

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

When an athlete or athlete support person commits a doping offence, it is known as an anti-doping rule violation (ADRV). Certain consequences or sanctions apply to the athlete or athlete support person 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 2015 ADRVs Report is based on the types of ADRVs listed in the 2015 Code (except for Article 2.4):

- 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 or 18-month period by an athlete)¹
- 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

¹ Refer to Question 18 of the Q&A.

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 (otherwise known as a positive result), which indicates the presence of a prohibited substance in a urine and/or blood sample collected from athletes and analyzed by a WADA-accredited laboratory.

A non-analytical ADRV is where an athlete or athlete support person (coach, trainer, manager, agent, medical staff, parent, etc.) commits another type of ADRV that does not involve the detection of a prohibited substance 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 2015 ADRVs REPORT?

The 2015 ADRVs Report begins with an Introduction and an Executive Summary, and consists of four main sections.

- The Overview comprises an Introduction and an Executive Summary of the Report and highlights the key data.
- 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 and received by the laboratories in 2015. They are presented by sport, discipline (Section 1) and testing authority (Section 2).
- Section 3 includes ADRVs that resulted from non-analytical findings committed by athletes (presented by sport and nationality) and by athlete support personnel (presented by nationality).
- Section 4 indicates the total number of ADRVs in 2015, which includes AAFs that resulted in an ADRV plus all non-analytical ADRVs. It presents the data by sport and nationality. It is further broken down into type of samples (urine or blood), type of test (in- or out-of-competition) and athlete gender.

5. HOW DOES THIS REPORT DIFFER FROM THE 2015 ANTI-DOPING TESTING FIGURES REPORT?

The 2015 Anti-Doping Testing Figures Report is a compilation of analysis results of athlete urine and blood samples as reported by WADA-accredited laboratories.

The ADRVs Report provides information regarding all ADRVs, which includes the outcomes of AAFs detected by WADA-accredited laboratories 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 the 2015 Anti-Doping Testing Figures Report (published in November 2016). The results for all samples were submitted by WADA-accredited laboratories directly into the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS), WADA's centralized online database.

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 2015 ADRVs Report correspond to the analysis of samples received by all WADA-accredited laboratories between 1 January and 31 December 2015.

The ADRVs that resulted from non-analytical findings refer to cases that were concluded in 2015. These figures may include violations that were initially pursued prior to 2015, and may not include violations that occurred in 2015 yet were not *closed* in the same year.

The outcomes indicated in the 2015 ADRVs Report for cases involving both AAFs and non-analytical ADRVs are based on the decisions received and reviewed by WADA before 31 January 2017, which is the date the Report was compiled. **Discrepancy from ADOs' published statistics may occur due to different reporting criteria.**

8. HOW SHOULD THE ADRVs REPORT BE INTERPRETED?

This Report offers the most comprehensive set of global statistics on doping offences in 2015 broken down by sport, testing authority 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 the number of non-analytical ADRVs, which, when combined with the total number of AAFs, provides a more accurate assessment of the number of doping cases that were adjudicated in 2015.

The Report's data is provided by Code Signatories and reviewed by WADA in accordance with the requirements of the 2015 Code (Article 14.4). WADA is mandated to report the data. It should be noted that 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 and nationalities (e.g. Analytical ADRVs should be considered in proportion to the total number of samples analyzed, or in the context of the Signatory's Test Distribution Plan). This caution applies to this Report as well as 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 2015 TESTING FIGURES REPORT?

The results management process can take a long time. This process includes a number of steps, beginning with the observation of a potential analytical or non-analytical violation. This is followed by an AAF being reported and other steps including investigation, decision, potential appeal and the publication of the decision. A high number of cases must be resolved before the Report can be prepared on the basis of a robust set of data that reflects the year in its entirety. At the time of compiling this ADRVs Report (31 January 2017), WADA had received 92% of the decisions relating to 2015 AAFs.

Future ADRVs Reports will be released on an annual basis and within a similar timeframe prior to the release of the following year's Anti-Doping Testing Figures Report.

10. WHY ARE THERE STILL AAF CASES PENDING FROM 2015?

Cases classified as pending are those cases where the Results Management Authority (RMA) has not 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); and
- The athlete's identification information or any other relevant information about the case.

A very small number of cases may also be pending due to the complexity of the case. Consequently, disciplinary proceedings may still be ongoing.

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

It is the responsibility of the RMA to manage the results of tests and to render a decision for all AAF cases. In the majority of cases, the RMA is also the Testing Authority (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 Foundation Board.

12. IS THERE A SPECIFIC TIME FRAME IN WHICH CASES SHOULD BE FINALIZED BY THE RESULTS MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY?

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 case to the appointed disciplinary body. As outlined in the Results Management, Hearings and Decisions Guidelines: 'Irrespective of the type of ADRV involved, any anti-doping organization (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 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.

13. 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.

14. IS THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR ANTI-DOPING ORGANIZATIONS (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 not in compliance with the Code.

15. 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 those decisions that are not compliant with the Code to, either, the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) or national level reviewing bodies.

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

A total of 280 individuals (252 athletes and 28 athlete support personnel) were reported to have committed one or more non-analytical ADRVs based on decisions received in 2015.

In certain cases, the athlete or athlete support person 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). Such cases are calculated as single occurrences for each type of violation but only relate to one athlete or athlete support person. Therefore, a total of 375 non-analytical violations were committed by 280 individuals in 2015.

17. IN THE NON-ANALYTICAL ADRV SECTION, WHY ARE THE ATHLETE SUPPORT PERSONNEL 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 athlete support person can be involved in different sports and may not be connected to only one.

18. IN THE NON-ANALYTICAL ADRV SECTION, WHY DOES ARTICLE 2.4 (WHEREABOUTS AND FILING FAILURES) OF BOTH 2009 AND 2015 CODE APPLY?

The reference period for whereabouts failures pursuant to Article 2.4 of the 2009 Code is 18 months but the applicable period based on the 2015 Code is 12 months. Since the ADRVs Report is based on decisions rendered in 2015, this includes ongoing cases from 2014 to which the 2009 Code was applied and new cases from 2015 to which the 2015 Code was applied.