

1. WHAT IS AN ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATION (ADRV)?

When an athlete or Athlete Support Person (ASP) commits a doping offence, it is known as an ADRV. Certain consequences or sanctions apply to the athlete or ASP who commits an ADRV.

2. WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF ADRVs?

There are a number of different types of ADRVs, which are defined in Article 2 of the World Anti-Doping Code (Code). The 2016 ADRVs Report is based on the types of ADRVs listed in the 2015 Code, as follows:

- Article 2.1 – Presence of a prohibited substance or its metabolites or markers in an athlete's sample
- Article 2.2 – Use or attempted use by an athlete of a prohibited substance or a prohibited method
- Article 2.3 – Evading, refusing or failing to submit to sample collection
- Article 2.4 – Whereabouts failures (any combination of three missed tests and/or filing failures within a 12-month period by an athlete)
- Article 2.5 – Tampering or attempted tampering with any part of doping control
- Article 2.6 – Possession of a prohibited substance or a prohibited method
- Article 2.7 – Trafficking or attempted trafficking in any prohibited substance or prohibited method
- Article 2.8 – Administration or attempted administration to any athlete in-competition of any prohibited substance or prohibited method or administration or attempted administration to any athlete out-of-competition of any prohibited substance or any prohibited method that is prohibited out-of-competition.
- Article 2.9 – Complicity (assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, conspiring, covering up or any other type of intentional complicity involving an Anti-Doping Rule Violation)
- Article 2.10 – Prohibited Association

3. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN ANALYTICAL ADRV AND A NON-ANALYTICAL ADRV?

An analytical ADRV refers to a violation of Code Article 2.1 above and is based on an Adverse Analytical Finding (AAF) (otherwise known as a positive result), which indicates the presence

of a prohibited substance or its metabolite(s) or of marker(s) of the use of a prohibited substance in a urine and/or blood sample collected from an athlete and analyzed by a WADA-accredited Laboratory.

A non-analytical ADRV is a case in which an athlete or ASP (coach, trainer, manager, agent, medical staff, parent, etc.) commits another type of ADRV that does not involve the detection of a prohibited substance or prohibited method in a urine or blood sample from athletes, as outlined in Code Articles 2.2 to 2.10 above. Athlete Biological Passport cases are considered as non-analytical cases pursuant to Code Article 2.2.

4. WHAT FIGURES ARE INCLUDED IN THE 2016 ADRVs REPORT?

The 2016 ADRVs Report consists of four main sections.

- **An Introduction and an Executive Summary** which give an overview of the Report and highlight the key observations.
- **Sections 1 and 2** present the Results Management outcomes (including ADRVs) of all AAFs detected by WADA-accredited Laboratories for samples collected from athletes in- and out-of-competition in 2016. They are presented by sport, discipline (Section 1) and Testing Authority (TA) (Section 2).
- **Section 3** includes ADRVs that resulted from non-analytical findings committed by athletes (presented by sport and nationality) and by ASP (presented by nationality).
- **Section 4** indicates the total number of ADRVs in 2016, which includes AAFs that resulted in an ADRV plus all non-analytical ADRVs. The data is presented by sport and nationality. The information is further broken down into sample type (urine or blood), type of test (in- or out-of-competition) and athlete gender.

5. HOW DOES THIS REPORT DIFFER FROM THE 2016 ANTI-DOPING TESTING FIGURES REPORT?

The 2016 Anti-Doping Testing Figures Report is a compilation of the analysis results from athlete urine and blood samples as reported by WADA-accredited Laboratories.

The ADRVs Report provides information regarding all ADRVs, which includes the Results Management outcomes of AAFs reported by WADA-accredited Laboratories in the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS), WADA's centralized online database, as well as ADRVs that resulted from non-analytical findings.

6. WHERE DOES THE DATA FOR THIS REPORT COME FROM?

The data on urine and blood samples analyzed and the resulting AAFs are taken from WADA's 2016 Testing Figures Report (published in October 2017). The results for all samples were submitted by WADA-accredited Laboratories directly into ADAMS.

Aggregated data on the outcomes of AAFs, as well as all the data relating to non-analytical findings (case decisions) were compiled by WADA based on decisions provided by Anti-Doping Organizations (ADOs).

7. WHAT PERIOD DOES THE ADRVs REPORT COVER?

The AAFs featured in the 2016 ADRVs Report correspond to the analysis of samples collected between 1 January and 31 December 2016.

The ADRVs that resulted from non-analytical findings refer to cases that were concluded in 2016. These figures may include violations that were *initially pursued* prior to 2016, and may not include violations that occurred in 2016 yet were not *closed* in the same year.

The outcomes indicated in the 2016 ADRVs Report for cases involving both AAFs and non-analytical ADRVs are based on the decisions received and reviewed by WADA before 31 December 2017, which is the date the Report was compiled.

8. HOW SHOULD THE ADRVs REPORT BE INTERPRETED?

This Report offers the most comprehensive set of global statistics on doping offences in 2016 broken down by sport, TA and nationality. The Report provides the outcomes of cases reported as AAFs and includes those that resulted in an ADRV being asserted (subject to any cases that remain pending). The Report also includes non-analytical ADRVs, which, when combined with the total number of AAFs, provides a more accurate assessment of the total number of doping cases that were adjudicated in 2016.

The Report's data is provided by Code Signatories and reviewed by WADA. Further, in accordance with the requirements of the 2015 Code (Article 14.4), it is WADA's mandate to report the data. It should be noted that any interpretation of the data should be undertaken with caution as many contributing factors must be taken into account when attempting to interpret the data regarding sports, testing and Results Management Authorities (RMA) and nationalities. This caution applies to this Report as well as to the Testing Figures Report.

WADA is committed to further enhancing the statistical reports by providing the anti-doping community with more transparent and accurate data of the testing and investigation activities worldwide.

9. WHY IS THIS REPORT BEING PUBLISHED NEARLY HALF A YEAR AFTER THE 2016 TESTING FIGURES REPORT?

The Results Management process can take a long time. This process includes a number of steps, beginning with the reporting of an AAF. This is followed by an assertion of a potential analytical or non-analytical violation and investigation, decision, potential appeal and the publication of the decision. At the time of compiling this ADRVs Report (31 December 2017), WADA had received 2,366 decisions relating to AAFs in 2016.

Future ADRVs Reports will be released on an annual basis and within a similar timeframe prior to the release of the following year's Testing Figures Report. Further, it is important to keep

in mind that the ADOs with Results Management responsibility have the responsibility of providing all decisions to WADA in a timely fashion.

10. WHY IS THERE SUCH A LARGE GAP BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF ADRVs FOR IN-COMPETITION AS OPPOSED TO OUT-OF-COMPETITION AAFs?

Typically, more samples are collected in-competition than out-of-competition. The 2016 Report illustrates that, in ADAMS, 124,820 samples were collected in-competition (equating to 54.4%) while 104,694 samples were collected out-of-competition (equating to 45.6%).

Furthermore, by its very nature, the in-competition menu contains more drug classes and therefore more Prohibited Substances subject to detection compared to the out-of-competition menu. In 2016, 2,253 AAFs were reported from in-competition and 779 AAFs from out-of-competition. Subsequently more ADRVs are recorded from in-competition (1,030) than from out-of-competition (296).

11. WHY ARE THERE STILL SO MANY AAF CASES PENDING FROM 2016?

Cases classified as pending are those cases where the RMA has not yet provided all the documentation necessary to allow WADA to validate the case decision. Examples of missing documentation include:

- The reasoned decision explaining the outcome of the case;
- A copy of the relevant Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE), if applicable; and/or
- The athlete's identification information or any other relevant information about the case.

Further, the greater number of pending cases in the 2016 Report than in previous years may be due to a number of factors, including:

- This Report covers decisions received by WADA until 31 December 2017 whereas for the previous reports, the reporting period was longer and that gave the ADOs more time to send their decisions to WADA. For consistency going forward, the ADRVs Report

will cover decisions received by WADA by 31 December of the year following the sample collection;

- In 2016, 510 more AAFs were reported as compared to 2015. This increase in load led to corresponding delays in finalizing decisions;
- Anti-doping cases have become more and more complex, which often affects the length of a case;
- Non-Signatory organizations are conducting more testing than before and having samples analyzed at WADA-accredited Laboratories which report the analytical results in ADAMS. Among the 666 pending cases from 2016, 246 come from non-Signatories, which do not fall under WADA's authority. Within the ongoing Code review process, WADA is currently considering the best mechanism to address the issue of non-Signatory testing and Results Management;
- A significant number of the pending cases from 2016 involve meldonium, which was added to the 2016 Prohibited List and which accounted for 515 of the AAFs reported for samples collected that year.

12. WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CASES THAT ARE STILL PENDING?

It is the responsibility of the RMA to manage the test results and to render a decision for all AAF cases. In the majority of cases, the RMA is also the TA, which is the organization that authorized the collection of the sample.

In a small number of cases, the TA is not the RMA, and therefore is not responsible for the outcome of a pending case. Another organization such as an International Federation (IF), National Anti-Doping Organization (NADO) or National Federation (NF) may be the RMA and is therefore responsible for rendering a decision in a particular case.

WADA continues to follow up with the relevant RMAs to remind them to complete their outstanding Results Management procedures as soon as possible and to provide WADA with the final, reasoned decision. Timely completion of Results Management processes is a requirement for maintaining compliance with the Code. Not pursuing Results Management for

a potential doping case or a failure to provide the final written decision to WADA or the applicable NADO or IF may result in the matter being raised to WADA's Compliance Review Committee, who is responsible for making recommendations of non-compliance to WADA's Executive Committee. In the future, WADA will also have recourse to the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories, which recently came into force on 1 April 2018, to ensure that pending cases are resolved in a timely manner.

13. IS THERE A SPECIFIC TIME FRAME IN WHICH CASES SHOULD BE FINALIZED BY THE RMA?

The Code requires that cases are dealt with in a timely, fair and impartial manner. Sufficient time must be provided for each party to prepare and present their cases to the appointed disciplinary bodies. As outlined in WADA's [Results Management, Hearings and Decisions Guidelines](#): "Irrespective of the type of ADRV involved, any ADO should be able to conclude the Results Management and hearing process within a maximum of six months of the date of the commission or of discovery of the ADRV."

Some cases are more complex than others, and may be appealed after the first instance hearing, which then takes additional time for the case to be finalized and for a written decision to be published and submitted to WADA.

14. WHY ARE THE DETAILS OF THE SANCTIONS (FOR EXAMPLE THE PERIODS OF INELIGIBILITY) NOT INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT?

Every individual case is different and is assessed by the relevant RMA based on the specific facts and circumstances. Publishing the sanction details for every single case without the reasoning and context behind the decision could lead to misinterpretation of the information. Request for further detail about a specific case should be directed to the applicable ADO with Results Management authority.

15. IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR ADOs TO PUBLISH ALL ADRVs UNDER THEIR JURISDICTION?

Yes, ADOs are mandated under the Code to publish all ADRVs from their doping control activities (Articles 10.13 and 14.3.2). Furthermore, all ADOs must also notify WADA and the applicable IF or NADO of the decision in all cases, including non-analytical cases and any investigations conducted (Article 14.4). A failure to do so is non-compliant with the Code.

16. DOES WADA REVIEW EVERY CASE DECISION IT RECEIVES?

Yes, WADA reviews every single decision provided to its Legal Department by RMAs, and has the right to appeal any decision deemed to be non-compliant with the Code to, either, the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) or national level reviewing bodies.

17. IN THE NON-ANALYTICAL ADRV SECTION, WHY IS THERE A DIFFERENCE IN THE NUMBER OF VIOLATION CASES AND THE NUMBER BY TYPE OF VIOLATIONS?

A total of 269 individuals (248 athletes and 21 ASP) were reported to have committed one or more non-analytical ADRVs based on the decisions received in 2016.

In certain cases, the athlete or ASP may have been charged with more than one non-analytical ADRV. For example, an athlete can be charged with Article 2.6 (possession), Article 2.7 (trafficking) and Article 2.8 (administration) ADRVs. Such cases are calculated as single occurrences for each type of violation; however all relate to only one athlete or ASP. Therefore, the 269 decisions cover a total of 342 violations as defined in the Code (308 occurrences linked to athletes and 34 linked to ASP) in 2016.

18. IN THE NON-ANALYTICAL ADRV SECTION, WHY ARE THE ASP CASES NOT CLASSIFIED BY SPORT?

The Code defines the term “Athlete Support Personnel” as *“any coach, trainer, manager, agent, and team staff, official, medical, paramedical personnel, parent or any other Person working with, treating or assisting an Athlete participating in or preparing for sports Competition”*. As such, an ASP can be involved in more than one sport.