CASES AND QUESTIONS
Case 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPID</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Passport Custodian</th>
<th>Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NADO ITALIA</td>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graphs showing T/E, A/T, A/Eto, and 5α-diol/5b-diol for BPID with gender, age, and passport custody information.]

How to proceed?
....... But the steroid module of the ABP has some additional information
“Isotopic Module”
Case 1:

1. Should IRMS be built into the costs of all analysis?

2. Should we run more IRMS (i.e. on all longitudinal samples of a steroid passport?)
Case 2:

No agreement on evaluations by a panel: what to do then?

- ADAMS notifications
  - > 20,000 notifications
    - 4.4% are ATPF
    - ATPF notifications sent to the first Expert
      - Test plan and further collection
        - 91.2% 8.8% come back as Likely Doping
      - ABP sent to a panel of Expert
        - What to do here?
        - 81.8% 18.2% are unanimously evaluated
    - < 20 APF
      - ABP doc pack built → APF → Athlete’s expert evaluation
        - How many lead to ADRV sanctions?

- How to proceed when non-unanimous expert panel evaluation?
- Do we need a standard procedure for how to proceed?
Case 3:

- 3 ‘Likely Doping’
- ABP Dock Pack Prepared
- New sample added to the profile

- How to proceed?
- Does the answer depend on the nature of the last result (‘suspicious’ or ‘normal’)?
Case 4:

- What do you see?
- How to proceed?

Athlete resides at altitude

S1 = coll. 3 days before race
S4 = coll. 3 weeks before race

Expert opinion: S5 = suspicious

Expert recommendations: further data required
Athlete resides at altitude

S1 = coll. 3 days before race
S4 = coll. 3 weeks before race

Expert opinion: S5 = suspicious
Expert recommendations: further data required
Workshop question

Test frequently the month before the next major race and 7-10 days after the race

Likely doping by the 3 experts