



INTERNATIONAL GOLF FEDERATION

ANTI-DOPING POLICY

Effective 1 January 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
PREFACE.....	3
SCOPE	3
ARTICLE 1 DEFINITION OF DOPING.....	4
ARTICLE 2 ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS.....	4
ARTICLE 3 PROOF OF DOPING	7
ARTICLE 4 THE <i>PROHIBITED LIST</i>	9
ARTICLE 5 <i>TESTING</i>	11
ARTICLE 6 ANALYSIS OF <i>SAMPLES</i>	14
ARTICLE 7 RESULTS MANAGEMENT	15
ARTICLE 8 FAIR HEARINGS	19
ARTICLE 9 AUTOMATIC <i>DISQUALIFICATION</i> OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS	22
ARTICLE 10 SANCTIONS ON INDIVIDUALS.....	22
ARTICLE 11 <i>CONSEQUENCES</i> TO TEAMS IN TEAM <i>EVENTS</i>	37
ARTICLE 12 SANCTIONS AND COSTS ASSESSED AGAINST A <i>NATIONAL UNION OR FEDERATION</i>	38
ARTICLE 13 APPEALS.....	38
ARTICLE 14 <i>NATIONAL UNION OR FEDERATION'S</i> INCORPORATION OF IGF'S RULES, REPORTING AND RECOGNITION	40
ARTICLE 15 RECOGNITION OF DECISIONS BY OTHER ORGANISATIONS	49
ARTICLE 16 STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.....	50
ARTICLE 17 IGF COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO <i>WADA</i>	50
ARTICLE 18 AMENDMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF IGF ANTI-DOPING POLICY	43
ARTICLE 19 WAIVER AND CONSENT	52

INTERNATIONAL GOLF FEDERATION ANTI-DOPING POLICY

INTRODUCTION

Preface

This Anti-Doping Policy is adopted and implemented by the International Golf Federation (“IGF”) in conformance with the World Anti-Doping Code (the “Code”). This Anti-Doping Policy is adopted and implemented in conformance with IGF’s responsibilities under the Code, and are in furtherance of IGF’s continuing efforts to eradicate doping in the sport of golf.

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

General Statement of Policy

The International Golf Federation is committed to maintaining the integrity of golf. The use of doping substances or doping methods is contrary to the spirit of fair competition. This Anti-Doping Policy is designed to deter the use of Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods through education, information and, where appropriate, testing. **It is a condition of entry to all Events organised by the IGF that *Players* voluntarily accept the application to them of this Policy in its entirety and submit to Testing in accordance with its provisions, and to the jurisdiction of the disciplinary process set out in this Policy.**

Scope

[In addition to any requirement which may be applicable under Rule 33-1 of the Rules of Golf], this Anti-Doping Policy shall apply to and be adhered to by the IGF, and each of its member *National Unions or Federations*. Any *Person* who fulfills the requirements to be part of the IGF *Registered Testing Pool* must become a member of the *Person’s National Union or Federation* and must make himself or herself available for *Testing* at least six months before participating in IGF *Events* or events of his/her *National Union or Federation*.

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

This Anti-Doping Policy shall apply to all *Doping Controls* over which IGF and its *National Unions or Federations* have jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 1 DEFINITION OF DOPING

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

ARTICLE 2 ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS

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

The following constitute anti-doping rule violations:

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

2.1 The presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* in a *Player's Sample*

2.1.1 It is each *Player's* personal duty to ensure that no *Prohibited Substance* enters his or her body. *Players* 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 *Player's* part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping violation under Article 2.1.

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

The strict liability rule for the finding of a Prohibited Substance in a Player's Sample, with a possibility that sanctions may be modified based on specified criteria, provides a reasonable balance between effective anti-doping enforcement for the benefit of all "clean" Players and fairness in the exceptional circumstance where a Prohibited Substance entered a Player's system through No Fault or Negligence or No Significant Fault or Negligence on the Player's part. It is important to emphasize that while the determination of whether the anti-doping rule has been violated is based on strict liability, the imposition of a fixed period of Ineligibility is not automatic. The strict liability principle set forth in IGF's Anti-Doping Policy has been consistently upheld in the decisions of CAS.]

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

[Comment to Article 2.1.2: IGF may in its discretion choose to have the B Sample analyzed even if the Player 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 a *Player's Sample* shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.

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

2.2 Use or Attempted Use by a Player of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method

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

2.2.1 It is each *Player's* personal duty to ensure that no *Prohibited Substance* enters his or her body. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing *Use* on the *Player'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 Player'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.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.6 Possession of Prohibited Substances and Methods

2.6.1 Possession by a Player In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance, or Possession by a Player Out-of-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance which is prohibited in Out-of-Competition Testing unless the Player establishes that the Possession is

pursuant to a therapeutic use exemption (“TUE”) granted in accordance with Article 4.4 (Therapeutic Use) or other acceptable justification.

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

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

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

2.7 Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking in any Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.

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

ARTICLE 3 PROOF OF DOPING

3.1 Burdens and Standards of Proof

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

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

3.2 Methods of Establishing Facts and Presumptions

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

[Comment to Article 3.2: For example, IGF or its National Unions or Federations may establish an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use by a Player of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method) based on the Player'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 Player's blood or urine Samples.]

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

If the *Player* or other *Person* rebuts the preceding presumption by showing that a departure from the *International Standard* occurred which could reasonably have caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*, then IGF or its *National Union or Federation* shall have the burden to establish that such departure did not cause the *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

[Comment to Article 3.2.1: The burden is on the Player 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 Player or other Person does so, the burden shifts to IGF or its National Union or Federation to prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that the departure did not cause the Adverse Analytical Finding.]

3.2.2 Departures from any other *International Standard* or other anti-doping rule or policy which did not cause an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or other anti-doping rule violation shall not invalidate such results. If the *Player* or other *Person* establishes that a departure from another *International Standard* or other anti-doping rule or policy which could reasonably have caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding* or other anti-doping rule violation occurred, then IGF or its *National Union or Federation* shall have the burden to establish that such a departure did not cause the *Adverse Analytical Finding* or the factual basis for the anti-doping rule violation.

3.2.3 The facts established by a decision of a court or professional disciplinary tribunal of competent jurisdiction which is not the subject of a pending appeal shall be irrebuttable evidence against the *Player* or other *Person* to whom the decision pertained of those facts unless the *Player* or other *Person* establishes that the decision violated principles of natural justice.

3.2.4 The hearing panel in a hearing on an anti-doping rule violation may draw an inference adverse to the *Player* or other *Person* who is asserted to have

committed an anti-doping rule violation based on the *Player's* or other *Person's* refusal, after a request made in a reasonable time in advance of the hearing, to appear at the hearing (either in person or telephonically as directed by the tribunal) and to answer questions either from the hearing panel or from the *Anti-Doping Organization* asserting the anti-doping rule violation.

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

ARTICLE 4 THE PROHIBITED LIST

4.1 Incorporation of the *Prohibited List*

This Anti-Doping Policy incorporates the *Prohibited List* which is published and revised by WADA as described in Article 4.1 of the *Code*. The *Prohibited List* can be found on both the IGF and WADA websites. Each *National Union or Federation* shall ensure that the current *Prohibited List* is available to its members and constituents.

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

4.2 Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods Identified on the *Prohibited List*

4.2.1 Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods

Unless provided otherwise in the *Prohibited List* and/or a revision, the *Prohibited List* and revisions shall go into effect under this Anti-Doping Policy three months after publication of the *Prohibited List* by WADA without requiring any further action by IGF. As described in Article 4.2 of the *Code*, the IGF may request that WADA expand the *Prohibited List* for the sport of golf. The IGF may also request that WADA include additional substances or methods, which have the potential for abuse in the sport of golf, in the monitoring program described in Article 4.5 of the *Code*. As provided in the *Code*, WADA shall make the final decision on such requests by the IGF.

4.2.2 Specified Substances

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

4.2.3 New Classes of *Prohibited Substances*

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

4.3 Criteria for Including Substances and Methods on the *Prohibited List*

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

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

4.4 Therapeutic Use

4.4.1 *Players* with a documented medical condition requiring the use of a *Prohibited Substance* or a *Prohibited Method* must first obtain a TUE. The presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* (Article 2.1), *Use* or *Attempted Use* of a *Prohibited Substance* or a *Prohibited Method* (Article 2.2), *Possession* of *Prohibited Substances* or *Prohibited Methods* (Article 2.6) or administration of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* (Article 2.8) consistent with the provisions of an applicable TUE issued pursuant to the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions shall not be considered an anti-doping rule violation. (In addition, while not prohibited, the use of Glucocorticosteroids by inhalation requires the filing of a Declaration of Use.)

4.4.2 Subject to Article 4.4.3, *Players* included by IGF in its *Registered Testing Pool* and other *Players* participating in any *International Event* must obtain a TUE from IGF (regardless of whether the *Player* previously has received a TUE at the national level, unless IGF has agreed with the applicable *National Union* or *Federation* to recognize TUEs granted by it). The application for a TUE must be made as soon as possible (in the case of a *Player* in the *Registered Testing Pool*, this would be when he/she is first notified of his/her inclusion in the pool) and in any event (save in emergency situations) no later than 21 days before the *Player's* participation in the *Event*.

4.4.3 As an exception to Article 4.4.2, in accordance with Article 7.13 of the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, *Players* not in IGF's *Registered Testing Pool* who inhale formoterol, salbutamol, salmeterol or terbutaline to treat asthma or one of its clinical variants do not need a TUE in advance of participating in an *International Event* unless so specified by IGF. Instead, if necessary, any such *Player* may apply for a Retroactive TUE after the

Event in accordance with Article 7.13 of the *International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions* and Article 7.1.3 of these Anti-Doping Rules. As a further exception, *Players* using Glucocorticosteroids by non-systemic routes will be required to file a declaration of use.

4.4.4 TUEs granted by IGF shall be reported to the *Player's National Union or Federation* and to WADA. Other *Players* subject to *Testing* who need to use a *Prohibited Substance* or a *Prohibited Method* for therapeutic reasons must obtain a TUE from their *National Anti-Doping Organization* or other body designated by their *National Union or Federation*, as required under the rules of the *National Anti-Doping Organization/other body*. The *National Union or Federation* shall promptly report any such TUEs involving *Players* in their Registered Testing Pool to IGF and WADA.

4.4.5 IGF has appointed a committee to consider requests for TUEs (the "TUEC"). Upon IGF's receipt of a TUE request, the Chair of the TUEC shall appoint one or more members of the TUEC (which may include the Chair) to consider such request. The TUEC member(s) so designated shall promptly evaluate such request in accordance with the *International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions* and render a decision on such request, which shall be the final decision of IGF.

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

ARTICLE 5 TESTING

5.1 Authority to Test

All *Players* in IGF's *Registered Testing Pool* or who have entered an IGF-sanctioned event and all *Players* under the jurisdiction of a *National Union or Federation* shall be subject to *In-Competition Testing* by IGF, the *Player's National Union or Federation*, and any other *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for *Testing* at a *Competition* or *Event* in which they participate. All *Players* in IGF's *Registered Testing Pool* or who have entered an IGF-sanctioned event and all *Players* under the jurisdiction of a *National Union or Federation*, including *Players* serving a period of *Ineligibility* or a *Provisional Suspension*, shall also be subject to *Out-of-Competition Testing* at any time or place, with or without advance notice, by IGF, WADA, the *Player's National Union or Federation*, the *National Anti-Doping Organization* of any country where the *Player* is present, the IOC during the Olympic Games, and the IPC during Paralympic Games. *Target Testing* will be made a priority.

[Comment to Article 5.1: Target Testing is specified because random Testing, or even weighted random Testing, does not ensure that all of the appropriate Players will be tested (e.g., world-class Players, Players whose performances have dramatically improved over a short period of time, Players whose coaches have had other Players test positive, etc.). Obviously, Target Testing must not be used for any purposes other than legitimate Doping Control. The Code makes it clear that

Players have no right to expect that they will be tested only on a random basis. Similarly, it does not impose any reasonable suspicion or probable cause requirement for Target Testing]

5.2 Responsibility for IGF Testing

The IGF Anti-Doping Program Administrator shall be responsible for drawing up a test distribution plan in accordance with Article 4 of the *International Standard for Testing*, and for the implementation of that plan, including overseeing all *Testing* conducted by or on behalf of IGF. *Testing* may be conducted by any qualified persons so authorized by IGF.

5.3 Testing Standards

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

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

5.4 Coordination of Testing

IGF and the *National Unions or Federations* shall promptly report completed tests through the WADA clearinghouse to avoid unnecessary duplication in *Testing*.

5.5 Player Whereabouts Requirements

5.5.1 IGF shall identify a *Registered Testing Pool* of those *Players* who are required to comply with the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing*, and shall publish the criteria for *Players* to be included in this *Registered Testing Pool* as well as a list of the *Players* meeting those criteria for the period in question. IGF shall review and update as necessary its criteria for including *Players* in its *Registered Testing Pool*, and shall revise the membership of its *Registered Testing Pool* from time to time as appropriate in accordance with the set criteria. Each *Player* in the *Registered Testing Pool* (a) shall advise IGF of his/her whereabouts on a quarterly basis, in the manner set out in Article 11.3 of the *International Standard for Testing*; (b) shall update that information as necessary, in accordance with Article 11.4.2 of the *International Standard for Testing*, so that it remains accurate and complete at all times; and (c) shall make him/herself available for *Testing* at such whereabouts, in accordance with Article 11.4 of the *International Standard for Testing*.

5.5.2 A *Player's* failure to advise IGF of his/her whereabouts shall be deemed a Filing Failure for purposes of Article 2.4 where the conditions of Article 11.3.5 of the *International Standard for Testing* are met.

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

5.5.4 Each *National Union or Federation* shall also, on its own or through its *National Anti-Doping Organization*, establish a national-level *Registered Testing Pool* of top level national *Players* to whom the whereabouts requirements of the

International Standard for Testing shall also apply. Where those *Players* are also in the IGF's *Registered Testing Pool*, the IGF and the *National Anti-Doping Organization* will agree (with the assistance of *WADA* if required) on which of them will take responsibility for receiving whereabouts filings from the *Player* and sharing it with the other and with other *Anti-Doping Organizations* in accordance with Article 5.5.5.

5.5.5 Whereabouts information provided pursuant to Articles 5.5.1 and 5.5.4 shall be shared with *WADA* and other *Anti-Doping Organizations* having jurisdiction to test a *Player* in accordance with Articles 11.7.1(d) and 11.7.3(d) of the *International Standard for Testing*, including the strict condition that it be used only for *Doping Control* purposes.

5.6 Retirement and Return to Competition

5.6.1 A *Player* who has been identified by IGF for inclusion in IGF's *Registered Testing Pool* shall continue to be subject to this Anti-Doping Policy, including the obligation to comply with the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing* unless and until the *Player* gives written notice to IGF that he or she has retired or until he or she no longer satisfies the criteria for inclusion in IGF's *Registered Testing Pool* and has been so informed by IGF.

5.6.2 A *Player* who has given notice of retirement to IGF may not resume competing in IGF-sanctioned competitions or competitions in which IGF has any administrative responsibility unless he or she notifies IGF at least twelve months before he or she expects to return to *Competition* and makes him/herself available for unannounced *Out-of-Competition Testing*, including (if requested) complying with the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing*, at any time during the period before actual return to *Competition*.

5.6.3 *National Unions or Federations or National Anti-Doping Organizations* may establish similar requirements for retirement and returning to *Competition* for *Players* in the national *Registered Testing Pool*.

5.7 Selection of *Players* to be Tested

5.7.1 At *International Events*, the IGF Anti-Doping Program Administrator shall determine the number of finishing placement tests, random tests and target tests to be performed.

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

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

5.7.4 *Players* shall be selected for *Out-of-Competition Testing* by the IGF Anti-Doping Program Administrator and by the *National Union or Federation* through a

process that substantially complies with the *International Standard for Testing* in force at the time of selection.

5.8 The *National Unions or Federations* and the organizing committees for *National Union or Federation Events* shall provide access to *Independent Observers at Events* as directed by IGF.

5.9 A *Player* who is not a regular member of IGF or one of its *National Unions or Federations* and who otherwise would have met the criteria for inclusion in the IGF *Registered Testing Pool* will not be permitted to compete in IGF-sanctioned *Events* or international *Events* where the IGF is involved in an administrative capacity unless he or she offers to be included in IGF's *Registered Testing Pool* at least twelve months before he or she expects to compete.

ARTICLE 6 ANALYSIS OF SAMPLES

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

6.1 Use of Approved Laboratories

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

[Comment to Article 6.1: Violations of Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers) may be established only by Sample analysis performed by a WADA-approved laboratory or another laboratory specifically authorized by WADA. Violations of other Articles may be established using analytical results from other laboratories so long as the results are reliable.]

6.2 Purposes of Collection and Analysis of Samples

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

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

6.3 Research on Samples

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

6.4 Standards for *Sample* Analysis and Reporting

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

6.5 Retesting *Samples*

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

ARTICLE 7 RESULTS MANAGEMENT

7.1 Results Management for Tests Initiated by IGF

Results management for tests initiated by IGF (including tests performed by other *Anti-Doping Organizations* pursuant to agreement with IGF) shall proceed as set forth below:

7.1.1 The results from all analyses must be sent to IGF in encoded form, in a report signed by an authorised representative of the laboratory. All communication must be conducted in confidentiality and in conformity with *ADAMS*, a database management tool developed by *WADA*.

7.1.2 Upon receipt of an *A Sample Adverse Analytical Finding*, the IGF Investigations Committee shall conduct a review to determine whether: (a) the *Adverse Analytical Finding* is consistent with an applicable TUE (or whether other special requirements set forth in the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions applicable to Glucocorticosteroids and Beta-2 Agonists apply), or (b) there is any apparent departure from the *International Standard* for Testing or *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

7.1.3 When the *Adverse Analytical Finding* is for formoterol, salbutamol, salmeterol or terbutaline and the *Player* is not in IGF's *Registered Testing Pool*, then, before the IGF Investigations Committee completes its review under Article 7.1.2, the *Player* shall be given an opportunity to apply to the TUE Committee for a Retroactive TUE in accordance with Article 7.13 of the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions. When the *Adverse Analytical Finding* is for a Glucocorticosteroid, the IGF Investigations Committee shall confirm that a declaration of use is in place for the non-systemic use of Glucocorticosteroids.

7.1.4 If the initial review of an *Adverse Analytical Finding* under Article 7.1.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE, or departure from the *International Standard* for Testing or the *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*, IGF shall promptly notify the *Player* of: (a) the *Adverse Analytical Finding*; (b) the anti-doping rule violated; (c) the *Player's* right to request the analysis of the *B Sample*, which must be received by IGF within three calendar days of the date of the notice to the *Player* or, failing such request, that the *B Sample* analysis may be deemed waived; (d) the scheduled date, time and place for the *B Sample* analysis (which shall be within the time period specified in the

International Standard for Laboratories) if the *Player* or IGF chooses to request an analysis of the *B Sample*; (e) the opportunity for the *Player* and/or the *Player's* representative to attend the *B Sample* opening and analysis at the scheduled date, time and place if such analysis is requested; and (f) the *Player'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. IGF shall also notify the *Player's National Union or Federation*, his *National Anti-Doping Organization* and *WADA*. If IGF decides not to bring forward the *Adverse Analytical Finding* as an anti-doping rule violation, it shall so notify the *Player*, the *Player's National Union or Federation*, his *Anti-Doping Organization* and *WADA*.

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

7.1.6 The *Player* and/or his representative shall be allowed to be present at the analysis of the *B Sample* within the time period specified in the *International Standard* for Laboratories. Also a representative of the *Player's National Union or Federation* as well as a representative of IGF shall be allowed to be present.

7.1.7 The conclusion of the *B Sample* analysis shall be reported to the *Player*, his *National Union or Federation*, IGF, and to *WADA*.

7.1.8 If the *B Sample* proves negative, then (unless IGF takes the case forward as an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.2) the entire test shall be considered negative.

7.1.9 As provided in the *International Standards*, in certain circumstances laboratories are directed to report the presence of *Prohibited Substances* that may also be produced endogenously as *Atypical Findings* that should be investigated further.

7.1.10 If a laboratory reports an *Atypical Finding* in respect of a *Sample* collected from an *Player* by or on behalf of IGF, the IGF Investigations Committee shall conduct a review to determine whether: (a) the *Atypical Finding* is consistent with an applicable TUE that has been granted as provided in the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, or (b) there is any apparent departure from the *International Standard* for *Testing* or *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Atypical Analytical Finding*.

7.1.11 If the initial review of an *Atypical Finding* under Article 7.1.10 reveals an applicable TUE or departure from the *International Standard* for *Testing* or the *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Atypical Finding*, the *Atypical Finding* shall not be pursued as an anti-doping rule violation.

7.1.12 If the initial review of an *Atypical Finding* under Article 7.1.10 does not reveal an applicable TUE or departure from the *International Standard* for *Testing* or the *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Atypical Finding*, the IGF Anti-Doping Investigations Committee shall conduct the follow-up investigation required by the *International Standards*. If, once that investigation is completed, it is

concluded that the *Atypical Finding* should be considered an *Adverse Analytical Finding*, IGF shall pursue the matter in accordance with Article 7.1.3.

7.1.13 IGF will not provide notice of an *Atypical Finding* until it has completed its investigation and has decided whether it will bring the *Atypical Finding* forward as an *Adverse Analytical Finding* unless one of the following circumstances exists:

(a) If IGF determines the *B Sample* should be analyzed prior to the conclusion of its follow-up investigation, it may conduct the *B Sample* analysis after notifying the *Player*, with such notice to include a description of the *Atypical Finding* and the information described in Article 7.1.4(c) to (f).

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

7.1.14 For apparent anti-doping rule violations that do not involve *Adverse Analytical Findings* or *Atypical Findings*, the IGF Investigations Committee shall conduct any necessary follow-up investigation and, at such time as it is satisfied that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, it shall then promptly notify the *Player*, his *National Union or Federation*, his *National Anti-Doping Organization*, and *WADA* of the anti-doping rule which appears to have been violated, and the basis of the violation.

7.1.15 *Players* and other *Persons* shall cooperate with any investigation conducted by the Anti-Doping Investigations Committee or comparable national body.

7.2 Results Management for Tests Initiated During Other *International Events*

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

7.3 Results Management for Tests initiated by a *National Union or Federation*

Results management conducted by a *National Union or Federation* shall be consistent with the general principles for effective and fair results management which underlie the detailed provisions set forth in Article 7.1. *National Unions or Federations* shall keep IGF apprised of the status of their results management process involving all *Adverse Analytical Findings* or *Atypical Findings*. Results of all *Doping Controls* shall be reported to IGF and to *WADA* within 14 days of the conclusion of the *National Union or Federation's* results management process. Any apparent anti-doping rule violation by a *Player* who is a member of that *National Union or Federation* shall be promptly referred to an appropriate hearing panel established pursuant to the rules of the *National Union or Federation* or national law. Apparent anti-doping rule violations by *Players* who are members of another *National Union or Federation* shall be referred to the *Player's National Union or Federation* for hearing.

7.4 Results Management for Whereabouts Violations

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

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

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

7.5 Provisional Suspensions

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

7.5.2 In any case not covered by Article 7.5.1 where IGF decides to take the matter forward as an apparent anti-doping rule violation in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Article 7, the IGF Anti-Doping Program Administrator, after consultation with the IGF Investigations Committee, may *Provisionally Suspend* the *Player* pending the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee's determination of whether he/she has committed an anti-doping rule violation.

7.5.3 Where a *Provisional Suspension* is imposed, whether pursuant to Article 7.5.1 or Article 7.5.2, the *Player* shall, as determined by IGF, be given either (a) an opportunity for a *Provisional Hearing* before imposition of the *Provisional Suspension* or on a timely basis after imposition of the *Provisional Suspension*; or (b) an opportunity for an expedited hearing in accordance with Article 8.1.5 below. *Provisional Hearings* shall be held via conference call before the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee on a date designated by IGF. The sole issue to be determined by the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee panel at such *Provisional Hearing* will be whether IGF's decision that a *Provisional Suspension* should be imposed shall be upheld. IGF's decision to impose a *Provisional Suspension* shall be upheld if probable cause exists for IGF to proceed with an anti-doping rule

violation case against the *Player*. To establish probable cause, it shall not be necessary for any B Sample analysis to be completed nor shall it be necessary for IGF to have provided the *Player* full laboratory or chain of custody written documentation.

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

7.5.5 **Players** shall receive credit for a *Provisional Suspension* against any period of *Ineligibility* which is ultimately imposed as provided in Article 10.

7.5.6 **National Unions or Federations** shall impose *Provisional Suspensions* in accordance with the principles set forth in this Article 7.5.

7.6 Retirement from Sport

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

[Comment to Article 7.6: Conduct by a Player or other Person before the Player 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 Player or other Person membership in a National Union or Federation.]

ARTICLE 8 FAIR HEARINGS

8.1 Hearings before the IGF Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee

8.1.1 The IGF shall appoint an Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee from which panels will be appointed to conduct hearings involving alleged anti-doping rule violations.

8.1.2 When it appears, following the Results Management process described in Article 7, that this Anti-Doping Policy has been violated in connection with IGF *Testing*, *Testing* at an *International Event*, other anti-doping rule violations discovered by IGF, or instances where the IGF is not satisfied with the adjudication being conducted by a *National Union or Federation*, then the case

shall be assigned to a panel appointed by the IGF Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee (an “IGF Doping Hearing Panel”) for adjudication.

8.1.3 The IGF Doping Hearing Panel shall consist of three members from the IGF Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee to hear each case. At least one of the appointed members shall be a lawyer. One of the appointed members shall be appointed as the IGF Doping Hearing Panel Chair. The appointed members shall have had no prior involvement with the case and shall not have the same nationality as the *Player* or other *Person* alleged to have violated this Anti-Doping Policy.

8.1.4 Once an IGF Doping Hearing Panel has been convened, the *Player* or *Other Person* shall be notified of the composition of the IGF Doping Hearing Panel and his or her right to participate in the hearing.

8.1.5 The hearing shall be held at the location designated by the IGF Doping Hearing panel and shall occur within four weeks of the notice of hearing to the *Player* or other *Person* unless special circumstances require a delay. Hearings held in connection with *Events* or to determine a *Player* or other *Person’s* eligibility to participate in an *Event* may be conducted on an expedited basis.

8.1.6 The IGF Doping Hearing Panel will have power to receive written and all other forms of evidence and submissions from the *Player* or other *Person* concerned and the Anti-Doping Investigations Committee. The Chair of the IGF Doping Hearing Panel shall have authority to address all procedural matters, including establishing a schedule for the submission of evidence and motions. The Chair of the IGF Doping Hearing Panel will decide on issues relating to the admissibility of evidence, the attendance of experts or witnesses and all other matters relating to evidence. Where any *Player* is appearing in front of an IGF Doping Hearing Panel without representation, the Chair of that panel shall offer guidance as to the applicable procedures.

8.1.7 The reasoned decision of the IGF Doping Hearing Panel shall be delivered within ten days of the close of the hearing, unless special circumstances exist.

8.1.8 The *National Union or Federation* of the *Player* or other *Person* alleged to have violated this Anti-Doping Policy may attend the hearing as an observer.

8.1.9 IGF shall keep *WADA* fully apprised as to the status of pending cases and the result of all hearings.

8.1.10 A *Player* 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 IGF. The right to a hearing may be waived either expressly or by the *Player’s* or other *Person’s* failure to challenge IGF’s assertion within ten days that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. Where no hearing occurs, IGF shall submit to the persons described in Article 13.2.3 a reasoned decision explaining the action taken.

8.1.11 Decisions of the IGF Doping Hearing Panel may be appealed to Court of Arbitration for Sport as provided in Article 13.

8.2 Hearings Conducted by *National Unions or Federations* or their Respective National or Regional *Anti-Doping Organizations*

8.2.1 When it appears that this Anti-Doping Policy has been violated in circumstances other than those discussed in Article 8.1.2, the *Player* or other *Person* involved shall be brought before a disciplinary panel of the *Player* or other *Person's National Union or Federation* or, as applicable, national or regional *Anti-Doping Organization*, for a hearing to adjudicate whether a violation of this Anti-Doping Policy occurred and if so what *Consequences* should be imposed.

8.2.2 Hearings pursuant to this Article 8.2 shall be completed expeditiously, normally within four weeks, and in all cases within three months of the notice of hearing to the *Player* or other *Person*. National hearings may also be expedited as provided in Article 8.1.5. If the completion of the hearing is delayed beyond three months, IGF may elect to bring the case directly before the IGF Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee at the responsibility and at the expense of the *National Union or Federation*.

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

8.2.4 IGF and WADA shall have the right to attend hearings as an observer.

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

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

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

8.3 Principles for a Fair Hearing Hearings pursuant to either Article 8.1 or 8.2 shall respect the following principles:

- a timely hearing;
- fair and impartial hearing panel;
- the right to be represented by counsel at the *Person's* own expense;

- the right to be informed in a fair and timely manner of the asserted anti-doping rule violation;
- the right to respond to the asserted anti-doping rule violation and resulting *Consequences*;
- the right of each party to present evidence, including the right to call and question witnesses (subject to the hearing panel's discretion to accept testimony by telephone or written submission);
- the *Person's* right to an interpreter at the hearing, with the hearing panel to determine the identity, and responsibility for the cost of the interpreter; and
- a timely, written, reasoned decision, specifically including an explanation of the reason(s) for any period of *Ineligibility*.

Hearings shall not be open to the public or press unless all parties agree otherwise.

[The Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee or national hearing body shall have the discretionary authority to make an award of costs in favor of the prevailing party.]

ARTICLE 9 AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS

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

[Comment to Article 9: When a Player wins a tournament with a Prohibited Substance in his or her system, that is unfair to the other Players in that tournament regardless of whether the winner was at fault in any way. Only a "clean" Player should be allowed to benefit from his or her competitive results.

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

ARTICLE 10 SANCTIONS ON INDIVIDUALS

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

An anti-doping rule violation occurring during or in connection with an *Event* will lead to *Disqualification* of all of the *Player's* individual results obtained in that *Event* with all *Consequences*, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes.

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

The period of *Ineligibility* imposed for a violation of Article 2.1 (Presence of *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers*), Article 2.2 (*Use or Attempted Use of Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method*) or Article 2.6 (*Possession of Prohibited Substances and Methods*) shall be as follows, unless the conditions for eliminating or reducing the period of

Ineligibility, as provided in Articles 10.4 and 10.5, or the conditions for increasing the period of *Ineligibility*, as provided in Article 10.6, are met:

First violation: Two (2) years' *Ineligibility*.

[Comment to Article 10.2: Harmonization of sanctions has been one of the most discussed and debated areas of anti-doping. Harmonization means that the same rules and criteria are applied to assess the unique facts of each case. Arguments against requiring harmonization of sanctions are based on differences between sports including, for example, the following: in some sports the Athletes are professionals making a sizable income from the sport and in others the Athletes are true amateurs; in those sports where an Athlete's career is short (e.g., artistic gymnastics) a two year Disqualification has a much more significant effect on the Athlete than in sports where careers are traditionally much longer (e.g., equestrian and shooting); in Individual Sports, the Athlete is better able to maintain competitive skills through solitary practice during Disqualification than in other sports where practice as part of a team is more important. A primary argument in 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 bodies to be more lenient with dopers. The lack of harmonization of sanctions has also frequently been the source of jurisdictional conflicts between IFs and National Anti-Doping Organizations.]

10.3 *Ineligibility for Other Anti-Doping Rule Violations*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To justify any elimination or reduction, the *Player* or other *Person* must produce corroborating evidence in addition to his or her word which establishes to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel the absence of an intent to enhance sport performance or mask the *Use* of a performance enhancing substance. The *Player* or other *Person's* degree of fault shall be the criterion considered in assessing any reduction of the period of *Ineligibility*.

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

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

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

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

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

10.5.1 *No Fault or Negligence*

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

10.5.2 *No Significant Fault or Negligence*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The IGF 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 *Player* or other *Person* has provided *Substantial Assistance* to an *Anti-Doping Organization*, criminal authority or professional disciplinary body which results in the *Anti-Doping Organization* discovering or establishing an anti-doping rule violation by another *Person* or which results in a criminal or disciplinary body discovering or establishing a criminal offense or the breach of professional rules by another *Person*. After a final appellate decision under Article 13 or the expiration of time to appeal, IGF may only suspend a part of the applicable period of *Ineligibility* with the approval of WADA. The extent to which the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility* may be suspended shall be based on the seriousness of the anti-

doping rule violation committed by the *Player* or other *Person* and the significance of the *Substantial Assistance* provided by the *Player* 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 IGF suspends any part of the period of *Ineligibility* under this Article, it shall promptly provide a written justification for its decision to each *Anti-Doping Organization* having a right to appeal the decision. If IGF subsequently reinstates any part of the suspended period of *Ineligibility* because the *Player* or other *Person* has failed to provide the *Substantial Assistance* which was anticipated, the *Player* or other *Person* may appeal the reinstatement pursuant to Article 13.2.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Comment to Article 10.5.4: This Article is intended to apply when a Player 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 Player or other Person knows he or she is about to be caught.]

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

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

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

Example 1.

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

Application of Article 10:

1. The basic sanction would be two years under Article 10.2. (Aggravating circumstances (Article 10.6) would not be considered because the Player promptly admitted the violation. Article 10.4 would not apply because a steroid is not a Specified Substance.)

2. Based on No Significant Fault alone, the sanction could be reduced up to one-half of the two years. Based on Substantial Assistance alone, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the two years.

3. Under Article 10.5.5, in considering the possible reduction for No Significant Fault and Substantial Assistance together, the most the sanction could be reduced is up to three-quarters of the two years. Thus, the minimum sanction would be a six-month period of Ineligibility.

4. Under Article 10.9.2, because the Player promptly admitted the anti-doping rule violation, the period of Ineligibility could start as early as the date of Sample collection, but in any event the Player would have to serve at least one-half of the Ineligibility period (minimum three months) after the date of the hearing decision.

Example 2.

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

Application of Article 10:

1. The basic sanction would be between two and four years Ineligibility as provided in Article 10.6.

2. Based on Substantial Assistance, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the maximum four years.

3. Article 10.5.5 does not apply.

4. Under Article 10.9.2, the period of Ineligibility would start on the date of the hearing decision.

Example 3.

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

Application of Article 10:

1. Because the Adverse Analytical Finding involved a Specified Substance and the Player has satisfied the other conditions of Article 10.4, the basic sanction would fall in the range between a reprimand and two years Ineligibility. The hearing panel would assess the Player's fault in imposing a sanction within that range. (Assume for illustration in this example that the panel would otherwise impose a period of Ineligibility of eight months.)

2. *Based on Substantial Assistance, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the eight months. (No less than two months.) [No Significant Fault (Article 10.2) would not be applicable because the Player's degree of fault was already taken into consideration in establishing the eight-month period of Ineligibility in step 1.]*

3. *Article 10.5.5 does not apply.*

4. *Under Article 10.2, because the Player promptly admitted the anti-doping rule violation, the period of Ineligibility could start as early as the date of Sample collection, but in any event, the Player would have to serve at least half of the Ineligibility period after the date of the hearing decision. (Minimum one month.)*

Example 4.

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

Application of Article 10:

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

2. *Based on the Player's spontaneous admissions (Article 10.5.4) alone, the period of Ineligibility could be reduced up to one-half of the two years. Based on the Player's Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3) alone, the period of Ineligibility could be reduced up to three-quarters of the two years.*

3. *Under Article 10.5.5, in considering the spontaneous admission and Substantial Assistance together, the most the sanction could be reduced would be up to three-quarters of the two years. (The minimum period of Ineligibility would be six months.)*

4. *If Article 10.5.4 was considered by the hearing panel in arriving at the minimum six month period of Ineligibility at step 3, the period of Ineligibility would start on the date the hearing panel imposed the sanction. If, however, the hearing panel did not consider the application of Article 10.5.4 in reducing the period of Ineligibility in step 3, then under Article 10.9.2, the commencement of the period of Ineligibility could be started as early as the date the anti-doping rule violation was committed, provided that at least half of that period (minimum of three months) would have to be served after the date of the hearing decision.]*

10.6 Aggravating Circumstances Which May Increase the Period of Ineligibility

If IGF establishes in an individual case involving an anti-doping rule violation other than violations under Article 2.7 (Trafficking) and 2.8 (Administration) that aggravating circumstances are present which justify the imposition of a period of

Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction, then the period of *Ineligibility* otherwise applicable shall be increased up to a maximum of four years unless the *Player* or other *Person* can prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that he did not knowingly violate the anti-doping rule.

A *Player* or other *Person* can avoid the application of this Article by admitting the anti-doping rule violation as asserted promptly after being confronted with the anti-doping rule violation by IGF.

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

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

10.7 Multiple Violations

10.7.1 Second Anti-Doping Rule Violation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10.5.4, must be at least one-fourth of the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility*.

10.7.3 Third Anti-Doping Rule Violation

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

10.7.4 Additional Rules for Certain Potential Multiple Violations

For purposes of imposing sanctions under Article 10.7, an anti-doping rule violation will only be considered a second violation if the IGF (or its *National Union or Federation*) can establish that the *Player* or other *Person* committed the second anti-doping rule violation after the *Player* or other *Person* received notice pursuant to Article 7 (Results Management), or after IGF (or its *National Union or Federation*) made reasonable efforts to give notice, of the first anti-doping rule violation; if the IGF (or its *National Union or Federation*) cannot establish this, the violations shall be considered together as one single first violation, and the sanction imposed shall be based on the violation that carries the more severe sanction; however, the occurrence of multiple violations may be considered as a factor in determining Aggravating Circumstances (Article 10.6).

- If, after the resolution of a first anti-doping rule violation, IGF discovers facts involving an anti-doping rule violation by the *Player* or other *Person* which occurred prior to notification regarding the first violation, then IGF shall impose an additional sanction based on the sanction that could have been imposed if the two violations would have been adjudicated at the same time. Results in all *Competitions* dating back to the earlier anti-doping rule violation will be *Disqualified* as provided in Article 10.8. To avoid the possibility of a finding of Aggravating Circumstances (Article 10.6) on account of the earlier-in-time but later-discovered violation, the *Player* or other *Person* must voluntarily admit the earlier anti-doping rule violation on a timely basis after notice of the violation for which he or she is first charged. The same rule shall also apply when IGF discovers facts involving another prior violation after the resolution of a second anti-doping rule violation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

10.8.2 Allocation of Forfeited Prize Money.

Alternative 1: Forfeited prize money shall be allocated first to reimburse the collection expenses incurred by the *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for collecting back that prize money back, then to reimburse the expenses incurred by the *Anti-Doping Organization* conducting results management in the case, with the balance, if any, allocated to IGF.

Alternative 2: Forfeited prize money shall be reallocated to other *Players*.

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

10.9 Commencement of Ineligibility Period

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

10.9.1 Delays Not Attributable to the *Player* or other *Person*

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

10.9.2 Timely Admission

Where the *Player* promptly (which, in all events, means before the *Player* competes again) admits the anti-doping rule violation after being confronted with the anti-doping rule violation by IGF, 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 *Player* or other *Person* shall serve at least one-half of the period of *Ineligibility* going forward from the date the *Player* or other *Person* accepted the imposition of a sanction, the date of a hearing decision imposing a sanction, or the date the sanction is otherwise imposed.

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

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

10.9.4 If a *Player* voluntarily accepts a *Provisional Suspension* in writing from IGF and thereafter refrains from competing, the *Player* 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 *Player's* voluntary acceptance of a *Provisional Suspension* shall be provided promptly to each party entitled to receive notice of a potential anti-doping rule violation under Article 14.1.

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

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

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

10.10 Status During *Ineligibility*

10.10.1 Prohibition against Participation during *Ineligibility*

No *Player* or other *Person* who has been declared *Ineligible* may, during the period of *Ineligibility*, participate in any capacity in an *Event* or activity (other than authorized anti-doping education or rehabilitation programs) authorized or organized by IGF or any *National Union or Federation* or a club or other member organization of IGF or any *National Union or Federation*, or in *Competitions* authorized or organized by any professional league or any international or national level *Event* organization.

A *Player* or other *Person* subject to a period of *Ineligibility* longer than four years may, after completing four years of the period of *Ineligibility*, participate in local sport events in a sport other than sports subject to the jurisdictions of IGF and its *National Union or Federation*, but only so long as the local sport event is not at a level that could otherwise qualify such *Person* directly or indirectly to compete in (or accumulate points toward) a national championship or *International Event*.

A *Player* or other *Person* subject to a period of *Ineligibility* shall remain subject to *Testing*.

[Comment to Article 10.10.1: For example, an ineligible Player cannot participate in a training camp, exhibition or practice organized by his or her National Union or Federation or a club which is a member of that National Union or Federation. Further, an ineligible Player may not compete in a non-Signatory professional league (e.g., the PGA TOUR, The European Tour, the LPGA or the Asian Tour), Events organized by a non-Signatory International Event organization or a non-Signatory national-level event organization without triggering the consequences set forth in Article 10.10.2. Sanctions in one sport will also be recognized by other sports (see Article 15).]

10.10.2 Violation of the Prohibition of Participation during *Ineligibility*

Where a *Player* or other *Person* who has been declared *Ineligible* violates the prohibition against participation during *Ineligibility* described in Article 10.10.1, the results of such participation shall be *Disqualified* and the period of *Ineligibility* which was originally imposed shall start over again as of the date of the violation. The new period of *Ineligibility* may be reduced under Article 10.5.2 if the *Player* or other *Person* establishes he or she bears *No Significant Fault or Negligence* for violating the prohibition against participation. The determination of whether a *Player* or other *Person* has violated the prohibition against participation, and whether a reduction under Article 10.5.2 is appropriate, shall be made by IGF.

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

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

10.10.3 Withholding of Financial Support during *Ineligibility*

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

10.11 Reinstatement *Testing*

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

10.12 Imposition of Financial Sanctions

IGF may impose financial sanctions on *Players* and other *Persons* who have committed anti-doping rule violations in an amount of up to \$100,000 US. However, no financial sanction may be considered a basis for reducing the period of *Ineligibility* or other sanction which would otherwise be applicable under the *Code*.

ARTICLE 11 CONSEQUENCES TO TEAMS IN TEAM EVENTS

In a team *Event* (e.g., the World Amateur Team Championships) if a member of the team commits an anti-doping rule violation during the *Event*, that *Player* will be disqualified and the overall placing of the teams will be recalculated. Should two or more *Players* of a team commit anti-doping rule violations during a team *Event*, the team will be disqualified.

ARTICLE 12 SANCTIONS AND COSTS ASSESSED AGAINST A NATIONAL UNION OR FEDERATION

12.1 The IGF has the authority to withhold some or all funding or other non-financial support to any *National Union or Federation* that is not in compliance with this Anti-Doping Policy.

12.2 *National Unions and Federations* shall be obligated to reimburse IGF for all costs (including but not limited to laboratory fees, hearing expenses (including costs and attorney fees), and travel) related to a violation of this Anti-Doping Policy committed by a *Player* or other *Person* affiliated with that *National Union or Federation*.

12.3 IGF may elect to take additional disciplinary action against a *National Union or Federation* with respect to recognition, the eligibility of its officials and *Players* to participate in *International Events* and fines based on any violation by the *National Union or Federation* of this Anti-Doping Policy.

ARTICLE 13 APPEALS

13.1 Decisions Subject to Appeal

Decisions made under this Anti-Doping Policy may be appealed as set forth below in Article 13.2 through 13.4 or as otherwise provided in this Anti-Doping Policy. Such decisions shall remain in effect while under appeal unless the appellate body orders otherwise. Before an appeal is commenced, any post-decision review authorized in these rules must be exhausted (except as provided in Article 13.1.1).

13.1.1 IGF and WADA Not Required to Exhaust Internal Remedies

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

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

A decision that an anti-doping rule violation was committed, a decision imposing *Consequences* for an anti-doping rule violation, or a decision that no anti-doping rule violation was committed; a decision that an anti-doping rule violation proceeding cannot go forward for procedural reasons (including, for example, prescription); a decision under Article 10.10.1 (prohibition of participation during *Ineligibility*); a decision that the IGF or its *National Union or Federation* lacks jurisdiction to rule on an alleged anti-doping rule violation or its *Consequences*; a decision by any *National Union or Federation* not to bring forward an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or an *Atypical Finding* as an anti-doping rule violation, or a decision to impose a *Provisional Suspension* as a result of a *Provisional Hearing* or otherwise in violation of Article 7.5 may be appealed exclusively as provided in this Article 13.2. Notwithstanding any other provision herein, the only *Person* who may appeal from a *Provisional Suspension* is the *Player* or other *Person* upon whom the *Provisional Suspension* is imposed.

13.2.1 Appeals Involving *International-Level Players*

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

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

13.2.2 Appeals Involving National-Level Players

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

13.2.3 Persons Entitled to Appeal

In cases under Article 13.2.1, the following parties shall have the right to appeal to CAS: (a) the *Player* 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) IGF and any other *Anti-Doping Organization* under whose rules a sanction could have been imposed; (d) the International Olympic Committee or International Paralympic Committee, as applicable, where the decision may have an effect in relation to the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games, including decisions affecting eligibility for the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games; and (e) WADA. In cases under Article 13.2.2, the parties having the right to appeal to the national-level reviewing body shall be as provided in the *National Union or Federation's* rules but, at a minimum, shall include the following parties: (a) the *Player* 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) IGF; and (d) WADA. For cases under Article 13.2.2, WADA and IGF shall also have the right to appeal to CAS with respect to the decision of the national-level reviewing body.

13.3 Failure to Render a Timely Decision by IGF or its *National Union or Federations*

Where, in a particular case, IGF or its *National Union or Federation* 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 CAS as if IGF or its *National Union or Federation* had rendered a decision finding no anti-doping rule violation. If the CAS panel determines that an anti-doping rule violation was committed and that WADA acted reasonably in electing to appeal directly to CAS, then WADA's costs and attorneys fees in prosecuting the appeal shall be reimbursed to WADA by IGF or its *National Union or Federation*.

[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 IGF to render a decision before WADA may intervene by appealing directly to CAS. Before

taking such action, however, WADA will consult with IGF and give IGF an opportunity to explain why it has not yet rendered a decision.]

13.4 Appeals from Decisions Granting or Denying a Therapeutic Use Exemption

Decisions by *WADA* reversing the grant or denial of a TUE may be appealed exclusively to CAS by the *Player*, IGF, or *National Anti-Doping Organization* or other body designated by a *National Union or Federation* which granted or denied the exemption. Decisions to deny TUEs, and which are not reversed by *WADA*, may be appealed by *International-Level Players* to CAS and by other *Players* to the national level reviewing body described in Article 13.2.2. If the national level reviewing body reverses the decision to deny a TUE, that decision may be appealed to CAS by *WADA*.

When IGF, *National Anti-Doping Organizations* or other bodies designated by *National Unions or Federations* fail to take action on a properly submitted TUE application within a reasonable time, their failure to decide may be considered a denial for purposes of the appeal rights provided in this Article.

13.5 Appeal from Decisions Pursuant to Article 12

Decisions by IGF pursuant to Article 12 may be appealed exclusively to CAS by the *National Union or Federation*.

13.6 Time for Filing Appeals

The time to file an appeal to CAS shall be twenty-one (21) days from the date of receipt of the full written 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 subject to appeal:

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

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

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

ARTICLE 14 NATIONAL UNION OR FEDERATION'S INCORPORATION OF IGF'S RULES, REPORTING AND RECOGNITION

14.1 Incorporation of IGF's Anti-Doping Policy

All *National Unions or Federations* shall comply with this Anti-Doping Policy. This Anti-Doping Policy shall also be incorporated either directly or by reference into each *National Union or Federation's* Rules. All *National Unions or Federations* shall include in their regulations the procedural rules necessary to effectively implement this Anti-Doping Policy. Each *National Union or Federation* shall obtain the written acknowledgement and agreement, of all *Players* subject to *Doping Control* and *Player Support Personnel* for such *Players*. Notwithstanding whether or not the required form has been signed, the Rules of each *National Union or Federation* shall specifically provide that all *Players, Player Support Personnel* and other *Persons* under the jurisdiction of the *National Union or Federation* shall be bound by this Anti-Doping Policy.

14.2 Statistical Reporting

14.2.1 *National Unions or Federations* shall report to IGF at the end of every year results of all *Doping Controls* within their jurisdiction sorted by *Player* and identifying each date on which the *Player* was tested, the entity conducting the test, and whether the test was *In-Competition* or *Out-of-Competition*. IGF may periodically publish *Testing* data received from *National Unions or Federations* as well as comparable data from *Testing* under IGF's jurisdiction.

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

14.3 Doping Control Information Clearinghouse

When a *National Union or Federation* has received an *Adverse Analytical Finding* on one of its *Players*, it shall report the following information to IGF and *WADA* within fourteen (14) days of the process described in Article 7.1.2 and 7.1.3: the *Player's* name, country, sport and discipline within the sport, whether the test was *In-Competition* or *Out-of-Competition*, the date of *Sample* collection and the analytical result reported by the laboratory. The *National Union or Federation* shall also regularly update IGF and *WADA* on the status and findings of any review or proceedings conducted pursuant to Article 7 (*Results Management*), Article 8 (*Hearings*) or Article 13 (*Appeals*), and comparable information shall be provided to IGF and *WADA* within 14 days of the notification described in Article 7.1.7, with respect to other violations of this Anti-Doping Policy. In any case in which the period of *Ineligibility* is eliminated under Article 10.5.1 (*No Fault or Negligence*) or reduced under Article 10.5.2 (*No Significant Fault or Negligence*), IGF and *WADA* shall be provided with a written reasoned decision explaining the basis for the elimination or reduction. Neither IGF nor *WADA* shall disclose this information beyond those persons within their organisations with a need to know until the *National Union or Federation* has made public disclosure or has failed to make public disclosure as required in Article 14.4 below.

14.4 Public Disclosure

14.4.1 Neither IGF nor its *National Unions or Federations* shall publicly identify *Players* whose *Samples* have resulted in *Adverse Analytical Findings*, or who were alleged to have violated other Articles of this Anti-Doping Policy until it has been determined in a hearing in accordance with Article 8 that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, or such hearing has been waived, or the assertion of an anti-doping rule violation has not been timely challenged or the *Player* has been *Provisionally Suspended*. Once a violation of this Anti-Doping Policy has been established, it shall be publicly reported within 20 days. IGF or its *National Union or*

Federation must also report within 20 days appeal decisions on an anti-doping rule violation. IGF or its *National Union or Federation* shall also, within the time period for publication, send all hearing and appeal decisions to WADA.

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

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

14.5 Recognition of Decisions by IGF and *National Unions or Federations*

Any decision of IGF or a *National Union or Federation* regarding a violation of this Anti-Doping Policy shall be recognized by all *National Unions or Federations*, which shall take all necessary action to render such results effective.

ARTICLE 15 RECOGNITION OF DECISIONS BY OTHER ORGANISATIONS

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

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

ARTICLE 16 STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

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

ARTICLE 17 IGF COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO WADA

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

ARTICLE 18 AMENDMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF IGF ANTI-DOPING POLICY

18.1 This Anti-Doping Policy may be amended from time to time upon recommendation by the IGF *Judiciary Committee*.

18.2 Except as provided in Article 18.5, this Anti-Doping Policy shall be interpreted as an independent and autonomous text and not by reference to existing law or statutes.

18.3 The headings used for the various Parts and Articles of this Anti-Doping Policy are for convenience only and shall not be deemed part of the substance of this Anti-Doping Policy or to affect in any way the language of the provisions to which they refer.

18.4 The INTRODUCTION and the APPENDIX I DEFINITIONS shall be considered integral parts of this Anti-Doping Policy.

18.5 This Anti-Doping Policy has been adopted pursuant to the applicable provisions of the *Code* and shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with applicable provisions of the *Code*. The comments annotating various provisions of the *Code* may, where applicable, assist in the understanding and interpretation of this Anti-Doping Policy.

18.6 Notices required by this Policy must be in writing and may be delivered personally, by email, or by recorded delivery post, and in the case of post, will be deemed to have been given two days after the date of posting. Notice to a *Player* or other *Person* who is a member of a *National Union or Federation* may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the *National Union or Federation*.

18.7 This Anti-Doping Policy shall come into full force and effect on 1 January 2009 (the "**Effective Date**"). It shall not apply retrospectively to matters pending before the Effective Date; provided, however, that:

18.7.1 Any case pending prior to the Effective Date, or brought after the Effective Date based on an anti-doping rule violation that occurred prior to the Effective Date, shall be governed by the predecessor to this Anti-Doping Policy in force at the time of the anti-doping rule violation, subject to any application of the principle of *lex mitior* by the hearing panel determining the case.

18.7.2 Any Article 2.4 whereabouts violation (whether a Filing Failure or a Missed Test) declared by IGF under rules in force prior to the Effective Date that has not

expired prior to the Effective Date and that would qualify as a whereabouts violation under Article 11 of the *International Standard for Testing* shall be carried forward and may be relied upon, prior to expiry, as one of the three Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests giving rise to an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.4 of this Anti-Doping Policy. However, Filing Failures or Missed Tests declared by any *Anti-Doping Organization* other than IGF or a *National Union or Federation* prior to the Effective Date may only be combined with Filing Failures or Missed Tests declared under the policies of that organization.

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

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

ARTICLE 19 WAIVER AND CONSENT

Players and other *Persons* subject to this Anti-Doping Policy, insofar as permitted by the law of the country in which any anti-doping rule violation takes place, agree to release and waive any and all claims, actions, lawsuits, damages, awards and losses arising out of or in connection with the administration of this Policy that the *Player* or other *Person* may have against IGF and its *National Unions or Federations* and their members, employees, agents, championship officials, and other *Players* involved in the implementation and administration of this Policy. This consent and waiver shall apply to the parents and legal guardians of any minor so as to bind the *Player* or other *Person* concerned.

APPENDIX 1 - DEFINITIONS

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

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

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

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

CAS. The Court of Arbitration for Sport.

Code. The World Anti-Doping Code.

Competition. A tournament.

Consequences of anti-doping rule violations. A *Player's* or other *Person's* violation of an anti-doping rule may result in one or more of the following: (a) Disqualification means the *Player'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 *Player* or other *Person* is barred for a specified period of time from participating in any *Competition* or other activity or funding as provided in Article 10.9; and (c) Provisional Suspension means the *Player* or other *Person* is barred temporarily from participating in any *Competition* prior to the final decision at a hearing conducted under Article 8 (Hearings).

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 tournament.

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

In-Competition. “*In-Competition*” means the period commencing at midnight the night before the first day of a tournament in which a *Player* is entered through midnight of the day a *Player* has finished participating in a tournament.

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.

Ineligibility. See *Consequences of anti-doping rule violations* above.

International Event. An *Event* where the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, the IGF, 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 Player. *Players* designated by IGF as being within its *Registered Testing Pool*.

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*.

Judiciary Committee. The IGF committee comprised of an equal number of voting members from IGF member organizations representing female and male golfers, such that half of the committee members represent golf organizations whose membership is female and half represent golf organizations whose membership is male.

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

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

Metabolite. Any substance produced by a biotransformation process.

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

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

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

National-Level Player. *Players in a national Registered Testing Pool or as otherwise identified by the Player's National Union or Federation or his or her national or regional Anti-Doping Organization.*

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.*

National Union or Federation. *A national or regional entity that is a member of the IGF and recognized in its country as the as the entity governing golf in that nation or region. Professional golf tours are specifically excluded from the definition of National Unions or Federations.*

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

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

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

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

Participant. *Any Player or Player Support Personnel.*

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

Player. *Any International-Level Player, National-Level Player and any other competitor in the sport of golf who is otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of any Signatory or other sports organization accepting the Code. All provisions of the Code, including, for example, Testing, and TUEs, must be applied to international and national-level competitors. Some National Anti-Doping Organizations may elect to test and apply anti-doping rules to recreational-level or masters competitors who are not current or potential national caliber competitors. National Anti-Doping Organizations are not required, however, to apply all aspects of the Code to such Persons. Specific national rules may be established for Doping Control for non-international-level or national-level competitors without being in conflict with the Code. Thus, a country could elect to test recreational-level competitors but not require TUEs or whereabouts information. In the same manner, a Major Event Organization holding an Event only for masters-level competitors could elect to test the competitors but not require advance TUE or whereabouts information. For purposes of Article 2.8 (Administration or Attempted Administration) and for purposes of anti-doping information and education, any Person who participates in sport under the authority of any Signatory, government, or other sports organization accepting the Code is a Player.*

Player Support Personnel. Any coach, trainer, manager, agent, [caddie], team staff, official, medical, paramedical personnel, parent or any other *Person* working with, treating or assisting a *Player* participating in or preparing for sports *Competition*.

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

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

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

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

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

Provisional Hearing. For purposes of Article 7.5, an expedited abbreviated hearing occurring prior to a hearing under Article 8 (Hearings) that provides the *Player* with notice and an opportunity to be heard in either written or oral form.

Provisional Suspension. See *Consequences* above.

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

Registered Testing Pool. The pools of top level *Players* established separately by IGF and *National Unions or Federations* or their national or regional *Anti-Doping Organizations* who are subject to both *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition Testing* as part of IGF or its *National Union or Federation's* test distribution plan.

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

Rules of Golf. The *Rules of Golf* as approved by the United States Golf Association and R&A Rules Limited.

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

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

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

Specified Substances. As defined in Article 4.2.2.

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

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

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

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

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

TUE. As defined in Article 2.6.1.

TUE Committee. As defined in Article 4.4.4.

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.