

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 ADRV. Certain consequences or sanctions apply to the athlete or athlete support person who commits an anti-doping rule violation (ADRV).

2. WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF ADRV?

There are a number of different types of ADRVs, which are defined in Article 2 of the World Anti-Doping Code (Code). The 2014 ADRVs Report is based on the types of ADRVs listed in the 2009 Code:

- 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 of a prohibited substance or a prohibited method
- Article 2.3 – Refusing or failing without compelling justification to submit to sample collection or evading
- Article 2.4 – Whereabouts violation (any combination of three missed tests and/or filing failures within an 18-month period)
- Article 2.5 – Tampering or attempted tampering with any part of doping control
- Article 2.6 – Possession of prohibited substances and prohibited methods
- Article 2.7 – Trafficking or attempted trafficking in any prohibited substance or prohibited method
- Article 2.8 – Administration or attempted administration of any prohibited method or prohibited substance or assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, covering up, or other type of complicity.

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

An analytical ADRV refers to 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 2.8 above.

4. WHAT FIGURES ARE INCLUDED IN THE 2014 ADRVs REPORT?

The 2014 ADRVs Report begins with an executive summary and consists of four main sections.

- **The Executive Summary** captures key figures and patterns of data contained in the report.
- **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 2014, and is presented by sport, discipline (Section 1) and testing authority (Section 2).
- **Section 3** presents ADRVs that resulted from non-analytical findings committed by athletes presented by sport and nationality and athlete support personnel by nationality.
- **Section 4** indicates the total number of ADRVs in 2014, which includes AAFs that resulted in an ADRV plus all non-analytical ADRVs; it also presents the data by sport and nationality. It 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 ANNUAL TESTING FIGURES REPORT?

WADA's Annual 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 and also 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 2014 Testing Figures Report (published in July 2015). The results for all samples were submitted by WADA-accredited laboratories directly into the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System (ADAMS), the organization's centralized online database.

Aggregated data on the outcomes of AAFs, as well as all the data on the 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 2014 ADRVs Report correspond to the analysis of samples received by all WADA-accredited laboratories between 1 January and 31 December 2014.

The ADRVs that resulted from non-analytical findings refer to cases that were concluded in 2014. These figures may include violations that were *initially pursued* prior to 2014, and may not include violations that occurred in 2014 yet were not *closed* in the same year.

The outcomes indicated in the 2014 ADRVs Report for cases involving both AAFs and non-analytical ADRVs are based on the decisions received and reviewed by WADA as of 21 February 2016, 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 2014 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 2014.

The Report's data is provided by Code signatories and reviewed by WADA in accordance with the requirements of the 2009 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 there are many contributing factors that must be taken into account when attempting to interpret the data regarding sports, testing and results management authorities and nationalities. 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 ONE YEAR AFTER THE 2014 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, followed by an AAF being reported, then an investigation, decision, 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 (21 February 2016), WADA had received 93% of the decisions relating to 2014 AAFs.

Future ADRVs Reports will be released on an annual basis and within a similar timeframe prior to the release of the Testing Figures Report.

10. WHY ARE THERE STILL AAF CASES PENDING FROM 2014?

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 could 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 testing and render a decision for 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 Testing Authority 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. Any outstanding cases may result in compliance decisions being made by the Compliance Review Committee in the future.

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 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.

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 Results Management Authority (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 (Article 10.13 and Article 14.3.2). Furthermore, all ADOs must also notify WADA and the applicable IF or NADO of the decision of all cases, including non-analytical cases and any investigations conducted (Article 14.4).

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 to national level reviewing bodies.

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

A total of 231 individuals (185 athletes and 46 athlete support personnel) were reported to have committed one or more non-analytical ADRVs in 2014.

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 301 different types of non-analytical violations were committed in 2014.

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.