
- 22.1.2 To be available for sample collection at all times.
- [Comment to Article 22.1.2: With due regard to an athlete’s human rights and privacy, legitimate anti-doping considerations sometimes require sample collection late at night or early in the morning. For example, it is known that some athletes use low doses of EPO during these hours so that it will be undetectable in the morning.]*
- 22.1.3 To take responsibility, in the context of anti-doping, for what they ingest and use.
- 22.1.4 To inform medical personnel of their obligation not to use prohibited substances and prohibited methods and to take responsibility to make sure that any medical treatment received does not violate these Anti-Doping Rules.
- 22.1.5 To disclose to their national anti-doping organization and to the IBU any decision by a non-signatory finding that the athlete committed an anti-doping rule violation within the previous ten years.
- 22.1.6 To cooperate with anti-doping organizations investigating anti-doping rule violations.
- 22.1.7 Failure by any athlete to cooperate in full with anti-doping organizations investigating anti-doping rule violations may result in a disciplinary consequence according to the IBU Disciplinary Rules.
- 22.2 Roles and Responsibilities of Athlete Support Personnel**
- 22.2.1 To be knowledgeable of and comply with these Anti-Doping Rules.
- 22.2.2 To cooperate with the athlete testing program.
- 22.2.3 To use his or her influence on athlete values and behavior to foster anti-doping attitudes.
- 22.2.4 To disclose to his or her national anti-doping organization and to the IBU any decision by a non-signatory finding that he or she committed an anti-doping rule violation within the previous ten years.
- 22.2.5 To cooperate with anti-doping organizations investigating anti-doping rule violations.
- 22.2.6 Failure by any athlete support personnel to cooperate in full with anti-doping organizations investigating anti-doping rule violations may result in a disciplinary consequence according to the IBU’s Disciplinary Rules.
- 22.2.7 Athlete support personnel shall not use or possess any prohibited substance or prohibited method without valid justification.
- 22.2.8 Use or possession of a prohibited substance or prohibited method by an athlete support personnel without valid justification may result in a disciplinary consequence according to the IBU Disciplinary Rules.
- 23. Implementation of the Olympic Movement Medical Code**
- 23.1. The Olympic Movement Medical Code is considered integral part of the IBU Rules.
- 23.2. An IBU Medical Complaints Committee is, herewith, established. It consists of three members elected by and from among the members of the IBU Medical Committee. The chairperson of the IBU Medical Committee is also chairperson of the IBU Medical Complaints Committee.
- 23.3. The IBU Medical Complaints Committee is responsible to deal with violations of the Olympic Movement Medical Code at IBU events.
- 23.4. Such alleged violation must be brought to the attention of the chairperson of the IBU Medical Complaints Committee via the IBU Headquarters in writing and within 21 days after its occurrence.
- 23.5. The Complaints Committee will explore the facts of the case and prepare a report to the IBU Executive Board, which will include a recommendation on which measures to undertake to solve the case. It will not be restricted in the admission or evaluation of evidence. It will sit in person or via phone or internet conference, and is entitled to hear the persons involved in person or via phone or internet. The report will be finalized at the latest one (1) month after the receipt of the allegation.
- 23.6. Based on the report of the IBU Medical Complaints Committee, the IBU Executive Board may order all necessary measures, including sanctions.
- 24. Divergences**

In case of any divergences between the IBU Rules and the WADA Code, the WADA Code overrule the IBU Rules.

- 25. Entry into Force**

These rules are effective as of 1 January 2015.

APPENDIX 1 DEFINITIONS

ADAMS: The Anti-Doping Administration and Management System is a Web-based database management tool for data entry, storage, sharing, and reporting designed to assist stakeholders and WADA in their anti-doping operations in conjunction with data protection legislation.

Administration: Providing, supplying, supervising, facilitating, or otherwise participating in the use or attempted use by another person of a prohibited substance or prohibited method. However, this definition shall not include the actions of bona fide medical personnel involving a prohibited substance or prohibited method 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 that such prohibited substances are not intended for genuine and legal therapeutic purposes or are intended to enhance sport performance.

Adverse analytical finding: A report from a WADA-accredited laboratory or other WADA-approved laboratory that, consistent with the International Standard for Laboratories and the related Technical documents, 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.

Adverse passport finding: A report identified as an adverse passport finding as described in the applicable International Standards.

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, the IBU and other international federations, and national anti-doping organizations.

Athlete: Any person who competes in sport at the international level (as defined by each International Federation), or the national level (as defined by each national anti-doping organization). An anti-doping organization has discretion to apply anti-doping rules to an athlete who is neither an international-level athlete nor a national-level athlete, and thus to bring them within the definition of "athlete." In relation to athletes who are neither international-level nor national-level athletes, an anti-doping organization may elect to: conduct limited testing or no testing at all; analyze samples for less than the full menu of prohibited substances; require limited or no whereabouts information; or not require advance TUEs. However, if an Article 2.1, 2.3 or 2.5 anti-doping rule violation is committed by any athlete over whom an anti-doping organization has authority who competes below the international or national level, then the consequences set forth in the Code (except Article 14.3.2) must be applied. For purposes of Article 2.8 and Article 2.9 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: This definition makes it clear that all international- and national-level 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 International Federations and national anti-doping organizations, respectively. The definition also allows each national anti-doping organization, if it chooses to do so, to expand its anti-doping program beyond international- or national-level athletes to competitors at lower levels of competition or to individuals who engage in fitness activities but do not compete at all. Thus, a national anti-doping organization could, for example, elect to test recreational-level competitors but not require advance TUEs. But an anti-doping rule violation involving an adverse analytical finding or tampering results in all of the consequences provided for in the Code (with the exception of Article 14.3.2). The decision on whether consequences apply to recreational-level athletes who engage in fitness activities but never compete is left to the national anti-doping organization. In the same manner, a major event organization holding an event only for masters-level competitors could elect to test the competitors but not analyze samples for the full menu of prohibited substances. Competitors at all levels of competition should receive the benefit of anti-doping information and education.]

Athlete biological passport: The program and methods of gathering and collating data as described in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations and International Standard for Laboratories.

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 WADA-accredited laboratory or other WADA-approved laboratory which requires further investigation as provided by the WADA International Standard for Laboratories or related technical documents prior to the determination of an adverse analytical finding.

Atypical passport finding: A report described as an atypical passport finding as described in the applicable International Standards.

CAS: The Court of Arbitration for Sport.

Code: The World Anti-Doping Code.

Competition: A single race, match, game or singular sport contest. For example, a basketball game or the finals of the Olympic 100-meter race in athletics. For stage races and other sport 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 (“consequences”): 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 on account of an anti-doping rule violation for a specified period of time from participating in any competition or other activity or funding as provided in Article 10.12.1;

(c) provisional suspension means the athlete or other person is barred temporarily from participating in any competition or activity prior to the final decision at a hearing conducted under Article 8 (Right to a Fair Hearing).

(d) financial consequences means a financial sanction imposed for an anti-doping rule violation or to recover costs associated with an anti-doping rule violation; and

(e) public disclosure or public reporting means the dissemination or distribution of information to the general public or persons beyond those persons entitled to earlier notification in accordance with Article 14. Teams in team sports may also be subject to consequences as provided in Article 11 of the Code.

Contaminated product: A product that contains a prohibited substance that is not disclosed on the product label or in information available in a reasonable Internet search.

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, TUEs, results management and hearings.

Event: A series of individual competitions conducted together under one ruling body (e.g., the Olympic Games or the IBU World Championships).

Event venues: Those venues so designated by the ruling body for the event.

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

Fault: Fault is any breach of duty or any lack of care appropriate to a particular situation. Factors to be taken into consideration in assessing an athlete or other person’s degree of fault include, for example, the athlete’s or other person’s experience, whether the athlete or other person is a minor, special considerations such as impairment, the degree of risk that should have been perceived by the athlete and the level of care and investigation exercised by the athlete in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk. 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 behavior. 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 Article 10.5.1 or 10.5.2.

[Comment: The criteria for assessing an athlete’s degree of fault are the same under all Articles where fault is to be considered. However, under Article 10.5.2, no reduction of sanction is appropriate unless, when the degree of fault is assessed, the conclusion is that no significant fault or negligence on the part of the athlete or other person was involved.]

Financial consequences: see consequences of anti-doping rule violations, above.

IBU: The International Biathlon Union.

In-competition: The In-competition testing period for IBU events is defined as the period of the entry into a competition (three (3) hours before a competition starts) until five (5) hours after a competition ends.

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, i.e. individual, pursuit, sprint, super sprint and mass start competitions.

Ineligibility: See consequences of anti-doping rule violations above.

International event: An event where the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, the IBU, 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 who compete in sport at the international level, as defined by each international federation, consistent with the International Standard for Testing and Investigations. For the sport of Biathlon, international-level athletes are defined as set out in the Scope section of the Introduction to these Anti-Doping Rules.

[Comment: Consistent with the International Standard for Testing and Investigations, the international federation is free to

determine the criteria it will use to classify athletes as international-level athletes, e.g., by ranking, by participation in particular international events, by type of license, etc. However, it must publish those criteria in clear and concise form, so that athletes are able to ascertain quickly and easily when they will become classified as international-level athletes. For example, if the criteria include participation in certain international events, the international federation must publish a list of those international events.]

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 eighteen years.

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. If this designation has not been made by the competent public authority(ies), the entity will 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/Member federation: A national entity that is a member of or is recognized by the IBU as the entity governing biathlon in that nation. The exact definition is set out in the IBU Constitution.

National-level athlete: Athletes who compete in sport at the national level, as defined by each national anti-doping organization, consistent with the International Standard for Testing and Investigations.

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 that 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 or other person'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 or otherwise violated and anti-doping rule. Except in the case of a minor, for any violation of Article 2.1, the athlete must also establish how the prohibited substance entered his or her system.

No significant fault or negligence: The athlete or other person'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. Except in the case of a minor, for any violation of Article 2.1, the athlete must also establish how the prohibited substance entered his or her system.

[Comment: For cannabinoids, an athlete may establish no significant fault or negligence by clearly demonstrating that the context of the use was unrelated to sport performance.]

Out-of-competition: Any period 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 or intends to exercise 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 will 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. The act of purchasing a prohibited substance alone constitutes possession, even where, for example, the product does not arrive, is received by someone else, or is sent to a third party address.]

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, or class of substances, so described on the Prohibited List.

Provisional hearing: For purposes of Article 7.9, 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.

[Comment: A provisional hearing is only a preliminary proceeding which may not involve a full review of the facts of the case. Following a provisional hearing, the athlete remains entitled to a subsequent full hearing on the merits of the case. By contrast, an "expedited hearing," as that term is used in Article 7.9, is a full hearing on the merits conducted on an expedited time schedule.]

Provisional suspension: See consequences of anti-doping rule violations above.

Publicly disclose or publicly report: See consequences of anti-doping rule violations above.

Regional anti-doping organization: A regional entity designated by member countries to coordinate and manage delegated areas of their national anti-doping programs, which may include the adoption and implementation of anti-doping rules, the planning and collection of samples, the management of results, the review of TUEs, the conduct of hearings, and the conduct of educational programs at a regional level.

Registered testing pool: The pool highest-priority athletes established separately at the international level by the IBU, and at the national level by national anti-doping organizations, who are subject to focused in-competition and out-of-competition testing as part of that international federation's or national anti-doping organization's test distribution plan and therefore are required to provide whereabouts information as provided in Article 5.6 of the Code and the International Standard for Testing and Investigations.

Sample or specimen: 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 WADA Code and agreeing to comply with the Code, as provided in Article 23 of the Code.

Specified substances: As defined in Article 4.2.2.

Strict liability: The rule which provides that under Article 2.1 and Article 2.2, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence, or knowing use on the athlete's part be demonstrated by the anti-doping organization in order to establish an anti-doping rule violation.

Substantial assistance: For purposes of Article 10.6.1, 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 that 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;

Target testing: Selection of specific athletes for based on criteria set forth in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations.

Team sport: A sport in which the substitution of players is permitted during a competition, i.e. relay and mixed relay.

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 (or possessing for any such purpose) 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 will 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: Therapeutic use exemption, as defined in Article 4.4

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

Use: The utilization, application, ingestion, injection or consumption by any means whatsoever of any prohibited substance or prohibited method.

WADA: The World Anti-Doping Agency.