ARTICLE 2 ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS

[Comment: 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 have been violated. Most of the circumstances and conduct on this list of violations can be found in some form in the OMADC or other existing anti-doping rules.]

The following constitute anti-doping rule violations:

2.1 The presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s bodily Specimen.

2.1.1 It is each Athlete’s personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Athletes are responsible for any Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in their bodily Specimens. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete’s part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping violation under Article 2.1.

[Comment: For purposes of anti-doping violations involving the presence of a Prohibited Substance (or its Metabolites or Markers), the Code adopts the rule of strict liability which is found in the OMADC and the vast majority of existing anti-doping rules. Under the strict liability principle, an anti-doping rule violation occurs whenever a Prohibited Substance is found in an Athlete’s bodily Specimen. The violation occurs whether or not the Athlete intentionally or unintentionally used a Prohibited Substance or was negligent or otherwise at fault. If the positive Sample came from an In-Competition test, then the results of that Competition are automatically invalidated (Article 9 (Automatic Disqualification of Individual Results)). However, the Athlete then has the possibility to avoid or reduce sanctions if the Athlete can demonstrate that he or she was not at fault or significant fault. (Article 10.5 (Elimination or Reduction of Period of Ineligibility Based on Exceptional Circumstances).

The strict liability rule for the finding of a Prohibited Substance in an Athlete’s Specimen, with a possibility that sanctions may be modified based on specified criteria, provides a reasonable balance between effective anti-doping enforcement for the benefit of all "clean" Athletes and fairness in the exceptional circumstance where a Prohibited Substance entered an Athlete’s system through no fault or negligence on the Athlete’s part. It is important to emphasize that while the determination of whether the anti-doping rule has been violated is based on strict liability, the imposition of a fixed period of Ineligibility is not automatic.
The rationale for the strict liability rule was well stated by the Court of Arbitration for Sport in the case of Quigley v. UIT.

"It is true that a strict liability test is likely in some sense to be unfair in an individual case, such as that of Q., where the Athlete may have taken medication as the result of mislabeling or faulty advice for which he or she is not responsible - particularly in the circumstances of sudden illness in a foreign country. But it is also in some sense "unfair" for an Athlete to get food poisoning on the eve of an important competition. Yet in neither case will the rules of the competition be altered to undo the unfairness. Just as the competition will not be postponed to await the Athlete's recovery, so the prohibition of banned substances will not be lifted in recognition of its accidental absorption. The vicissitudes of competition, like those of life generally, may create many types of unfairness, whether by accident or the negligence of unaccountable Persons, which the law cannot repair.

Furthermore, it appears to be a laudable policy objective not to repair an accidental unfairness to an individual by creating an intentional unfairness to the whole body of other competitors. This is what would happen if banned performance-enhancing substances were tolerated when absorbed inadvertently. Moreover, it is likely that even intentional abuse would in many cases escape sanction for lack of proof of guilty intent. And it is certain that a requirement of intent would invite costly litigation that may well cripple federations - particularly those run on modest budgets - in their fight against doping."

2.1.2 Excepting those substances for which a quantitative reporting threshold is specifically identified in the Prohibited List, the detected presence of any quantity of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s Sample shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.

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

[Comment: For example, the Prohibited List might provide that a T/E ratio greater than 6:1 is doping unless a longitudinal analysis of prior or subsequent test results by the Anti-Doping Organization demonstrates a naturally elevated ratio or the Athlete otherwise establishes that the elevated ratio is the result of a physiological or pathological condition.]
2.2 Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method.

2.2.1 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: The prohibition against "Use" has been expanded from the text in the OMADC to include Prohibited Substances as well as Prohibited Methods. With this inclusion there is no need to specifically delineate "admission of Use" as a separate anti-doping rule violation. "Use" can be proved, for example, through admissions, third party testimony or other evidence.

Demonstrating the "Attempted Use" of a Prohibited Substance requires proof of intent on the Athlete’s part. The fact that intent may be required to prove this particular anti-doping rule violation does not undermine the strict liability principle established for violations of Article 2.1 and Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.

An Athlete’s Out-of-Competition Use of a Prohibited Substance that is not prohibited Out-of-Competition would not constitute an anti-doping rule violation.]

2.3 Refusing, or failing without compelling justification, to submit to Sample collection after notification as authorized in applicable anti-doping rules or otherwise evading Sample collection.

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

2.4 Violation of applicable requirements regarding Athlete availability for Out-of-Competition Testing including failure to provide required whereabouts information and missed tests which are declared based on reasonable rules.

[Comment: Unannounced Out-of-Competition Testing is at the core of effective Doping Control. Without accurate Athlete location information such Testing is inefficient and sometimes impossible. This Article, which is not
typically found in most existing anti-doping rules, requires Athletes that have been identified for Out-of-Competition Testing to be responsible for providing and updating information on their whereabouts so that they can be located for No Advance Notice Out-of-Competition Testing. The "applicable requirements" are set by the Athlete's International Federation and National Anti-Doping Organization in order to allow some flexibility based upon varying circumstances encountered in different sports and countries. A violation of this Article may be based on either intentional or negligent conduct by the Athlete.]

2.5 Tampering, or Attempting to tamper, with any part of Doping Control.

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

2.6 Possession of Prohibited Substances and Methods:

2.6.1 Possession by an Athlete at any time or place of a substance that is prohibited in Out-of-Competition Testing or a Prohibited Method unless the Athlete establishes that the Possession is pursuant to a therapeutic use exemption granted in accordance with Article 4.4 (Therapeutic Use) or other acceptable justification.

2.6.2 Possession of a substance that is prohibited in Out-of-Competition Testing or a Prohibited Method by Athlete Support Personnel in connection with an Athlete, Competition or training, unless the Athlete Support Personnel establishes that the Possession is pursuant to a therapeutic use exemption granted to an Athlete in accordance with Article 4.4 (Therapeutic Use) or other acceptable justification.

2.7 Trafficking in any Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.

2.8 Administration or Attempted administration of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method to any Athlete, or assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, covering up or any other type of complicity involving an anti-doping rule violation or any Attempted violation.
ARTICLE 10  SANCTIONS ON INDIVIDUALS

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

An anti-doping rule violation occurring during or in connection with an Event may, upon the decision of the ruling body of the Event, lead to Disqualification of all of the Athlete's individual results obtained in that Event with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes, except as provided in Article 10.1.1.

[Comment: Whereas Article 9 (Automatic Disqualification of Individual Results) Disqualifies the result in a single Competition in which the Athlete tested positive (e.g., the 100 meter backstroke), this Article may lead to Disqualification of all results in all races during the Event (e.g., the FINA World Championships).

Factors to be included in considering whether to Disqualify other results in an Event might include, for example, the severity of the Athlete’s anti-doping rule violation and whether the Athlete tested negative in the other Competitions.]

10.1.1 If the Athlete establishes that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence for the violation, the Athlete's individual results in the other Competitions shall not be Disqualified unless the Athlete's results in Competitions other than the Competition in which the anti-doping rule violation occurred were likely to have been affected by the Athlete’s anti-doping rule violation.

10.2 Imposition of Ineligibility for Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods

Except for the specified substances identified in Article 10.3, the period of Ineligibility imposed for a violation of Articles 2.1 (presence of Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers), 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use of Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method) and 2.6 (Possession of Prohibited Substances and Methods) shall be:

First violation:  Two (2) years' Ineligibility.

Second violation: Lifetime Ineligibility.

However, the Athlete or other Person shall have the opportunity in each case, before a period of Ineligibility is imposed, to establish the basis for eliminating or reducing this sanction as provided in Article 10.5.
[Comment: Harmonization of sanctions has been one of the most discussed and debated areas of anti-doping. 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 International Federations and National Anti-Doping Organizations.]

The consensus of the World Conference on Doping in Sport held in Lausanne in February 1999 supported a two year period of Ineligibility for a first serious anti-doping rule violation followed with a lifetime ban for a second violation. This consensus was reflected in the OMADC.]

10.3 Specified Substances

The Prohibited List may identify specified substances which are particularly susceptible to unintentional anti-doping rules violations because of their general availability in medicinal products or which are less likely to be successfully abused as doping agents. Where an Athlete can establish that the Use of such a specified substance was not intended to enhance sport performance, the period of Ineligibility found in Article 10.2 shall be replaced with the following:

First violation: At a minimum, a warning and reprimand and no period of Ineligibility from future Events, and at a maximum, one (1) year's Ineligibility.

Second violation: Two (2) years' Ineligibility.

Third violation: Lifetime Ineligibility.

However, the Athlete or other Person shall have the opportunity in each case, before a period of Ineligibility is imposed, to establish the basis for eliminating or reducing (in the case of a second or third violation) this sanction as provided in Article 10.5.
10.4 Ineligibility for Other Anti-Doping Rule Violations

The period of Ineligibility for other anti-doping rule violations shall be:

10.4.1 For violations of Article 2.3 (refusing or failing to submit to Sample collection) or Article 2.5 (Tampering with Doping Control), the Ineligibility periods set forth in Article 10.2 shall apply.

10.4.2 For violations of Articles 2.7 (Trafficking) or 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. An anti-doping rule violation involving a Minor shall be considered a particularly serious violation, and, if committed by Athlete Support Personnel for violations other than specified substances referenced in Article 10.3, shall result in lifetime Ineligibility for such Athlete Support Personnel. In addition, violations of such Articles which also violate non-sporting laws and regulations, may be reported to the competent administrative, professional or judicial authorities.

10.4.3 For violations of Article 2.4 (whereabouts violation or missed test), the period of Ineligibility shall be at a minimum 3 months and at a maximum 2 years in accordance with the rules established by the Anti-Doping Organization whose test was missed or whereabouts requirement was violated. The period of Ineligibility for subsequent violations of Article 2.4 shall be as established in the rules of the Anti-Doping Organization whose test was missed or whereabouts requirement was violated.
[Comment: The whereabouts and missed test policies of different Anti-Doping Organizations may vary considerably, particularly at the outset as these policies are being put into place. Thus, considerable flexibility has been provided for sanctioning these anti-doping rule violations. Those Anti-Doping Organizations with more sophisticated policies including built in safeguards, and those organizations with longer track records of Athlete experience with a whereabouts policy, could provide for Ineligibility periods at the longer end of the specified range.]

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

10.5.1 No Fault or Negligence
If the Athlete establishes in an individual case involving an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 (presence of Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers) or Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method under Article 2.2 that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence for the violation, the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility shall be eliminated. When a Prohibited Substance or its Markers or Metabolites is detected in an Athlete’s Specimen in violation of Article 2.1 (presence of Prohibited Substance), the Athlete must also establish how the Prohibited Substance entered his or her system in order to have the period of Ineligibility eliminated. In the event this Article is applied and the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable is eliminated, the anti-doping rule violation shall not be considered a violation for the limited purpose of determining the period of Ineligibility for multiple violations under Articles 10.2, 10.3 and 10.6.

[Comment: Article 10.5.1 applies only to violations under Articles 2.1 and 2.2 (presence and Use of Prohibited Substances) because fault or negligence is already required to establish an anti-doping rule violation under other anti-doping rules.]

10.5.2 No Significant Fault or Negligence
This Article 10.5.2 applies only to anti-doping rule violations involving Article 2.1 (presence of Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers), Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method under Article 2.2, failing to submit to Sample collection under Article 2.3, or administration of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method under Article 2.8. If an Athlete establishes in an individual case involving such violations 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 minimum period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable. If the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility is a lifetime, the reduced period
under this section may be no less than 8 years. When a Prohibited Substance or its Markers or Metabolites is detected in an Athlete's Specimen in violation of Article 2.1 (presence of Prohibited Substance), the Athlete must also establish how the Prohibited Substance entered his or her system in order to have the period of Ineligibility reduced.

[Comment: The trend in doping cases has been to recognize that there must be some opportunity in the course of the hearing process to consider the unique facts and circumstances of each particular case in imposing sanctions. This principle was accepted at the World Conference on Doping in Sport and was incorporated into the OMADC which provides that sanctions can be reduced in "exceptional circumstances." The Code also provides for the possible reduction or elimination of the period of Ineligibility in the unique circumstance where the Athlete can establish that he or she had No Fault or Negligence, or No Significant Fault or Negligence, in connection with the violation. This approach is consistent with basic principles of human rights and provides a balance between those Anti-Doping Organizations that argue for a much narrower exception, or none at all, and those that would reduce a two year suspension based on a range of other factors even when the Athlete was admittedly at fault. These Articles apply only to the imposition of sanctions; they are not applicable to the determination of whether an anti-doping rule violation has occurred.

Article 10.5 is 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, an example where No Fault or Negligence would result in the total elimination of a sanction is where an Athlete could prove that, despite all due care, he or she was sabotaged by a competitor. Conversely, a sanction could not be completely eliminated on the basis of No Fault or Negligence in the following circumstances: (a) a positive test resulting from a mislabeled or contaminated vitamin or nutritional supplement (Athletes are responsible for what they ingest (Article 2.1.1) and have been warned against the possibility of supplement contamination); (b) the administration of a prohibited substance by the Athlete’s personal physician or trainer without disclosure to the Athlete (Athletes are responsible for their choice of medical personnel and for advising medical personnel that they cannot be given any prohibited substance); and (c) sabotage of the Athlete’s food or drink by a spouse, coach or other person within the Athlete’s circle of associates (Athletes are responsible for what they ingest and for the conduct of those persons to whom they entrust access to their food and drink). However, depending on the unique facts of a particular case, any of the referenced illustrations could result in a reduced sanction based on No Significant Fault or Negligence. (For example, reduction may well be appropriate in illustration (a) if the Athlete clearly establishes that the cause of the positive test was contamination in a common multiple vitamin purchased from a source with
no connection to Prohibited Substances and the Athlete exercised care in not taking other nutritional supplements.)

Article 10.5.2 applies only to the identified anti-doping rule violations because these violations may be based on conduct that is not intentional or purposeful. Violations under Article 2.4 (whereabouts information and missed tests) are not included, even though intentional conduct is not required to establish these violations, because the sanction for violations of Article 2.4 (from three months to two years) already builds in sufficient discretion to allow consideration of the Athlete’s degree of fault.

10.5.3 **Athlete’s Substantial Assistance in Discovering or Establishing Anti-Doping Rule Violations by Athlete Support Personnel and Others.** An Anti-Doping Organization may also reduce the period of Ineligibility in an individual case where the Athlete has provided substantial assistance to the Anti-Doping Organization which results in the Anti-Doping Organization discovering or establishing an anti-doping rule violation by another Person involving Possession under Article 2.6.2 (Possession by Athlete Support Personnel), Article 2.7 (Trafficking), or Article 2.8 (administration to an Athlete). The reduced period of Ineligibility may not, however, be less than one-half of the minimum period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable. If the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility is a lifetime, the reduced period under this section may be no less than 8 years.

10.6 **Rules for Certain Potential Multiple Violations**

10.6.1 For purposes of imposing sanctions under Articles 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4, a second anti-doping rule violation may be considered for purposes of imposing sanctions only if the Anti-Doping Organization can establish that the Athlete or other Person committed the second anti-doping rule violation after the Athlete or other Person received notice, or after the Anti-Doping Organization made a reasonable Attempt to give notice, of the first anti-doping rule violation; if the Anti-Doping Organization cannot establish this, the violations shall be considered as one single first violation, and the sanction imposed shall be based on the violation that carries the more severe sanction.

[Comment: Under this Article, an Athlete testing positive a second time before notice of the first positive test would only be sanctioned on the basis of a single anti-doping rule violation.]

10.6.2 Where an Athlete, based on the same Doping Control, is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation involving both a specified substance under Article 10.3 and another Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method, the Athlete shall be
considered to have committed a single anti-doping rule violation, but the sanction imposed shall be based on the *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* that carries the most severe sanction.

10.6.3 Where an *Athlete* is found to have committed two separate anti-doping rule violations, one involving a specified substance governed by the sanctions set forth in Article 10.3 (Specified Substances) and the other involving a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* governed by the sanctions set forth in Article 10.2 or a violation governed by the sanctions in Article 10.4.1, the period of *Ineligibility* imposed for the second offense shall be at a minimum two years' *Ineligibility* and at a maximum three years' *Ineligibility*. Any *Athlete* found to have committed a third anti-doping rule violation involving any combination of specified substances under Article 10.3 and any other anti-doping rule violation under 10.2 or 10.4.1 shall receive a sanction of lifetime *Ineligibility*.

[Comment: Article 10.6.3 deals with the situation where an Athlete commits two separate anti-doping rule violations, but one of the violations involves a specified substance governed by the lesser sanctions of Article 10.3. Without this Article in the Code, the second offense arguably could be governed by: the sanction applicable to a second violation for the Prohibited Substance involved in the second violation, the sanction applicable to a second offense for the substance involved in the first violation, or a combination of the sanctions applicable to the two offenses. This Article imposes a combined sanction calculated by adding together the sanctions for a first offense under 10.2 (two years) and a first offense under 10.3 (up to one year). This provides the same sanction to the Athlete that commits a first violation under 10.2 followed by a second violation involving a specified substance, and the Athlete that commits a first violation involving a specified substance followed by a second violation under 10.2. In both cases, the sanction shall be from two years to three years' Ineligibility.]

10.7 *Disqualification of Results in Competitions Subsequent to Sample Collection*

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 doping 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 Commencement of Ineligibility Period
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. Any period of Provisional Suspension (whether imposed or voluntarily accepted) shall be credited against the total period of Ineligibility to be served. Where required by fairness, such as delays in the hearing process or other aspects of Doping Control not attributable to the Athlete, the body imposing the sanction may start the period of Ineligibility at an earlier date commencing as early as the date of Sample collection.

[Comment: Currently, many Anti-Doping Organizations start the two-year period of Ineligibility at the time a hearing decision is rendered. Those Anti-Doping Organizations also frequently invalidate results retroactively to the date a positive Sample was collected. Other Anti-Doping Organizations simply start the two-year suspension on the date the positive Sample was collected. The OMADC, as clarified by its Explanatory Document, does not mandate either approach. The approach provided in the Code gives Athletes a strong disincentive to drag out the hearing process while they compete in the interim. It also encourages them to voluntarily accept Provisional Suspensions pending a hearing. On the other hand, the body imposing the sanction can start the sanction running before the date the hearing decision is reached so that an Athlete is not penalized by delays in the Doping Control process which are not his or her fault, for example, inordinate delay by the laboratory in reporting a positive test or delays in scheduling the hearing caused by the Anti-Doping Organization.]

10.9 Status During Ineligibility
No Person who has been declared Ineligible may, during the period of Ineligibility, participate in any capacity in a Competition or activity (other than authorized anti-doping education or rehabilitation programs) authorized or organized by any Signatory or Signatory's member organization. In addition, for any anti-doping rule violation not involving specified substances described in Article 10.3, some or all sport-related financial support or other sport-related benefits received by such Person will be withheld by Signatories, Signatories' member organizations and governments. A 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 the sport in which the Person committed the anti-doping rule violation, 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.

[Comment: The rules of some Anti-Doping Organizations only ban an Athlete from "competing" during a period of Ineligibility. For example, an Athlete in those sports could still coach during the Ineligibility period. This Article
adopts the position set forth in the OMADC that an Athlete who is made ineligible for doping should not participate in any capacity in an authorized Event or activity during the Ineligibility period. This would preclude, for example, practicing with a national team, or acting as a coach or sport official. Sanctions in one sport will also be recognized by other sports (see Article 15.4). This article would not prohibit the Person from participating in sport on a purely recreational level.]

**10.10 Reinstatement Testing.** As a condition to regaining eligibility at the end of a specified period of Ineligibility, an Athlete must, during any period of Provisional Suspension or Ineligibility, make him or herself available for Out-of-Competition Testing by any Anti-Doping Organization having testing jurisdiction, and must, if requested, provide current and accurate whereabouts information. If an Athlete subject to a period of Ineligibility retires from sport and is removed from Out-of-Competition Testing pools and later seeks reinstatement, the Athlete shall not be eligible for reinstatement until the Athlete has notified relevant Anti-Doping Organizations and has been subject to Out-of-Competition Testing for a period of time equal to the period of Ineligibility remaining as of the date the Athlete had retired.

[Comment: On a related issue, the Code does not establish a rule, but rather leaves it to the various Anti-Doping Organizations to establish their own rules, addressing eligibility requirements for Athletes who are not ineligible and retire from sport while included in an Out-of-Competition pool and then seek to return to active participation in sport.]

**ARTICLE 11 CONSEQUENCES TO TEAMS**

Where more than one team member in a Team Sport has been notified of a possible anti-doping rule violation under Article 7 in connection with an Event, the Team shall be subject to Target Testing for the Event. If more than one team member in a Team Sport is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation during the Event, the team may be subject to Disqualification or other disciplinary action. In sports which are not Team Sports but where awards are given to teams, Disqualification or other disciplinary action against the team when one or more team members have committed an anti-doping rule violation shall be as provided in the applicable rules of the International Federation.