



Anti Doping Regulations

based upon

The World Anti-Doping Code 2009

Date of enforcement: 1st January 2009

Explanations Accompanying UIM Anti-Doping Rules

The UIM Anti-Doping rules were adapted to the World Anti-Doping Code in 2004 to ensure a harmonized approach to anti-doping. Following the revisions made to the World Anti-Doping Code and its related International Standards, entering into effect on 1 January 2009, the UIM Rules have now been updated to reflect these changes.

All provisions contained in the Code are mandatory and therefore had to be incorporated into UIM's regulations in order to ensure compliance with the Code.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
PREFACE	4
▪ <i>Fundamental Rationale for the Code and UIM's Anti-Doping Rules</i>	4
▪ <i>Scope</i>	5
ARTICLE 1 DEFINITION OF DOPING	6
ARTICLE 2 ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS	6
ARTICLE 3 PROOF OF DOPING	10
ARTICLE 4 THE PROHIBITED LIST.....	12
ARTICLE 5 <i>TESTING</i>	16
ARTICLE 6 ANALYSIS OF <i>SAMPLES</i>	20
ARTICLE 7 RESULTS MANAGEMENT	21
ARTICLE 8 RIGHT TO A FAIR HEARING.....	29
ARTICLE 9 AUTOMATIC <i>DISQUALIFICATION</i> OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS....	32
ARTICLE 10 SANCTIONS ON INDIVIDUALS	32
ARTICLE 11 <i>CONSEQUENCES</i> TO TEAMS	52
ARTICLE 12 SANCTIONS AND COSTS ASSESSED AGAINST <i>NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</i>	52
ARTICLE 13 APPEALS.....	53
ARTICLE 14 <i>NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS</i> INCORPORATION OF UIM RULES, REPORTING AND RECOGNITION	57
ARTICLE 15 RECOGNITION OF DECISIONS BY OTHER ORGANISATIONS ...	59
ARTICLE 16 STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS	59
ARTICLE 17 UIM COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO <i>WADA</i>	59
ARTICLE 18 AMENDMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF ANTI-DOPING RULES	60

UIM ANTI-DOPING RULES

INTRODUCTION

Preface

At the UIM General Assembly held on the 2nd November 2008 in the Gold Coast, Australia, the UIM accepted the revised (2009) UIM Anti-Doping Rules based on the World Anti-Doping *Code* (the "*Code*") approved in Madrid, Spain, in November 2007. These Anti-Doping Rules are adopted and implemented in conformance with the UIM's responsibilities under the *Code*, and are in furtherance of the UIM's continuing efforts to eradicate doping in the sport of Powerboating.

Anti-Doping Rules, like *Competition* rules, are sport rules governing the conditions under which sport is played. *Drivers* and other *Persons* accept these rules as a condition of participation and shall be bound by them. These sport-specific rules and procedures, aimed at enforcing anti-doping principles in a global and harmonized manner, are distinct in nature and, therefore, not intended to be subject to, or limited by any national requirements and legal standards applicable to criminal proceedings or employment matters. When reviewing the facts and the law of a given case, all courts, arbitral tribunals and other adjudicating bodies should be aware of and respect the distinct nature of the anti-doping rules in the *Code* and the fact that these rules represent the consensus of a broad spectrum of stakeholders around the world with an interest in fair sport.

Fundamental Rationale for the Code and the UIM's Anti-Doping Rules

Anti-doping programs seek to preserve what is intrinsically valuable about sport. This intrinsic value is often referred to as "the spirit of sport"; it is the essence of Olympism; it is how we play true. The spirit of sport is the celebration of the human spirit, body and mind, and is characterized by the following values:

- Ethics, fair play and honesty
- Health
- Excellence in performance
- Character and education
- Fun and joy
- Teamwork
- Dedication and commitment
- Respect for rules and laws
- Respect for self and other participants
- Courage
- Community and solidarity

Doping is fundamentally contrary to the spirit of sport.

Scope

These Anti-Doping Rules shall apply to the UIM, each *National Association* of the UIM, and each *Participant* in the activities of the UIM or any of its *National Associations* by virtue of the *Participant's* membership, accreditation, or participation in the UIM, its *National Associations*, or their activities or *Events*. Any *Person* who is not a member of a National Association and who fulfills the requirements to be part of the UIM Registered Testing Pool, must become a member of the *Person's National Association*, and must make himself or herself available for *Testing*, at least six months before participating in *International Events* or events of his/her *National Association*.

To be eligible for participation in UIM events, a Driver must have a Powerboat Racing licence issued by his or her National Association. The Powerboat Racing licence will only be issued to *Drivers* who have personally signed the Appendix 2 consent form, in the actual form approved by the UIM Executive. All forms from under-age applicants must be counter-signed by their legal guardians.

The National Association must guarantee that all *Drivers* registered for a Powerboat Racing Licence accept the Rules of the UIM, concerning these UIM Anti-Doping Rules.

It is the responsibility of each *National Association* to ensure that all national-level *Testing* on the *National Association's Drivers* complies with these Anti-Doping Rules. In some countries, the *National Association* itself will be conducting the *Doping Control* described in these Anti-Doping Rules. In other countries, many of the *Doping Control* responsibilities of the *National Association* have been delegated or assigned by statute or agreement to a *National Anti-Doping Organization*. In those countries, references in these Anti-Doping Rules to the *National Association* shall apply, as appropriate, to the *National Anti-Doping Organization*.

These Anti-Doping Rules shall apply to all *Doping Controls* over which the UIM and its *National Associations* have jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 1 DEFINITION OF DOPING

Doping is defined as the occurrence of one or more of the anti-doping rule violations set forth in Article 2.1 through Article 2.8 of these Anti-Doping Rules.

ARTICLE 2 ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS

Drivers and other *Persons* shall be responsible for knowing what constitutes an anti-doping rule violation and the substances and methods which have been included on the *Prohibited List*.

The following constitute anti-doping rule violations:

[Comment to Article 2: 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 has been violated.]

2.1 The presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* in a *Driver's Sample*

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

[Comment to Article 2.1.1: For purposes of anti-doping violations involving the presence of a Prohibited Substance (or its Metabolites or Markers), UIM's Anti-Doping Rules adopt the rule of strict liability which was found in the Olympic Movement Anti-Doping Code ("OMADC") and the vast majority of pre-Code anti-doping rules. Under the strict liability principle, a Driver is responsible, and an anti-doping rule violation occurs, whenever a Prohibited Substance is found in a Driver's Sample. The violation occurs whether or not the Driver 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 Driver then has the possibility to avoid or reduce sanctions if the Driver 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)) or in certain circumstances did not intend to enhance his or her sport performance (Article 10.4 (Elimination or Reduction

of the Period of Ineligibility for Specified Substances under Specific Circumstances)).

The strict liability rule for the finding of a Prohibited Substance in a Driver's Sample, 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" Drivers and fairness in the exceptional circumstance where a Prohibited Substance entered a Driver's system through No Fault or Negligence or No Significant Fault or Negligence on the Driver'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 strict liability principle set forth in International Federation's Anti-Doping Rules has been consistently upheld in the decisions of CAS.]

2.1.2 Sufficient proof of an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 is established by either of the following: presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* in the *Driver's A Sample* where the *Driver* waives analysis of the *B Sample* and the *B Sample* is not analyzed; or, where the *Driver's B Sample* is analyzed and the analysis of the *Driver's B Sample* confirms the presence of the *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* found in the *Driver's A Sample*.

[Comment to Article 2.1.2: The UIM may in its discretion choose to have the B Sample analyzed even if the Driver does not request the analysis of the B Sample.]

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

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

2.2 Use or Attempted Use by a Driver of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method

[Comment to Article 2.2: As noted in Article 3 (Proof of Doping), it has always been the case that Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method may be established by any reliable means. Unlike the proof required to establish an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1, Use or Attempted Use may also be established by other reliable means such as

admissions by the Driver, witness statements, documentary evidence, conclusions drawn from longitudinal profiling, or other analytical information which does not otherwise satisfy all the requirements to establish "Presence" of a Prohibited Substance under Article 2.1. For example, Use may be established based upon reliable analytical data from the analysis of an A Sample (without confirmation from an analysis of a B Sample) or from the analysis of a B Sample alone where the UIM provides a satisfactory explanation for the lack of confirmation in the other Sample.]

2.2.1 It is each *Driver's* personal duty to ensure that no *Prohibited Substance* enters his or her body. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing *Use* on the *Driver's* part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping rule violation for *Use* of a *Prohibited Substance* or a *Prohibited Method*.

2.2.2 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 to Article 2.2.2: Demonstrating the "Attempted Use" of a Prohibited Substance requires proof of intent on the Driver'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 violations of Article 2.2 in respect of Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.]

A Driver's "Use" of a Prohibited Substance constitutes an anti-doping rule violation unless such substance is not prohibited Out-of-Competition and the Driver's Use takes place Out-of-Competition. (However, the presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in a Sample collected In-Competition will be a violation of Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers) regardless of when that substance might have been administered.)]

2.3 Refusing or failing without compelling justification to submit to *Sample* collection after notification as authorized in these Anti-Doping Rules, or otherwise evading *Sample* collection.

[Comment to Article 2.3: Failure or refusal to submit to Sample collection after notification was prohibited in almost all pre-Code anti-doping rules. This Article expands the typical pre-Code 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 a Driver was hiding from

a Doping Control official to evade notification or Testing. A violation of "refusing or failing to submit to Sample collection" may be based on either intentional or negligent conduct of the Driver, while "evading" Sample collection contemplates intentional conduct by the Driver.]

2.4 Violation of applicable requirements regarding Driver availability for Out-of-Competition Testing set out in the International Standard for Testing, including failure to file whereabouts information in accordance with Article 11.3 of the *International Standard for Testing* (a "**Filing Failure**") and failure to be available for Testing at the declared whereabouts in accordance with Article 11.4 of the *International Standard for Testing* (a "**Missed Test**"). Any combination of three Missed Tests and/or Filing Failures committed within an eighteen-month period, as declared by the UIM or any other Anti-Doping Organization with jurisdiction over a Driver, shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 2.4: Separate whereabouts filing failures and missed tests declared under the rules of the UIM or any other Anti-Doping Organization with authority to declare whereabouts filing failures and missed tests in accordance with the International Standard for Testing shall be combined in applying this Article. In appropriate circumstances, missed tests or filing failures may also constitute an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.3 or Article 2.5.]

2.5 Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control.

[Comment to Article 2.5: This Article prohibits conduct which subverts the Doping Control process but which would not otherwise be included in the definition of Prohibited Methods. For example, altering identification numbers on a Doping Control form during Testing, breaking the B Bottle at the time of B Sample analysis or providing fraudulent information to the UIM.]

2.6 Possession of Prohibited Substances and Methods

2.6.1 *Possession by a Driver In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance, or Possession by a Driver Out-of-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance which is prohibited in Out-of-Competition Testing unless the Driver establishes that the Possession is pursuant to a therapeutic use exemption ("TUE") granted in accordance with Article 4.4 (Therapeutic Use) or other acceptable justification.*

2.6.2 *Possession by Driver Support Personnel In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance, or*

Possession by Driver Support Personnel Out-of-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance which is prohibited Out-of-Competition, in connection with a Driver, Competition or training, unless the Driver Support Personnel establishes that the Possession is pursuant to a TUE granted to a Driver in accordance with Article 4.4 (Therapeutic Use) or other acceptable justification.

[Comment to Article 2.6.1 and 2.6.2: Acceptable justification would not include, for example, buying or possessing a Prohibited Substance for purposes of giving it to a friend or relative, except under justifiable medical circumstances where that Person had a physician's prescription, e.g., buying Insulin for a diabetic child.]

[Comment to Article 2.6.2: Acceptable justification would include, for example, a team doctor carrying Prohibited Substances for dealing with acute and emergency situations.]

2.7 Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking in any Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.

2.8 Administration or Attempted administration to any Driver
In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or Prohibited Substance, or administration or Attempted administration to any Driver Out-of-Competition of any Prohibited Method or any Prohibited Substance that is prohibited Out-of-Competition, or assisting, encouraging, aiding, abetting, covering up or any other type of complicity involving an anti-doping rule violation or any Attempted anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 2: The Code does not make it an anti-doping rule violation for a Driver or other Person to work or associate with Driver Support Personnel who are serving a period of Ineligibility. However, UIM may adopt its own specific policy which prohibits such conduct.]

ARTICLE 3 PROOF OF DOPING

3.1 Burdens and Standards of Proof

UIM and its National Associations shall have the burden of establishing that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. The standard of proof shall be whether UIM or its National Association has established an anti-doping rule violation to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel bearing in mind the seriousness of the allegation which is made. This standard of proof in all cases is greater than a mere balance of probability but less than proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Where these Rules place the burden of proof upon the Driver or other Person alleged to have committed an anti-doping rule violation to rebut a presumption

or establish specified facts or circumstances, the standard of proof shall be by a balance of probability, except as provided in Articles 10.4 and 10.6, where the *Driver* must satisfy a higher burden of proof.

[Comment to Article 3.1: This standard of proof required to be met by UIM or its National Association is comparable to the standard which is applied in most countries to cases involving professional misconduct. It has also been widely applied by courts and hearing panels in doping cases. See, for example, the CAS decision in N., J., Y., W. v. FINA, CAS 98/208, 22 December 1998.]

3.2 Methods of Establishing Facts and Presumptions

Facts related to anti-doping rule violations may be established by any reliable means, including admissions. The following rules of proof shall be applicable in doping cases:

[Comment to Article 3.2: For example, UIM or its National Association may establish an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.2 (Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method) based on the Driver's admissions, the credible testimony of third Persons, reliable documentary evidence, reliable analytical data from either an A or B Sample as provided in the Comments to Article 2.2, or conclusions drawn from the profile of a series of the Driver's blood or urine Samples.]

3.2.1 WADA-accredited laboratories are presumed to have conducted *Sample* analysis and custodial procedures in accordance with the *International Standard* for Laboratories. The *Driver* or other *Person* may rebut this presumption by establishing that a departure from the *International Standard* occurred which could reasonably have caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

If the *Driver* or other *Person* rebuts the preceding presumption by showing that a departure from the *International Standard* occurred which could reasonably have caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*, then UIM or its *National Association* shall have the burden to establish that such departure did not cause the *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

[Comment to Article 3.2.1: The burden is on the Driver or other Person to establish, by a balance of probability, a departure from the International Standard that could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding. If the Driver or other Person does so, the burden shifts to UIM or its National Association to prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that the departure did not cause the Adverse Analytical Finding.]

3.2.2 Departures from any other *International Standard* or other anti-doping rule or policy which did not cause an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or other anti-doping rule violation shall not invalidate such results. If the *Driver* or other *Person* establishes that a departure from another *International Standard* or other anti-doping rule or policy which could reasonably have caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding* or other anti-doping rule violation occurred, then *UIM* or its *National Association* shall have the burden to establish that such a departure did not cause the *Adverse Analytical Finding* or the factual basis for the anti-doping rule violation.

3.2.3 The facts established by a decision of a court or professional disciplinary tribunal of competent jurisdiction which is not the subject of a pending appeal shall be irrebuttable evidence against the *Driver* or other *Person* to whom the decision pertained of those facts unless the *Driver* or other *Person* establishes that the decision violated principles of natural justice.

3.2.4 The hearing panel in a hearing on an anti-doping rule violation may draw an inference adverse to the *Driver* or other *Person* who is asserted to have committed an anti-doping rule violation based on the *Driver's* or other *Person's* refusal, after a request made in a reasonable time in advance of the hearing, to appear at the hearing (either in person or telephonically as directed by the tribunal) and to answer questions either from the hearing panel or from the *Anti-Doping Organization* asserting the anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 3.2.4: Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances has been recognized in numerous CAS decisions.]

ARTICLE 4 THE PROHIBITED LIST

4.1 Incorporation of the *Prohibited List*

These Anti-Doping Rules incorporate the *Prohibited List* which is published and revised by *WADA* as described in Article 4.1 of the *Code*. *UIM* will make the current *Prohibited List* available to each *National Association*, and each *National Association* shall ensure that the current *Prohibited List* is available to its members and constituents.

[Comment to Article 4.1: The Prohibited List will be revised and published on an expedited basis whenever the need arises. However, for the sake of predictability, a new Prohibited List will be published every year whether or not changes have been made. The Prohibited List in force is available on WADA's website at

www.wada-ama.org. The Prohibited List is an integral part of the International Convention against Doping in Sport.]

4.2 Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods Identified on the Prohibited List

4.2.1 Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods

Unless provided otherwise in the *Prohibited List* and/or a revision, the *Prohibited List* and revisions shall go into effect under these Anti-Doping Rules three months after publication of the *Prohibited List* by WADA without requiring any further action by UIM. As described in Article 4.2 of the *Code*, UIM may request that WADA expand the *Prohibited List* for the sport of Powerboating. UIM may also upon the recommendation of its Anti-Doping Commission request that WADA include additional substances or methods, which have the potential for abuse in the sport of Powerboating, in the monitoring program described in Article 4.5 of the *Code*. As provided in the *Code*, WADA shall make the final decision on such requests by UIM.

[Comment to Article 4.2.1: There will be one Prohibited List. The substances which are prohibited at all times would include masking agents and those substances which, when used in training, may have long term performance enhancing effects such as anabolics. All substances and methods on the Prohibited List are prohibited In-Competition. Out-of-Competition Use (Article 2.2) of a substance which is only prohibited In-Competition is not an anti-doping rule violation unless an Adverse Analytical Finding for the substance or its Metabolites is reported for a Sample collected In-Competition (Article 2.1).

There will be only one document called the "Prohibited List." WADA may add additional substances or methods to the Prohibited List for particular sports (e.g. the inclusion of beta-blockers for shooting) but this will also be reflected on the single Prohibited List. A particular sport is not permitted to seek exemption from the basic list of Prohibited Substances (e.g. eliminating anabolics from the Prohibited List for "mind sports"). The premise of this decision is that there are certain basic doping agents which anyone who chooses to call himself or herself a Driver should not take.]

4.2.2 Specified Substances

For purposes of the application of Article 10 (Sanctions on Individuals), all *Prohibited Substances* shall be "Specified Substances" except (a) substances in the classes of anabolic agents and hormones; and (b) those stimulants and hormone

antagonists and modulators so identified on the *Prohibited List*. *Prohibited Methods* shall not be Specified Substances.

4.2.3 New Classes of *Prohibited Substances*

In the event WADA expands the *Prohibited List* by adding a new class of *Prohibited Substances* in accordance with Article 4.1 of the *Code*, WADA's Executive Committee shall determine whether any or all *Prohibited Substances* within the new class of *Prohibited Substances* shall be considered Specified Substances under Article 4.2.2.

4.3 Criteria for Including Substances and Methods on the *Prohibited List*

As provided in Article 4.3.3 of the *Code*, WADA's determination of the *Prohibited Substances* and *Prohibited Methods* that will be included on the *Prohibited List* and the classification of substances into categories on the *Prohibited List* is final and shall not be subject to challenge by a Driver or other *Person* based on an argument that the substance or method was not a masking agent or did not have the potential to enhance performance, represent a health risk or violate the spirit of sport.

[Comment to Article 4.3: The question of whether a substance meets the criteria in Article 4.3 (Criteria for Including Substances and Methods on the Prohibited List) in a particular case cannot be raised as a defense to an anti-doping rule violation. For example, it cannot be argued that the Prohibited Substance detected would not have been performance enhancing in that particular sport. Rather, doping occurs when a substance on the Prohibited List is found in a Driver's Sample. Similarly, it cannot be argued that a substance listed in the class of anabolic agents does not belong in that class.]

4.4 Therapeutic Use

4.4.1 *Drivers* with a documented medical condition requiring the use of a *Prohibited Substance* or a *Prohibited Method* must first obtain a TUE. The presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* (Article 2.1), *Use* or *Attempted Use* of a *Prohibited Substance* or a *Prohibited Method* (Article 2.2), *Possession* of *Prohibited Substances* or *Prohibited Methods* (Article 2.6) or administration of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* (Article 2.8) consistent with the provisions of an applicable TUE issued pursuant to the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions shall not be considered an anti-doping rule violation.

4.4.2 Subject to Article 4.4.3, *Drivers* included by *UIM* in its *Registered Testing Pool* and other *Drivers* participating in any *International Event* must obtain a TUE from *UIM* (regardless of whether the *Driver* previously has received a TUE at the national level). The application for a TUE must be made as soon as possible (in the case of a *Driver* in the *Registered Testing Pool*, this would be when he/she is first notified of his/her inclusion in the pool) and in any event (save in emergency situations) no later than 21 days before the *Driver's* participation in the *Event*.

4.4.3 The only exception to Article 4.4.2 is that, in accordance with Article 7.13 of the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, *Drivers* not in *UIM's Registered Testing Pool* who inhale Glucocorticosteroids and/or formoterol, salbutamol, salmeterol or terbutaline to treat asthma or one of its clinical variants do not need a TUE in advance of participating in an *International Event* unless so specified by *UIM*. Instead, if necessary, any such *Driver* may apply for a Retroactive TUE after the *Event* in accordance with Article 7.13 of the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions and Article 7.1.3 of these Anti-Doping Rules.

4.4.4 TUE's granted by *UIM* shall be reported to the *Driver's National Association* and to *WADA*. Other *Drivers* subject to *Testing* who need to use a *Prohibited Substance* or a *Prohibited Method* for therapeutic reasons must obtain a TUE from their *National Anti-Doping Organization* or other body designated by their *National Association*, as required under the rules of the *National Anti-Doping Organization/other body*. *National Associations* shall promptly report any such TUE's to *UIM* and *WADA*.

4.4.5 The *UIM Executive* shall appoint a panel of physicians to consider requests for TUE's (the "**TUE Committee**"). Upon *UIM's* receipt of a TUE request, the Chair of the TUE Panel shall appoint one or more members of the TUE Panel (which may include the Chair) to consider such request. The TUE Committee member(s) so designated shall promptly evaluate such request in accordance with the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions and render a decision on such request, which shall be the final decision of *UIM*.

4.4.6 *WADA*, at the request of a *Driver* or on its own initiation, may review the granting or denial of any TUE by *UIM*. If *WADA* determines that the granting or denial of a TUE did not comply with the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions in force at the time then *WADA* may reverse that decision.

Decisions on TUE's are subject to further appeal as provided in Article 13.

ARTICLE 5 TESTING

5.1 Authority to Test

All *Drivers* under the jurisdiction of a *National Association* shall be subject to *In-Competition Testing* by *UIM*, the *Driver's National Association*, and any other *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for *Testing* at a *Competition* or *Event* in which they participate. All *Drivers* under the jurisdiction of a *National Association*, including *Drivers* serving a period of ineligibility or a *Provisional Suspension*, shall also be subject to *Out-of-Competition Testing* at any time or place, with or without advance notice, by *UIM*, *WADA*, the *Driver's National Association*, the *National Anti-Doping Organization* of any country where the *Driver* is present. *Target Testing* will be made a priority.

[Comment to Article 5.1: Target Testing is specified because random Testing, or even weighted random Testing, does not ensure that all of the appropriate Drivers will be tested (e.g., world-class Drivers, Drivers whose performances have dramatically improved over a short period of time, Drivers whose coaches have had other Drivers test positive, etc.). Obviously, Target Testing must not be used for any purposes other than legitimate Doping Control. The Code makes it clear that Drivers have no right to expect that they will be tested only on a random basis. Similarly, it does not impose any reasonable suspicion or probable cause requirement for Target Testing]

5.2 Responsibility for UIM Testing

The *UIM* shall be responsible for drawing up a test distribution plan for the sport of Powerboating in accordance with Article 4 of the *International Standard for Testing*, and for the implementation of that plan, including overseeing all *Testing* conducted by or on behalf of *UIM*. *Testing* may be conducted by members of the *UIM* or by other qualified persons so authorized by *UIM*.

5.3 Testing Standards

Testing conducted by *UIM* and its *National Associations* shall be in substantial conformity with the *International Standard for Testing* in force at the time of *Testing*.

5.3.1 Blood or other non-urine *Samples* may be used to detect *Prohibited Substances* or *Prohibited Methods*, for screening procedure purposes, or for longitudinal biological profiling. If the *Sample* is collected for screening only, it will have no consequences for the *Driver* other than to identify him/her for a urine test under these anti-doping rules. In these

circumstances, the UIM may decide at its own discretion which parameters are to be measured in the screening *Sample* and what levels of those parameters will be used to indicate that a Driver should be selected for a urine test. If however, the Sample is collected for longitudinal biological profiling, it may be used for anti-doping purposes in accordance with Article 2.2 of the *Code*.

5.4 Coordination of Testing

UIM and *National Associations* shall promptly report completed tests through the WADA clearinghouse to avoid unnecessary duplication in *Testing*.

5.5 Driver Whereabouts Requirements

5.5.1 UIM shall identify a *Registered Testing Pool* of those *Drivers* who are required to comply with the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing*, and shall publish the criteria for *Drivers* to be included in this *Registered Testing Pool* as well as a list of the *Drivers* meeting those criteria for the period in question. *UIM* shall review and update as necessary its criteria for including *Drivers* in its *Registered Testing Pool*, and shall revise the membership of its *Registered Testing Pool* from time to time as appropriate in accordance with the set criteria. Each *Driver* in the *Registered Testing Pool* (a) shall advise *UIM* of his/her whereabouts on a quarterly basis, in the manner set out in Article 11.3 of the *International Standard for Testing*; (b) shall update that information as necessary, in accordance with Article 11.4.2 of the *International Standard for Testing*, so that it remains accurate and complete at all times; and (c) shall make him/herself available for *Testing* at such whereabouts, in accordance with Article 11.4 of the *International Standard for Testing*.

[*Comment to Article 5.5.1: The purpose of the UIM Registered Testing Pool is to identify top-level International Drivers who the UIM requires to provide whereabouts information to facilitate Out-of-Competition Testing by UIM and other Anti-Doping Organizations with jurisdiction over the Drivers. UIM will identify such Drivers in accordance with the requirements of Articles 4 and 11.2 of the International Standard for Testing.*]

Examples for the criteria which could be used separately or in combination include:

- *All medalists / team members of (Team) medalists from the previous (one, two,...) world championships / continental championships / top 10 Drivers in each discipline or in World Ranking or World Cup.*
- *Any Driver whose performance is better than or equal to the fiftiest best performances in the preceding competition year.*
- *All Drivers who are members of the top 8 teams in the Team Ranking*

Every National Association shall report to UIM the performances, names and addresses of all Drivers whose performances fall within the Registered Testing Pool criteria established by UIM.

5.5.2 A Driver's failure to advise UIM of his/her whereabouts shall be deemed a Filing Failure for purposes of Article 2.4 where the conditions of Article 11.3.5 of the *International Standard for Testing* are met.

5.5.3 A Driver's failure to be available for Testing at his/her declared whereabouts shall be deemed a Missed Test for purposes of Article 2.4 where the conditions of Article 11.4.3 of the *International Standard for Testing* are met.

5.5.4 Each *National Association* shall also assist its *National Anti-Doping Organization* in establishing a national level *Registered Testing Pool* of top level national *Drivers* to whom the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing* shall also apply. Where those *Drivers* are also in the UIM's *Registered Testing Pool*, the UIM and the *National Anti-Doping Organization* will agree on which of them will take responsibility for receiving whereabouts filings from the *Driver* and sharing it with the other (and with other *Anti-Doping Organizations*) in accordance with Article 5.5.5.

5.5.5 Whereabouts information provided pursuant to Articles 5.5.1 and 5.5.4 shall be shared with *WADA* and other *Anti-Doping Organizations* having jurisdiction to test a *Driver* in accordance with Articles 11.7.1(d) and 11.7.3(d) of the *International Standard for Testing*, including the strict condition that it be used only for *Doping Control* purposes.

5.6 Retirement and Return to Competition

5.6.1 A *Driver* who has been identified by UIM for inclusion in UIM's *Registered Testing Pool* shall continue to be subject to these *Anti-Doping Rules*, including the obligation to comply with the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing* unless and until the *Driver* gives written notice to UIM that he or she has retired or until he or she no longer satisfies

the criteria for inclusion in UIM's *Registered Testing Pool* and has been so informed by UIM.

5.6.2 A Driver who has given notice of retirement to UIM may not resume competing unless he or she notifies UIM at least six months before he or she expects to return to competition and makes him/herself available for unannounced *Out-of-Competition Testing*, including complying with the whereabouts requirements of the *International Standard for Testing*, at any time during the period before actual return to competition.

5.6.3 *National Associations/National Anti-Doping Organizations* may establish similar requirements for retirement and returning to competition for *Drivers* in the national *Registered Testing Pool*.

5.7 Selection of *Drivers* to be Tested

5.7.1 At *International Events*, the UIM shall determine the number of finishing placement tests, random tests and target tests to be performed.

[Examples:

Alternative 1: The following *Drivers* shall be tested for each *Competition* at an *International Event*.

Each *Driver* finishing in one of the top [three] [four] placements in [random] [selected] [targeted] [disciplines] [all disciplines] in the *Competition*, plus one other *Driver* in the *Competition* selected at random.

Alternative 2: The UIM shall target a certain number of *Drivers* not necessarily linked to final placements in order to maximize the diversity of *Drivers* tested or based on information provided by the WADA Clearinghouse on previous tests.]

5.7.2 At *National Events*, each *National Association* shall determine the number of *Drivers* selected for *Testing* in each *Competition* and the procedures for selecting the *Drivers* for *Testing*.

5.7.3 In addition to the selection procedures set forth in Articles 5.7.1 and 5.7.2 above, the UIM at *International Events*, and the *National Association* at *National Events*, may also select *Drivers* or teams for *Target Testing* so long as such *Target Testing* is not used for any purpose other than legitimate *Doping Control* purposes.

5.7.4 *Drivers* shall be selected for *Out-of-Competition Testing* by the UIM and by *National Associations* through a process that substantially complies with the *International Standard for Testing* in force at the time of selection.

5.8 *National Associations* and the organizing committees for *National Association Events* shall provide access to *Independent Observers* at *Events* as directed by UIM.

ARTICLE 6 ANALYSIS OF SAMPLES

Doping Control Samples collected under these Anti-Doping Rules shall be analyzed in accordance with the following principles:

6.1 Use of Approved Laboratories

UIM shall send *Doping Control Samples* for analysis only to WADA-accredited laboratories or as otherwise approved by WADA. The choice of the WADA-accredited laboratory (or other laboratory or method approved by WADA) used for the *Sample* analysis shall be determined exclusively by UIM.

[Comment to Article 6.1: Violations of Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers) may be established only by Sample analysis performed by a WADA-approved laboratory or another laboratory specifically authorized by WADA. Violations of other Articles may be established using analytical results from other laboratories so long as the results are reliable.]

6.2 Purpose of Collection and Analysis of Samples

Samples shall be analyzed to detect *Prohibited Substances* and *Prohibited Methods* identified on the *Prohibited List* and other substances as may be directed by WADA pursuant to the Monitoring Program described in Article 4.5 of the *Code* or to assist UIM in profiling relevant parameters in a *Driver's* urine, blood or other matrix, including DNA or genomic profiling, for anti-doping purposes.

[Comment to Article 6.2: For example, relevant profile information could be used to direct Target Testing or to support an anti-doping rule violation proceeding under Article 2.2 (Use of a Prohibited Substance), or both.]

6.3 Research on Samples

No *Sample* may be used for any purpose other than as described in Article 6.2 without the *Driver's* written consent. *Samples* used (with the *Driver's* consent) for purposes other than Article 6.2 shall have any

means of identification removed such that they cannot be traced back to a particular *Driver*.

6.4 Standards for *Sample Analysis and Reporting*

Laboratories shall analyze *Doping Control Samples* and report results in conformity with the *International Standard* for Laboratories.

6.5 Retesting *Samples*

A *Sample* may be reanalyzed for the purposes described in Article 6.2 at any time exclusively at the direction of UIM or WADA. The circumstances and conditions for retesting *Samples* shall conform with the requirements of the *International Standard* for Laboratories.

[Comment to Article 6.5: Although this Article is new, Anti-Doping Organizations have always had the authority to reanalyze Samples. The International Standard for Laboratories or a new technical document which is made a part of the International Standard will harmonize the protocol for such retesting.]

ARTICLE 7 RESULTS MANAGEMENT

7.1 Results Management for Tests Initiated by UIM

Results management for tests initiated by UIM (including tests performed by WADA pursuant to agreement with UIM) shall proceed as set forth below:

7.1.1 The results from all analyses must be sent to UIM in encoded form, in a report signed by an authorised representative of the laboratory. All communication must be conducted in confidentiality and in conformity with *ADAMS*, a database management tool developed by WADA. *ADAMS* is consistent with data privacy statutes and norms applicable to WADA and other organizations using it.

7.1.2 Upon receipt of an *A Sample Adverse Analytical Finding*, the UIM Independent Doping Review Panel shall conduct a review to determine whether: (a) the *Adverse Analytical Finding* is consistent with an applicable TUE, or (b) there is any apparent departure from the *International Standard for Testing* or *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

[7.1.2.1 The UIM Executive shall appoint an Independent Doping Review Panel consisting of a Chair and 2 other members with experience in anti-doping. All

members of the panel shall be otherwise independent from UIM. Each panel member shall serve a term of four years. In each case the Chair of the panel shall appoint 1 or more members of the panel (which may include the Chair) to conduct the review discussed in Articles 7.1.2 and 7.1.8 and to review any other potential violations of these Anti-Doping Rules as may be requested by UIM.

7.1.3 In the following circumstances:

- (a) The *Adverse Analytical Finding* is for a Glucocorticosteroid, formoterol, salbutamol, salmeterol or terbutaline; and
- (b) The *Sample* in question was provided by a Driver who is not in UIM's *Registered Testing Pool*, during his/her participation in an *International Event* for which (in accordance with Article 7.13 of the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions and Article 4.4.3 of these Anti-Doping Rules UIM does not require a TUE for asthma medication in advance;

then, before the matter is referred to UIM Independent Review Panel under Article 7.1, the *Driver* shall be given an opportunity to apply to the TUE Committee for a Retroactive TUE in accordance with Article 7.13 of the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions. The result of that application shall be forwarded to the UIM Independent Review Panel for consideration in its review of the *Adverse Analytical Finding* under Article 7.1.2.

7.1.4 If the initial review of an *Adverse Analytical Finding* under Article 7.1.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE, or departure from the *International Standard* for Testing or the *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*, UIM shall promptly notify the *Driver* of: (a) the *Adverse Analytical Finding*; (b) the anti-doping rule violated; (c) the *Driver's* right to promptly request the analysis of the B *Sample* or, failing such request, that the B *Sample* analysis may be deemed waived; (d) the scheduled date, time and place for the B *Sample* analysis (which shall be within the time period specified in the *International Standard* for Laboratories) if the *Driver* or UIM chooses to request an analysis of the B *Sample*; (e) the opportunity for the *Driver* and/or the *Driver's* representative to attend the B *Sample* opening and analysis at the scheduled date,

time and place if such analysis is requested; and (f) the *Driver's* right to request copies of the A and B *Sample* laboratory documentation package which includes information as required by the *International Standard* for Laboratories. UIM shall also notify the *Driver's National Anti-Doping Organization* and WADA. If UIM decides not to bring forward the *Adverse Analytical Finding* as an anti-doping rule violation, it shall so notify the *Driver*, the *Driver's National Anti-Doping Organization* and WADA.

7.1.5 Where requested by the *Driver* or UIM, arrangements shall be made for *Testing* the B *Sample* within the time period specified in the *International Standard* for *Testing*. A *Driver* may accept the A *Sample* analytical results by waiving the requirement for B *Sample* analysis. UIM may nonetheless elect to proceed with the B *Sample* analysis.

7.1.6 The *Driver* and/or his representative shall be allowed to be present at the analysis of the B *Sample* within the time period specified in the *International Standard* for Laboratories. Also a representative of the *Driver's National Association* as well as a representative of UIM shall be allowed to be present.

7.1.7 If the B *Sample* proves negative, then (unless UIM takes the case forward as an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.2) the entire test shall be considered negative and the *Driver*, his *National Association*, and UIM shall be so informed.

7.1.8 If a *Prohibited Substance* or the *Use of a Prohibited Method* is identified, the findings shall be reported to the *Driver*, his *National Association*, UIM, and to WADA.

7.1.9 For apparent anti-doping rule violations that do not involve *Adverse Analytical Findings*, UIM shall conduct any necessary follow-up investigation and, at such time as it is satisfied that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, it shall then promptly notify the *Driver* of the anti-doping rule which appears to have been violated, and the basis of the violation.

7.2 Results Management for Atypical Findings

7.2.1 As provided in the *International Standards*, in certain circumstances laboratories are directed to report the presence of *Prohibited Substances* that may also be produced endogenously as *Atypical Findings* that should be investigated further.

7.2.2 If a laboratory reports an *Atypical Finding* in respect of a *Sample* collected from a *Driver* by or on behalf of UIM, the UIM Independent Doping Review Panel shall conduct a review to determine whether: (a) the *Atypical Finding* is consistent with an

applicable TUE that has been granted as provided in the *International Standard* for Therapeutic Use Exemptions, or (b) there is any apparent departure from the *International Standard* for Testing or *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Atypical Analytical Finding*.

7.2.3 If the initial review of an *Atypical Finding* under Article 7.2.2 reveals an applicable TUE or departure from the *International Standard* for Testing or the *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Atypical Finding*, the entire test shall be considered negative and the *Driver*, his *National Association*, and UIM shall be so informed.

7.2.4 If the initial review of an *Atypical Finding* under Article 7.2.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE or departure from the *International Standard* for Testing or the *International Standard* for Laboratories that caused the *Atypical Finding*, UIM shall conduct the follow-up investigation required by the *International Standards*. If, once that investigation is completed, it is concluded that the *Atypical Finding* should be considered an *Adverse Analytical Finding*, UIM shall pursue the matter in accordance with Article 7.1.3.

7.2.5 UIM will not provide notice of an *Atypical Finding* until it has completed its investigation and has decided whether it will bring the *Atypical Finding* forward as an *Adverse Analytical Finding* unless one of the following circumstances exists:

If UIM determines the B *Sample* should be analyzed prior to the conclusion of its follow-up investigation, it may conduct the B *Sample* analysis after notifying the *Driver*, with such notice to include a description of the *Atypical Finding* and the information described in Article 7.1.3(c) to (f).

7.3 Results Management for Tests Initiated During Other International Events

Results management and the conduct of hearings from a test by a Major Event Organization, shall be managed, as far as sanctions beyond Disqualification from the Event or the results of the Event, by UIM.

7.4 Results Management for Tests initiated by National Associations

Results management conducted by *National Associations* shall be consistent with the general principles for effective and fair results management which underlie the detailed provisions set forth in Article 7. Results of all *Doping Controls* shall be reported to UIM and to WADA within 14 days of the conclusion of the *National Association's* results

management process. Any apparent anti-doping rule violation by a *Driver* who is a member of that *National Association* shall be promptly referred to an appropriate hearing panel established pursuant to the rules of the *National Association* or national law. Apparent anti-doping rule violations by *Drivers* who are members of another *National Association* shall be referred to the *Driver's National Association* for hearing.

7.5 Results Management for Whereabouts Violations

7.5.1 Results management in respect of an apparent *Filing Failure* by a *Driver* in UIM's *Registered Testing Pool* shall be conducted by UIM in accordance with Article 11.6.2 of the *International Standard for Testing* (unless it has been agreed in accordance with Article 5.5.4 that the *National Association* or *National Anti-Doping Organization* shall take such responsibility).

7.5.2 Results management in respect of an apparent Missed Test by a *Driver* in UIM's *Registered Testing Pool* as a result of an attempt to test the *Driver* by or on behalf of UIM shall be conducted by UIM in accordance with Article 11.6.3 of the *International Standard for Testing*. Results management in respect of an apparent Missed Test by such *Driver* as a result of an attempt to test the *Driver* by or on behalf of another *Anti-Doping Organization* shall be conducted by that other *Anti-Doping Organization* in accordance with Article 11.7.6(c) of the *International Standard for Testing*.

7.5.3 Where, in any eighteen-month period, a *Driver* in UIM's *Registered Testing Pool* is declared to have three *Filing Failures*, or three *Missed Tests*, or any combination of *Filing Failures* or *Missed Tests* adding up to three in total, whether under these *Anti-Doping Rules* or under the rules of any other *Anti-Doping Organization*, UIM shall bring them forward as an apparent anti-doping rule violation.

7.6 Provisional Suspensions

7.6.1 If analysis of an *A Sample* has resulted in an *Adverse Analytical Finding* for a *Prohibited Substance* that is not a *Specified Substance*, and a review in accordance with Article 7.1.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE or departure from the *International Standard for Testing* or the *International Standard for Laboratories* that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*, UIM shall *Provisionally Suspend* the *Driver* pending the hearing panel's determination of whether he/she has committed an anti-doping rule violation.

7.6.2 In any case not covered by Article 7.6.1 where UIM decides to take the matter forward as an apparent anti-doping rule violation in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Article 7, the UIM Executive, after consultation with the UIM Independent Review Panel, may Provisionally Suspend the *Driver* pending the hearing panel's determination of whether he/she has committed an anti-doping rule violation.

7.6.3 Where a *Provisional Suspension* is imposed, whether pursuant to Article 7.6.1 or Article 7.6.2, the *Driver* shall be given either (a) an opportunity for a *Provisional Hearing* before imposition of the *Provisional Suspension*; or (b) an opportunity for an expedited hearing in accordance with Article 8 (Right to a Fair Hearing) on a timely basis after imposition of a *Provisional Suspension*. *National Associations* shall impose *Provisional Suspensions* in accordance with the principles set forth in this Article 7.6.

7.6.4 If a *Provisional Suspension* is imposed based on an *Adverse Analytical Finding* in respect of an *A Sample*, and any subsequent analysis of the *B Sample* analysis does not confirm the *A Sample* analysis, then the *Driver* shall not be subject to any further *Provisional Suspension* on account of a violation of Article 2.1 of the *Code* (Presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers*). In circumstances where the *Driver* or the *Driver's* team as may be provided in the rules of the UIM has been removed from a *Competition* based on a violation of Article 2.1 and the subsequent *B Sample* analysis does not confirm the *A Sample* finding, UIM, without otherwise affecting the *Competition*, it is still possible for the *Driver* or team to be reinserted, the *Driver* or team may continue to take part in the *Competition*.

[Comment to Article 7.6: Before a Provisional Suspension can be unilaterally imposed by an Anti-Doping Organization, the internal review specified in the Code must first be completed. In addition, a Signatory imposing a Provisional Suspension is required to give the Driver an opportunity for a Provisional Hearing either before or promptly after the imposition of the Provisional Suspension, or an expedited final hearing under Article 8 promptly after imposition of the Provisional Suspension. The Driver has a right to appeal under Article 13.2.]

In the rare circumstance where the B Sample analysis does not confirm the A Sample finding, the Driver who had been provisionally suspended will be allowed, where circumstances permit, to participate in subsequent Competitions during the Event..

Drivers shall receive credit for a Provisional Suspension against any period of Ineligibility which is ultimately imposed as provided in Article 10.9.3.]

7.7 Retirement from Sport

If a Driver or other *Person* retires while a results management process is underway, UIM retains jurisdiction to complete its results management process. If a Driver or other *Person* retires before any results management process has begun and UIM would have had results management jurisdiction over the *Driver* or other *Person* at the time the *Driver* or other *Person* committed an anti-doping rule violation, UIM has jurisdiction to conduct results management.

[Comment to Article 7.7: Conduct by a Driver or other Person before the Driver or other Person was subject to the jurisdiction of any Anti-Doping Organization would not constitute an anti-doping rule violation but could be a legitimate basis for denying the Driver or other Person membership in a sports organization.]

ARTICLE 8 RIGHT TO A FAIR HEARING

[NOTE: Two alternative models are presented. In the first alternative model, all initial hearings take place at the *National Association* level with a possibility for the UIM to appeal to the Court of Arbitration for Sport. In the second alternative model, hearing results from UIM tests and tests in other *International Events* are heard by an UIM Doping Panel and the initial hearing in domestic tests is at the *National Association* level.]

[Alternative 1:

8.1 When it appears, following the results management process described in Article 7, that these Anti-Doping Rules have been violated, the *Driver* or other *Person* involved shall be brought before a disciplinary panel of the *Driver* or other *Person's National Association* for a hearing to adjudicate whether a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules occurred and if so what *Consequences* should be imposed. The hearing process shall respect the following principles:

- a timely hearing;
- fair and impartial hearing panel;
- the right to be represented by counsel at the *Person's* own expense;
- the right to be informed in a fair and timely manner of the asserted anti-doping rule violation;
- the right to respond to the asserted anti-doping rule violation and resulting *Consequences*;
- the right of each party to present evidence, including the right to call and question witnesses (subject to the hearing panel's discretion to accept testimony by telephone or written submission);
- the *Person's* right to an interpreter at the hearing, with the hearing panel to determine the identity, and responsibility for the cost of the interpreter; and
- a timely, written, reasoned decision, specifically including an explanation of the reason(s) for any period of *Ineligibility*.

8.2 Hearings pursuant to this Article shall be completed expeditiously and in all cases within three months of the completion of the Results Management process described in Article 7. Hearings held in connection with *Events* may be conducted by an expedited process. If the completion of the hearing is delayed beyond three months, UIM may elect, if the *Driver* is an *International Level Driver*, to bring the case directly to a single arbitrator from the Court of Arbitration for Sport. The case before the Court of

Arbitration for Sport shall be handled in accordance with the Court of Arbitration for Sport appeal procedure without reference to any time limit for appeal. If the completion of the hearing is delayed beyond three months, and the *Driver* is not an *International Level Driver*, UIM may elect to bring the case directly to the national level appellate body referenced in Article 13.2.2. In either case, the hearing shall proceed at the responsibility of and the expense of the *National Association*. In either case the appeal from such decision shall be to the Court of Arbitration for Sport.

[Comment to Article 8.2: For example, a hearing could be expedited on the eve of a major Event where the resolution of the anti-doping rule violation is necessary to determine the Driver's eligibility to participate in the Event or during an Event where the resolution of the case will affect the validity of the Driver's results or continued participation in the Event.]

8.3 *National Associations* shall keep UIM fully apprised as to the status of pending cases and the results of all hearings.

8.4 UIM shall have the right to attend hearings as an observer.

8.5 The *Driver* or other *Person* may forego a hearing by acknowledging the violation of these Anti-Doping Rules and accepting *Consequences* consistent with Articles 9 and 10 as proposed by the *National Association*. The right to a hearing may be waived either expressly or by the *Driver's* or other *Person's* failure to challenge the *National Association's* assertion that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred within 28 days. Where no hearing occurs, the *National Association* shall submit to the persons described in Article 13.2.3 a reasoned decision explaining the action taken.

8.6 Decisions by *National Associations*, whether as the result of a hearing or the *Driver* or other *Person's* acceptance of *Consequences*, may be appealed as provided in Article 13.

8.7 Hearing decisions by the *National Association* shall not be subject to further administrative review at the national level except as provided in Article 13 or as required by applicable national law.]

[Alternative 2:

8.1 Hearings arising out of UIM Testing or Tests at International Events

8.1.1 The UIM Executive shall appoint a standing panel consisting of a Chair and four other experts with experience in anti-doping ("UIM Doping Hearing Panel"). The Chair shall be a lawyer. Each panel member shall be otherwise independent of UIM. Each panel membershall serve a term of four years.

8.1.2 When it appears, following the Results Management process described in Article 7, that these Anti-Doping Rules have been violated in connection with UIM *Testing* or *Testing* at an *International Event* then the case shall be assigned to the UIM Doping Hearing Panel for adjudication.

8.1.3 The Chair of the UIM Doping Hearing Panel shall appoint three members from the panel (which may include the Chair) to hear each case. At least one appointed member shall be a lawyer. The appointed members shall have had no prior involvement with the case and shall not have the same nationality as the *Driver* or other *Person* alleged to have violated these Anti-Doping Rules.

8.1.4 Hearings pursuant to this Article shall be completed expeditiously following the completion of the results management process described in Article 7. Hearings held in connection with *Events* may be conducted on an expedited basis.

8.1.5 The *National Association* of the *Driver* or other *Person* alleged to have violated these Anti-Doping Rules may attend the hearing as an observer.

8.1.6 UIM shall keep WADA fully apprised as to the status of pending cases and the result of all hearings.

8.1.7 A *Driver* or other *Person* may forego a hearing by acknowledging the Anti-Doping Rule violation and accepting *Consequences* consistent with Articles 9 and 10 as proposed by UIM. The right to a hearing may be waived either expressly or by the *Driver's* or other *Person's* failure to challenge UIM's assertion that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred within 28 days. Where no hearing occurs, UIM shall submit to the persons described in Article 13.2.3 a reasoned decision explaining the action taken.

8.1.8 Decisions of the UIM Doping Hearing Panel may be appealed to Court of Arbitration for Sport as provided in Article 13.

8.2 Hearings Arising Out of National Testing

8.2.1 When it appears, following the Results Management process described in Article 7, that these Anti-Doping Rules have been violated in connection with *Testing* other than in connection with UIM *Testing* or *Testing* at an *International Event*, the *Driver* or other *Person* involved shall be brought before a disciplinary panel of the *Driver* or other *Person's National Association* for a hearing to adjudicate whether a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules occurred and if so what *Consequences* should be imposed.

8.2.2 Hearings pursuant to this Article 8.2 shall be completed expeditiously and in all cases within three months of the completion of the Results Management process described in Article 7. Hearings held in connection with *Events* may be conducted by an expedited process. If the completion of the hearing is delayed beyond three months, UIM may elect to bring the case directly before the UIM Doping Hearing Panel at the responsibility and at the expense of the *National Association*.

8.2.3 *National Associations* shall keep UIM and WADA fully apprised as to the status of pending cases and the results of all hearings.

8.2.4 UIM and WADA shall have the right to attend hearings as an observer.

8.2.5 The *Driver* or other *Person* may forego a hearing by acknowledging the violation of these Anti-Doping Rules and accepting *Consequences* consistent with Articles 9 and 10 as proposed by the *National Association*. The right to a hearing may be waived either expressly or by the *Driver's* or other *Person's* failure to challenge the *National Association's* assertion that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred within 28 days. Where no hearing occurs, the *National Association* shall submit to the persons described in Article 13.2.3 a reasoned decision explaining the action taken.

8.2.6 Decisions by *National Associations*, whether as the result of a hearing or the *Driver* or other *Person's* acceptance of *Consequences*, may be appealed as provided in Article 13.

8.2.7 Hearing decisions by the *National Association* shall not be subject to further administrative review at the national level except as provided in Article 13 or required by applicable national law.

8.3 Principles for a Fair Hearing All hearings pursuant to either Article 8.1 or 8.2 shall respect the following principles:

- a timely hearing;
- fair and impartial hearing panel;
- the right to be represented by counsel at the *Person's* own expense;
- the right to be informed in a fair and timely manner of the asserted anti-doping rule violation;
- the right to respond to the asserted anti-doping rule violation and resulting *Consequences*;

- the right of each party to present evidence, including the right to call and question witnesses (subject to the hearing panel's discretion to accept testimony by telephone or written submission);
- the *Person's* right to an interpreter at the hearing, with the hearing panel to determine the identity, and responsibility for the cost of the interpreter; and
- a timely, written, reasoned decision, specifically including an explanation of the reason(s) for any period of *Ineligibility*.]

ARTICLE 9 AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS

A violation of these Anti-Doping Rules in *Individual Sports* in connection with an *In-Competition* test automatically leads to *Disqualification* of the result obtained in that *Competition* with all resulting consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.

[Comment to Article 9: When a Driver wins a gold medal with a Prohibited Substance in his or her system, that is unfair to the other Drivers in that Competition regardless of whether the gold medalist was at fault in any way. Only a "clean" Driver should be allowed to benefit from his or her competitive results.

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 UIM.]

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 lead to *Disqualification* of all of the *Driver'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 to Article 10.1: Whereas Article 9 (Automatic Disqualification of Individual Results) disqualifies the result in a single Competition in which the Driver tested positive, this Article may lead to Disqualification of all results in all races during the Event. Factors to be included in considering whether to disqualify other results in an Event might include, for example, the severity of the Driver's anti-

doping rule violation and whether the Driver tested negative in the other Competitions.]

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

10.2 *Ineligibility for Presence, Use or Attempted Use, or Possession of Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods*

The period of *Ineligibility* imposed for a violation of Article 2.1 (Presence of *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers*), Article 2.2 (*Use or Attempted Use of Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method*) or Article 2.6 (*Possession of Prohibited Substances and Methods*) shall be as follows, unless the conditions for eliminating or reducing the period of *Ineligibility*, as provided in Articles 10.4 and 10.5, or the conditions for increasing the period of *Ineligibility*, as provided in Article 10.6, are met:

First violation: Two (2) years' *Ineligibility*.

[Comment to Article 10.2: Harmonization of sanctions has been one of the most discussed and debated areas of anti-doping. Harmonization means that the same rules and criteria are applied to assess the unique facts of each case. Arguments against requiring harmonization of sanctions are based on differences between sports including, for example, the following: in some sports the Drivers are professionals making a sizable income from the sport and in others the Drivers are true amateurs; in those sports where a Driver's career is short (e.g., artistic gymnastics) a two year disqualification has a much more significant effect on the Driver than in sports where careers are traditionally much longer (e.g., equestrian and shooting); in Individual Sports, the Driver 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 Drivers 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 IFs and National Anti-Doping Organizations.]

10.3 *Ineligibility for Other Anti-Doping Rule Violations*

The period of *Ineligibility* for violations of these Anti-Doping Rules other than as provided in Article 10.2 shall be as follows:

10.3.1 For violations of Article 2.3 (refusing or failing to submit to *Sample* collection) or Article 2.5 (*Tampering with Doping Control*), the *Ineligibility* period shall be two (2) years unless the conditions provided in Article 10.5, or the conditions provided in Article 10.6, are met.

10.3.2 For violations of Article 2.7 (*Trafficking*) or Article 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* unless the conditions provided in Article 10.5 are met. An anti-doping rule violation involving a *Minor* shall be considered a particularly serious violation, and, if committed by *Driver Support Personnel* for violations other than specified Substances shall result in lifetime *Ineligibility* for such *Driver Support Personnel*. In addition, significant violations of such Articles which also violate non-sporting laws and regulations, shall be reported to the competent administrative, professional or judicial authorities.

[Comment to Article 10.3.2: Those who are involved in doping Drivers or covering up doping should be subject to sanctions which are more severe than the Drivers who test positive. Since the authority of sport organizations is generally limited to Ineligibility for credentials, membership and other sport benefits, reporting Driver Support Personnel to competent authorities is an important step in the deterrence of doping.]

10.3.3 For violations of Article 2.4 (Filing Failures and/ or Missed Tests), the period of *Ineligibility* shall be at a minimum one (1) year and at a maximum two (2) years based on the *Driver's* degree of fault.

[Comment to Article 10.3.3: The sanction under Article 10.3.3 shall be two years where all three filing failures or missed tests are inexcusable. Otherwise, the sanction shall be assessed in the range of two years to one year, based on the circumstances of the case.]

10.4 Elimination or Reduction of the Period of *Ineligibility* for specified Substances under specific Circumstances

Where a Driver or other *Person* can establish how a specified Substance entered his or her body or came into his or her possession and that such specified Substance was not intended to enhance the *Driver's* sport performance or mask the use of a performance-enhancing substance, the period of *Ineligibility* found in Article 10.2 shall be replaced with the following:

First violation: At a minimum, a reprimand and no period of *Ineligibility* from future *Events*, and at a maximum, two (2) years of *Ineligibility*.

To justify any elimination or reduction, the *Driver* or other *Person* must produce corroborating evidence in addition to his or her word which establishes to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel the absence of an intent to enhance sport performance or mask the use of a performance enhancing substance. The *Driver* or other *Person's* degree of fault shall be the criterion considered in assessing any reduction of the period of *Ineligibility*.

[Comment to Article 10.4: specified Substances as now defined in Article 4.2.2 are not necessarily less serious agents for purposes of sports doping than other Prohibited Substances (for example, a stimulant that is listed as a specified Substance could be very effective to a Driver in competition); for that reason, a Driver who does not meet the criteria under this Article would receive a two-year period of Ineligibility and could receive up to a four-year period of Ineligibility under Article 10.6. However, there is a greater likelihood that specified Substances, as opposed to other Prohibited Substances, could be susceptible to a credible, non-doping explanation.]

This Article applies only in those cases where the hearing panel is comfortably satisfied by the objective circumstances of the case that the Driver in taking a Prohibited Substance did not intend to enhance his or her sport performance. Examples of the type of objective circumstances which in combination might lead a hearing panel to be comfortably satisfied of no performance-enhancing intent would include: the fact that the nature of the specified Substance or the timing of its ingestion would not have been beneficial to the Driver; the Driver's open Use or disclosure of his or her Use of the specified Substance; and a contemporaneous medical records file substantiating the non-sport-related prescription for the specified Substance. Generally, the greater the potential performance-enhancing benefit, the higher the burden on the Driver to prove lack of an intent to enhance sport performance.

While the absence of intent to enhance sport performance must be established to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel, the Driver may establish how the specified Substance entered the body by a balance of probability.

In assessing the Driver's or other Person's degree of fault, the circumstances considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Driver's or other Person's departure from the expected standard of behavior. Thus, for example, the fact that a Driver would lose the opportunity to earn large sums of money during a period of Ineligibility or the fact that the Driver only has a short time left in his or her career or the timing of the sporting calendar would not be relevant factors to be considered in reducing the period of Ineligibility under this Article. It is anticipated that the period of Ineligibility will be eliminated entirely in only the most exceptional cases.]

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

10.5.1 *No Fault or Negligence*

If a Driver establishes in an individual case that he or she bears *No Fault or Negligence*, the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility* shall be eliminated. When a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Markers* or *Metabolites* is detected in a *Driver's Sample* in violation of Article 2.1 (presence of *Prohibited Substance*), the *Driver* 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 Article 10.7.

10.5.2 *No Significant Fault or Negligence*

If a Driver or other *Person* establishes in an individual case 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 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 a *Driver's Sample* in violation of Article 2.1 (Presence of *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers*), the *Driver* must also establish how the *Prohibited Substance* entered his or her system in order to have the period of *Ineligibility* reduced.

[Comment to Articles 10.5.1 and 10.5.2: UIM's Anti-Doping Rules provide for the possible reduction or elimination of the period of Ineligibility in the unique circumstance where the Driver 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 Driver 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 10.5.2 may be applied to any anti-doping violation even though it will be especially difficult to meet the criteria for a reduction for those anti-doping rule violations where knowledge is an element of the violation.]

Articles 10.5.1 and 10.5.2 are 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 10.5.1, an example where No Fault or Negligence would result in the total elimination of a sanction is where a Driver 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 (Drivers 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 Driver's personal physician or trainer without disclosure to the Driver (Drivers 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 Driver's food or drink by a spouse, coach or other person within the Driver's circle of associates (Drivers 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 Driver 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 Driver exercised care in not taking other nutritional supplements.)

For purposes of assessing the Driver or other Person's fault under Articles 10.5.1 and 10.5.2, the evidence considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Driver or other Person's departure from the expected standard of behavior. Thus, for example the fact that a Driver would lose the opportunity to earn large sums of money during a period of Ineligibility or the fact that the Driver only has a short time left in his or her career or the timing of the sporting calendar would not be relevant factors to be considered in reducing the period of Ineligibility under this Article.

While minors are not given special treatment per se in determining the applicable sanction, certainly youth and lack of experience are relevant factors to be assessed in determining the Driver or other Person's fault under Article 10.5.2, as well as Articles 10.4 and 10.5.1.

Article 10.5.2 should not be applied in cases where Articles 10.3.3 or 10.4 apply, as those Articles already take into consideration the Driver or other Person's degree of fault for purposes of establishing the applicable period of Ineligibility.]

10.5.3 *Substantial Assistance in Discovering or Establishing Anti-Doping Rule Violations*

The UIM Doping Hearing Panel may, prior to a final appellate decision under Article 13 or the expiration of the time to appeal, suspend a part of the period of *Ineligibility* imposed in an individual case where the

Driver or other *Person* has provided *Substantial Assistance* to an *Anti-Doping Organization*, criminal authority or professional disciplinary body which results in the *Anti-Doping Organization* discovering or establishing an anti-doping rule violation by another *Person* or which results in a criminal or disciplinary body discovering or establishing a criminal offense or the breach of professional rules by another *Person*. After a final appellate decision under Article 13 or the expiration of time to appeal, UIM may only suspend a part of the applicable period of *Ineligibility* with the approval of WADA. The extent to which the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility* may be suspended shall be based on the seriousness of the anti-doping rule violation committed by the *Driver* or other *Person* and the significance of the *Substantial Assistance* provided by the *Driver* or other *Person* to the effort to eliminate doping in sport. No more than three-quarters of the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility* may be suspended. If the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility* is a lifetime, the non-suspended period under this Article must be no less than 8 years. If UIM suspends any part of the period of *Ineligibility* under this Article, it shall promptly provide a written justification for its decision to each *Anti-Doping Organization* having a right to appeal the decision. If UIM subsequently reinstates any part of the suspended period of *Ineligibility* because the *Driver* or other *Person* has failed to provide the *Substantial Assistance* which was anticipated, the *Driver* or other *Person* may appeal the reinstatement pursuant to Article 13.2.

[Comment to Article 10.5.3: The cooperation of Driver, Driver Support Personnel and other Persons who acknowledge their mistakes and are willing to bring other anti-doping rule violations to light is important to clean sport.]

Factors to be considered in assessing the importance of the Substantial Assistance would include, for example, the number of individuals implicated, the status of those individuals in the sport, whether a scheme involving Trafficking under Article 2.7 or administration under Article 2.8 is involved and whether the violation involved a substance or method which is not readily detectable in Testing. The maximum suspension of the Ineligibility period shall only be applied in very exceptional cases. An additional factor to be considered in connection with the seriousness of the anti-doping rule violation is any performance-enhancing benefit which the Person providing Substantial Assistance may be likely to still enjoy. As a general matter, the earlier in the results management process the Substantial Assistance is provided, the greater the percentage of the period of Ineligibility may be suspended.

If the Driver or other Person who is asserted to have committed an anti-doping rule violation claims entitlement to a suspended period of Ineligibility under this Article in connection with the Driver or other Person's waiver of a hearing under Article 8.3 (Waiver of Hearing), UIM shall determine whether a suspension of a portion of the period of Ineligibility is appropriate under this Article. If the Driver or other Person

claims entitlement to a suspended period of Ineligibility before the conclusion of a hearing under Article 8 on the anti-doping rule violation, the hearing panel shall determine whether a suspension of a portion of the period of Ineligibility is appropriate under this Article at the same time the hearing panel decides whether the Driver or other Person has committed an anti-doping rule violation. If a portion of the period of Ineligibility is suspended, the decision shall explain the basis for concluding the information provided was credible and was important to discovering or proving the anti-doping rule violation or other offense. If the Driver or other Person claims entitlement to a suspended period of Ineligibility after a final decision finding an anti-doping rule violation has been rendered and is not subject to appeal under Article 13, but the Driver or other Person is still serving the period of Ineligibility, the Driver or other Person may apply to UIM to consider a suspension in the period of Ineligibility under this Article. Any such suspension of the period of Ineligibility shall require the approval of WADA. If any condition upon which the suspension of a period of Ineligibility is based is not fulfilled, UIM shall reinstate the period of Ineligibility which would otherwise be applicable. Decisions rendered by UIM under this Article may be appealed pursuant Article 13.2.

This is the only circumstance under UIM's Anti-Doping Rules where the suspension of an otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility is authorized.]

10.5.4 Admission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation in the Absence of Other Evidence

Where a Driver or other *Person* voluntarily admits the commission of an anti-doping rule violation before having received notice of a *Sample* collection which could establish an anti-doping rule violation (or, in the case of an anti-doping rule violation other than Article 2.1, before receiving first notice of the admitted violation pursuant to Article 7) and that admission is the only reliable evidence of the violation at the time of admission, then the period of *Ineligibility* may be reduced, but not below one-half of the period of *Ineligibility* otherwise applicable.

[Comment to Article 10.5.4: This Article is intended to apply when a Driver or other Person comes forward and admits to an anti-doping rule violation in circumstances where no Anti-Doping Organization is aware that an anti-doping rule violation might have been committed. It is not intended to apply to circumstances where the admission occurs after the Driver or other Person knows he or she is about to be caught.]

10.5.5 Where a Driver or Other Person Establishes Entitlement to Reduction in Sanction under More than One Provision of this Article

Before applying any reductions under Articles 10.5.2, 10.5.3 or 10.5.4, the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility* shall be determined in

accordance with Articles 10.2, 10.3, 10.4 and 10.6. If the *Driver* or other *Person* establishes entitlement to a reduction or suspension of the period of *Ineligibility* under two or more of Articles 10.5.2, 10.5.3 or 10.5.4, then the period of *Ineligibility* may be reduced or suspended, but not below one-quarter of the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility*.

[Comment to Article 10.5.5: The appropriate sanction is determined in a sequence of four steps. First, the hearing panel determines which of the basic sanctions (Article 10.2, Article 10.3, Article 10.4 or Article 10.6) applies to the particular anti-doping rule violation. In a second step, the hearing panel establishes whether there is a basis for elimination or reduction of the sanction (Articles 10.5.1 through 10.5.4). Note, however, not all grounds for elimination or reduction may be combined with the provisions on basic sanctions. For example, Article 10.5.2 does not apply in cases involving Articles 10.3.3 or 10.4, since the hearing panel, under Articles 10.3.3 and 10.4, will already have determined the period of Ineligibility based on the Driver or other Person's degree of fault. In a third step, the hearing panel determines under Article 10.5.5 whether the Driver or other Person is entitled to a reduction under more than one provision of Article 10.5. Finally, the hearing panel decides on the commencement of the period of Ineligibility under Article 10.9. The following four examples demonstrate the proper sequence of analysis:]

Example 1.

Facts: An Adverse Analytical Finding involves the presence of an anabolic steroid; the Driver promptly admits the anti-doping rule violation as alleged; the Driver establishes No significant Fault (Article 10.5.2); and the Driver provides important Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3).

Application of Article 10:

1. The basic sanction would be two years under Article 10.2. (Aggravating circumstances (Article 10.6) would not be considered because the Driver promptly admitted the violation. Article 10.4 would not apply because a steroid is not a specified Substance.)
2. Based on No significant Fault alone, the sanction could be reduced up to one-half of the two years. Based on Substantial Assistance alone, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the two years.
3. Under Article 10.5.5, in considering the possible reduction for No significant Fault and Substantial Assistance together, the most the sanction could be reduced is up to three-quarters of the two years. Thus, the minimum sanction would be a six-month period of Ineligibility.
4. Under Article 10.9.2, because the Driver promptly admitted the anti-doping rule violation, the period of Ineligibility could start as early as the date of Sample

collection, but in any event the Driver would have to serve at least one-half of the Ineligibility period (minimum three months) after the date of the hearing decision.

Example 2.

Facts: An Adverse Analytical Finding involves the presence of an anabolic steroid; aggravating circumstances exist and the Driver is unable to establish that he did not knowingly commit the anti-doping rule violation; the Driver does not promptly admit the anti-doping rule violation as alleged; but the Driver does provide important Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3).

Application of Article 10:

1. The basic sanction would be between two and four years Ineligibility as provided in Article 10.6.
2. Based on Substantial Assistance, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the maximum four years.
3. Article 10.5.5 does not apply.
4. Under Article 10.9.2, the period of Ineligibility would start on the date of the hearing decision.

Example 3.

Facts: An Adverse Analytical Finding involves the presence of a specified Substance; the Driver establishes how the specified Substance entered his body and that he had no intent to enhance his sport performance; the Driver establishes that he had very little fault; and the Driver provides important Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3).

Application of Article 10:

1. Because the Adverse Analytical Finding involved a specified Substance and the Driver has satisfied the other conditions of Article 10.4, the basic sanction would fall in the range between a reprimand and two years Ineligibility. The hearing panel would assess the Driver's fault in imposing a sanction within that range. (Assume for illustration in this example that the panel would otherwise impose a period of Ineligibility of eight months.)
2. Based on Substantial Assistance, the sanction could be reduced up to three-quarters of the eight months. (No less than two months.) [No significant Fault (Article 10.2) would not be applicable because the Driver's degree of fault was already taken into consideration in establishing the eight-month period of Ineligibility in step 1.]

3. Article 10.5.5 does not apply.

4. Under Article 9.2, because the Driver promptly admitted the anti-doping rule violation, the period of Ineligibility could start as early as the date of Sample collection, but in any event, the Driver would have to serve at least half of the Ineligibility period after the date of the hearing decision. (Minimum one month.)

Example 4.

Facts: A Driver who has never had an Adverse Analytical Finding or been confronted with an anti-doping rule violation spontaneously admits that he intentionally used multiple Prohibited Substances to enhance his performance. The Driver also provides important Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3).

Application of Article 10:

1. While the intentional Use of multiple Prohibited Substances to enhance performance would normally warrant consideration of aggravating circumstances (Article 10.6), the Driver's spontaneous admission means that Article 10.6 would not apply. The fact that the Driver's Use of Prohibited Substances was intended to enhance performance would also eliminate the application of Article 10.4 regardless of whether the Prohibited Substances Used were specified Substances. Thus, Article 10.2 would be applicable and the basic period of Ineligibility imposed would be two years.

2. Based on the Driver's spontaneous admissions (Article 10.5.4) alone, the period of Ineligibility could be reduced up to one-half of the two years. Based on the Driver's Substantial Assistance (Article 10.5.3) alone, the period of Ineligibility could be reduced up to three-quarters of the two years.

3. Under Article 10.5.5, in considering the spontaneous admission and Substantial Assistance together, the most the sanction could be reduced would be up to three-quarters of the two years. (The minimum period of Ineligibility would be six months.)

4. UIM Article 10.5.4 was considered by the hearing panel in arriving at the minimum six month period of Ineligibility at step 3, the period of Ineligibility would start on the date the hearing panel imposed the sanction. If, however, the hearing panel did not consider the application of Article 10.5.4 in reducing the period of Ineligibility in step 3, then under Article 10.9.2, the commencement of the period of Ineligibility could be started as early as the date the anti-doping rule violation was committed, provided that at least half of that period (minimum of three months) would have to be served after the date of the hearing decision.]

10.6 Aggravating Circumstances Which May Increase the Period of Ineligibility

If UIM establishes in an individual case involving an anti-doping rule violation other than violations under Article 2.7 (Trafficking) and 2.8 (Administration) that aggravating circumstances are present which justify the imposition of a period of *Ineligibility* greater than the standard sanction, then the period of *Ineligibility* otherwise applicable shall be increased up to a maximum of four years unless the *Driver* or other *Person* can prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that he did not knowingly violate the anti-doping rule.

A *Driver* or other *Person* can avoid the application of this Article by admitting the anti-doping rule violation as asserted promptly after being confronted with the anti-doping rule violation by UIM.

[Comment to Article 10.6: Examples of aggravating circumstances which may justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction are: the Driver or other Person committed the anti-doping rule violation as part of a doping plan or scheme, either individually or involving a conspiracy or common enterprise to commit anti-doping rule violations; the Driver or other Person used or possessed multiple Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods or used or possessed a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method on multiple occasions; a normal individual would be likely to enjoy the performance-enhancing effects of the anti-doping rule violation(s) beyond the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility; the Driver or Person engaged in deceptive or obstructing conduct to avoid the detection or adjudication of an anti-doping rule violation.]

For the avoidance of doubt, the examples of aggravating circumstances described in this Comment to Article 10.6 are not exclusive and other aggravating factors may also justify the imposition of a longer period of Ineligibility. Violations under Article 2.7 (Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking) and 2.8 (Administration or Attempted Administration) are not included in the application of Article 10.6 because the sanctions for these violations (from four years to lifetime Ineligibility) already build in sufficient discretion to allow consideration of any aggravating circumstance.]

10.7 Multiple Violations

10.7.1 Second Anti-Doping Rule Violation

For a *Driver's* or other *Person's* first anti-doping rule violation, the period of *Ineligibility* is set forth in Articles 10.2 and 10.3 (subject to elimination, reduction or suspension under Articles 10.4 or 10.5, or to an increase under Article 10.6). For a second anti-doping rule violation the period of *Ineligibility* shall be within the range set forth in the table below.

Second Violation	RS	FFMT	NSF	St	AS	TRA
First Violation						
RS	1-4	2-4	2-4	4-6	8-10	10-life
FFMT	1-4	4-8	4-8	6-8	10-life	life
NSF	1-4	4-8	4-8	6-8	10-life	life
St	2-4	6-8	6-8	8-life	life	life
AS	4-5	10-life	10-life	life	life	life
TRA	8-life	life	Life	life	life	life

Definitions for purposes of the second anti-doping rule violation table:

RS (Reduced sanction for specified Substance under Article 10.4): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by a reduced sanction under Article 10.4 because it involved a specified Substance and the other conditions under Article 10.4 were met.

FFMT (Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned under Article 10.3.3 (Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests).

NSF (Reduced sanction for *No significant Fault or Negligence*): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by a reduced sanction under Article 10.5.2 because *No significant Fault or Negligence* under Article 10.5.2 was proved by the *Driver*.

St (Standard sanction under Articles 10.2 or 10.3.1): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by the standard sanction of two years under Article 10.2 or 10.3.1.

AS (Aggravated sanction): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by an aggravated sanction under Article 10.6 because the *Anti-Doping Organization* established the conditions set forth under Article 10.6.

TRA (*Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking* and administration or *Attempted* administration): The anti-doping rule violation was or should be sanctioned by a sanction under Article 10.3.2.

[Comment to Article 10.7.1: The table is applied by locating the Driver or other Person's first anti-doping rule violation in the left-hand column and then moving across the table to the right to the column representing the second violation. By way of example, assume a Driver receives the standard period of Ineligibility for a first violation under Article 10.2 and then commits a second violation for which he receives a reduced sanction for a specified Substance under Article 10.4. The table

is used to determine the period of Ineligibility for the second violation. The table is applied to this example by starting in the left-hand column and going down to the fourth row which is "St" for standard sanction, then moving across the table to the first column which is "RS" for reduced sanction for a specified Substance, thus resulting in a 2-4 year range for the period of Ineligibility for the second violation. The Driver or other Person's degree of fault shall be the criterion considered in assessing a period of Ineligibility within the applicable range.]

[Comment to Article 10.7.1 RS Definition: See Article 25.4 with respect to application of Article 10.7.1 to pre-Code anti-doping rule violations.]

10.7.2 Application of Articles 10.5.3 and 10.5.4 to Second Anti-Doping Rule Violation

Where a Driver or other *Person* who commits a second anti-doping rule violation establishes entitlement to suspension or reduction of a portion of the period of *Ineligibility* under Article 10.5.3 or Article 10.5.4, the hearing panel shall first determine the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility* within the range established in the table in Article 10.7.1, and then apply the appropriate suspension or reduction of the period of *Ineligibility*. The remaining period of *Ineligibility*, after applying any suspension or reduction under Articles 10.5.3 and 10.5.4, must be at least one-fourth of the otherwise applicable period of *Ineligibility*.

10.7.3 Third Anti-Doping Rule Violation

A third anti-doping rule violation will always result in a lifetime period of *Ineligibility*, except if the third violation fulfills the condition for elimination or reduction of the period of *Ineligibility* under Article 10.4 or involves a violation of Article 2.4 (Filing Failures and/or and Missed Tests). In these particular cases, the period of *Ineligibility* shall be from eight (8) years to lifetime ban.

10.7.4 Additional Rules for Certain Potential Multiple Violations

- For purposes of imposing sanctions under Article 10.7, an anti-doping rule violation will only be considered a second violation if the UIM (or its *National Association*) can establish that the *Driver* or other *Person* committed the second anti-doping rule violation after the *Driver* or other *Person* received notice pursuant to Article 7 (Results Management), or after UIM (or its *National Association*) made reasonable efforts to give notice, of the first anti-doping rule violation; If the UIM (or its *National Association*) cannot establish this, the

violations shall be considered together as one single first violation, and the sanction imposed shall be based on the violation that carries the more severe sanction; however, the occurrence of multiple violations may be considered as a factor in determining Aggravating Circumstances (Article 10.6).

- If, after the resolution of a first anti-doping rule violation, UIM discovers facts involving an anti-doping rule violation by the *Driver* or other *Person* which occurred prior to notification regarding the first violation, then UIM shall impose an additional sanction based on the sanction that could have been imposed if the two violations would have been adjudicated at the same time. Results in all *Competitions* dating back to the earlier anti-doping rule violation will be *disqualified* as provided in Article 10.8. To avoid the possibility of a finding of Aggravating Circumstances (Article 10.6) on account of the earlier-in-time but later-discovered violation, the *Driver* or other *Person* must voluntarily admit the earlier anti-doping rule violation on a timely basis after notice of the violation for which he or she is first charged. The same rule shall also apply when UIM discovers facts involving another prior violation after the resolution of a second anti-doping rule violation.

[Comment to Article 10.7.4: In a hypothetical situation, a Driver commits an anti-doping rule violation on January 1, 2008 which UIM does not discover until December 1, 2008. In the meantime, the Driver commits another anti-doping rule violation on March 1, 2008 and the Driver is notified of this violation by UIM on March 30, 2008 and a hearing panel rules on June 30, 2008 that the Driver committed the March 1, 2008 anti-doping rule violation. The later-discovered violation which occurred on January 1, 2008 will provide the basis for Aggravating Circumstances because the Driver did not voluntarily admit the violation in a timely basis after the Driver received notification of the later violation on March 30, 2008.]

10.7.5 Multiple Anti-Doping Rule Violations during an Eight-Year Period

For purposes of Article 10.7, each anti-doping rule violation must take place within the same eight (8) year period in order to be considered multiple violations.

10.8 Disqualification of Results in Competitions Subsequent to Sample Collection or Commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation

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 anti-doping rule 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.

10.8.1 As a condition of regaining eligibility after being found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation, the *Driver* must first repay all prize money forfeited under this Article.

10.8.2 Allocation of Forfeited Prize Money.

Forfeited prize money shall be allocated first to reimburse the collection expenses incurred by the *Anti-Doping Organization* in order to perform the necessary steps to collect the prize money back, then to reimburse the expenses incurred by the *Anti-Doping Organization* in order to conduct results management in the case, with the balance, if any, allocated in accordance with UIM's specific rules.

[Comment to Article 10.8.2: Nothing in UIM's Anti-Doping Rules precludes clean Drivers or other Persons who have been damaged by the actions of a Person who has committed an anti-doping rule violation from pursuing any right which they would otherwise have to seek damages from such Person.]

10.9 Commencement of *Ineligibility* Period

Except as provided below, 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.

10.9.1 Delays Not Attributable to the *Driver* or other *Person*

Where there have been substantial delays in the hearing process or other aspects of *Doping Control* not attributable to the *Driver* or other *Person*, the *UIM* or *Anti-Doping Organization* imposing the sanction may start the period of *Ineligibility* at an earlier date commencing as early as the date of *Sample* collection or the date on which another anti-doping rule violation last occurred.

10.9.2 Timely Admission

Where the *Driver* promptly (which, in all events, means before the *Driver* competes again) admits the anti-doping rule violation after being confronted with the anti-doping rule violation by UIM, the period of *Ineligibility* may start as early as the date of *Sample* collection or the date on which another anti-doping rule violation last occurred. In each case, however, where this Article is applied, the *Driver* or other *Person* shall serve at least one-half of the period of *Ineligibility* going forward from the date the *Driver* or other *Person* accepted the imposition of a sanction, the date of a hearing decision imposing a sanction, or the date the sanction is otherwise imposed.

[Comment to Article 10.9.2: This Article shall not apply where the period of Ineligibility already has been reduced under Article 10.5.4 (Admission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation in the Absence of Other Evidence).]

10.9.3 If a *Provisional Suspension* is imposed and respected by the *Driver*, then the *Driver* shall receive a credit for such period of *Provisional Suspension* against any period of *Ineligibility* which may ultimately be imposed.

10.9.4 If a *Driver* voluntarily accepts a *Provisional Suspension* in writing from UIM and thereafter refrains from competing, the *Driver* shall receive a credit for such period of voluntary *Provisional Suspension* against any period of *Ineligibility* which may ultimately be imposed. A copy of the *Driver's* voluntary acceptance of a *Provisional Suspension* shall be provided promptly to each party entitled to receive notice of a potential anti-doping rule violation under Article 14.1.

[Comment to Article 10.9.4: A Driver's voluntary acceptance of a Provisional Suspension is not an admission by the Driver and shall not be used in any way as to draw an adverse inference against the Driver.]

10.9.5 No credit against a period of *Ineligibility* shall be given for any time period before the effective date of the *Provisional Suspension* or voluntary *Provisional Suspension* regardless of whether the *Driver* elected not to compete or was suspended by his or her team.

[Comment to Article 10.9: The text of Article 10.9 has been revised to make clear that delays not attributable to the Driver, timely admission by the Driver and Provisional Suspension are the only justifications for starting the period of Ineligibility earlier than the date of the hearing decision. This amendment corrects inconsistent interpretation and application of the previous text.]

10.10 Status During *Ineligibility*

10.10.1 Prohibition against Participation during *Ineligibility*

No *Driver* or other *Person* who has been declared *Ineligible* may, during the period of *Ineligibility*, participate in any capacity in an *Event* or activity (other than authorized anti-doping education or rehabilitation programs) authorized or organized by UIM or any *National Association* or a club or other member organization of UIM or any *National Association*, or in *Competitions* authorized or organized by any professional league or any international or national level *Event* organization.

A Driver or other *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 sports subject to the jurisdictions of UIM and its *National Associations*, 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*.

A Driver or other *Person* subject to a period of *Ineligibility* shall remain subject to *Testing*.

[Comment to Article 10.10.1: For example, an ineligible Driver cannot participate in a training camp, exhibition or practice organized by his or her National Association or a club which is a member of that National Association. Further, an ineligible Driver may not compete in a non-Signatory professional league (e.g., the National Hockey League, the National Basketball Association, etc.), Events organized by a non-Signatory International Event organization or a non-Signatory national-level event organization without triggering the consequences set forth in Article 10.10.2. Sanctions in one sport will also be recognized by other sports (see Article 15).]

10.10.2 Violation of the Prohibition of Participation during *Ineligibility*

Where a Driver or other *Person* who has been declared *Ineligible* violates the prohibition against participation during *Ineligibility* described in Article 10.10.1, the results of such participation shall be *disqualified* and the period of *Ineligibility* which was originally imposed shall start over again as of the date of the violation. The new period of *Ineligibility* may be reduced under Article 10.5.2 if the *Driver* or other *Person* establishes he or she bears *No significant Fault or Negligence* for violating the prohibition against participation. The determination of whether a Driver or other *Person* has violated the prohibition against participation, and whether a reduction under Article 10.5.2 is appropriate, shall be made by UIM.

[Comment to Article 10.10.2: If a Driver or other Person is alleged to have violated the prohibition against participation during a period of Ineligibility, UIM shall determine whether the Driver violated the prohibition and, if so, whether the Driver or other Person has established grounds for a reduction in the restarted period of Ineligibility under Article 10.5.2. Decisions rendered by UIM under this Article may be appealed pursuant to Article 13.2.]

Where a Driver Support Personnel or other Person substantially assists a Driver in violating the prohibition against participation during Ineligibility, UIM may appropriately impose sanctions under its own disciplinary rules for such assistance.]

10.10.3 Withholding of Financial Support during *Ineligibility*

In addition, for any anti-doping rule violation not involving a reduced sanction for *specified Substances* as described in Article 10.4, some or all sport-related financial support or other sport-related benefits received by such *Person* will be withheld by UIM and its *National Associations*.

10.11 Reinstatement *Testing*

As a condition to regaining eligibility at the end of a specified period of *Ineligibility*, a *Driver* must, during any period of *Provisional Suspension* or *Ineligibility*, make him or herself available for *Out-of-Competition Testing* by UIM, the applicable *National Association*, and any other *Anti-Doping Organization* having *Testing* jurisdiction, and must comply with the whereabouts requirements of Article 11 of the *International Standard for Testing*. If a *Driver* subject to a period of *Ineligibility* retires from sport and is removed from *Out-of-Competition Testing* pools and later seeks reinstatement, the *Driver* shall not be eligible for reinstatement until the *Driver* has notified UIM and the applicable *National Association* and has been subject to *Out-of-Competition Testing* for a period of time equal to the [longer of (a) the period set forth in Article 5.6 and (b)] period of *Ineligibility* remaining as of the date the *Driver* had retired. During such remaining period of *Ineligibility*, a minimum of 2 tests must be conducted on the *Driver* with at least three months between each test. The *National Association* shall be responsible for conducting the necessary tests, but tests by any *Anti-Doping Organization* may be used to satisfy the requirement. The results of such tests shall be reported to UIM. In addition, immediately prior to the end of the period of *Ineligibility*, a *Driver* must undergo *Testing* by UIM for the *Prohibited Substances* and *Methods* that are prohibited in *Out-of-Competition Testing*. Once the period of a *Driver's Ineligibility* has expired, and the *Driver* has fulfilled the conditions of reinstatement, then the *Driver* will become automatically re-eligible and no application by the *Driver* or by the *Driver's National Association* will then be necessary.

[10. 12 Imposition of Financial Sanctions

Anti-Doping Organizations may, in their own rules, provide for financial sanctions on account of anti-doping rule violations. However, no financial sanction may be considered a basis for reducing the period of *Ineligibility* or other sanction which would otherwise be applicable under the *Code*.]

ARTICLE 11 *Intentionally left blank*

ARTICLE 12 **SANCTIONS AND COSTS ASSESSED AGAINST NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS**

12.1 The UIM has the authority to withhold some or all funding or other non financial support to *National Associations* that are not in compliance with these Anti-Doping Rules.

[12.2 *National Associations* shall be obligated to reimburse UIM for all costs (including but not limited to laboratory fees, hearing expenses and travel) related to a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules committed by a Driver or other *Person* affiliated with that *National Association*.]

12.3 UIM may elect to take additional disciplinary action against National Associations with respect to recognition, the eligibility of its officials and Drivers to participate in International Events and fines based on the following:

12.3.1 Four or more violations of these Anti-Doping Rules (other than violations involving Articles 2.4 and 10.3) are committed by *Drivers* or other *Persons* affiliated with a *National Association* within a 12-month period in testing conducted by UIM or Anti-Doping Organizations other than the *National Association* or its *National Anti-Doping Organization*. [In such event the UIM may in its discretion elect to: (a) ban all officials from that *National Association* for participation in any UIM activities for a period of up to two years and/or (b) fine the *National Association* in an amount up to 10.000 Euro. (For purposes of this Rule, any fine paid pursuant to Rule 12.3.2 shall be credited against any fine assessed.)

12.3.1.1 If four or more violations of these Anti-Doping Rules (other than violations involving Articles 2.4 and 10.3) are committed in addition to the violations described in Article 12.3.1 by *Drivers* or other *Persons* affiliated with a *National Association* within a 12-month period in testing conducted by UIM or Anti-Doping Organizations other than the *National Association* or its *National Anti-Doping Organization*, then the UIM may suspend that *National Association's* membership for a period of up to 4 years.]

12.3.2 More than one *Driver* or other *Person* from a *National Association* commits an *Anti-Doping Rule* violation during an *International Event*. [In such event UIM may fine that *National Association* in an amount up to 10.000 Euro.]

12.3.3 A *National Association* has failed to make diligent efforts to keep UIM informed about a *Driver's* whereabouts after receiving a request for that information from UIM. [In such event UIM may fine the National

Association in an amount up to 10.000 Euro per *Driver* in addition to all of UIM costs incurred in *Testing* that *National Association's Drivers*.]

ARTICLE 13 APPEALS

13.1 Decisions Subject to Appeal

Decisions made under these Anti-Doping Rules may be appealed as set forth below in Article 13.2 through 13.4 or as otherwise provided in these Anti-Doping Rules. Such decisions shall remain in effect while under appeal unless the appellate body orders otherwise. Before an appeal is commenced, any post-decision review authorized in these rules must be exhausted (except as provided in Article 13.1.1).

13.1.1 WADA Not Required to Exhaust Internal Remedies

Where *WADA* has a right to appeal under Article 13 and no other party has appealed a final decision within the UIM or its *National Association's* process, *WADA* may appeal such decision directly to *CAS* without having to exhaust other remedies in the UIM or its *National Association's* process.

[Comment to Article 13.1.1: Where a decision has been rendered before the final stage of UIM's process (for example, a first hearing) and no party elects to appeal that decision to the next level of UIM's process (e.g., the Managing Board), then WADA may bypass the remaining steps in UIM's internal process and appeal directly to CAS.]

13.2 Appeals from Decisions Regarding *Anti-Doping* Rule Violations, Consequences, and *Provisional Suspensions*

A decision that an anti-doping rule violation was committed, a decision imposing *Consequences* for an anti-doping rule violation, or a decision that no anti-doping rule violation was committed; a decision that an anti-doping rule violation proceeding cannot go forward for procedural reasons (including, for example, prescription); a decision under Article 10.10.2 (prohibition of participation during *Ineligibility*); a decision that the UIM or its *National Association* lacks jurisdiction to rule on an alleged anti-doping rule violation or its *Consequences*; a decision by any *National Association* not to bring forward an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or an *Atypical Finding* as an anti-doping rule violation, or a decision not to go forward with an anti-doping rule violation after an investigation under Article 7.4; [and a decision to impose a *Provisional Suspension* as a result of a *Provisional Hearing* or otherwise in violation of Article 7.4] may be appealed exclusively as provided in this Article 13.2. [Notwithstanding any other provision herein, the only *Person* that may appeal from a *Provisional Suspension* is the *Driver* or other *Person* upon whom the *Provisional Suspension* is imposed.]

13.2.1 Appeals Involving *International-Level Drivers*

In cases arising from competition in an *International Event* or in cases involving *International-Level Drivers*, the decision may be appealed exclusively to CAS in accordance with the provisions applicable before such court.

[Comment to Article 13.2.1: CAS decisions are final and binding except for any review required by law applicable to the annulment or enforcement of arbitral awards.]

13.2.2 Appeals Involving National-Level Drivers

In cases involving *Drivers* who do not have a right to appeal under Article 13.2.1, each *National Association* shall have in place an appeal procedure that respects the following principles: a timely hearing, a fair and impartial hearing panel; the right to be represented by a counsel at the person's expense; and a timely, written, reasoned decision. UIM's rights of appeal with respect to these cases are set forth in Article 13.2.3 below.

[Comment to Article 13.2.2: UIM may elect to comply with this Article by giving its national-level Drivers the right to appeal directly to CAS.]

13.2.3 Persons Entitled to Appeal

In cases under Article 13.2.1, the following parties shall have the right to appeal to CAS: (a) the *Driver* or other *Person* who is the subject of the decision being appealed; (b) the other party to the case in which the decision was rendered; (c) UIM and any other *Anti-Doping Organization* under whose rules a sanction could have been imposed; (d) the International Olympic Committee or International Paralympic Committee, as applicable, where the decision may have an effect in relation to the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games, including decisions affecting eligibility for the Olympic Games or Paralympic Games; and (e) WADA. In cases under Article 13.2.2, the parties having the right to appeal to the national-level reviewing body shall be as provided in the *National Association's* rules but, at a minimum, shall include the following parties: (a) the *Driver* or other *Person* who is the subject of the decision being appealed; (b) the other party to the case in which the decision was rendered; (c) UIM; and (d) WADA. For cases under Article 13.2.2, WADA and UIM shall also have the right to appeal to CAS with respect to the decision of the national-level reviewing body.

13.3 Failure to Render a Timely Decision by UIM and its *National Associations*

Where, in a particular case, UIM or its *National Associations* fail to render a decision with respect to whether an anti-doping rule violation was committed within a reasonable deadline set by WADA, WADA may elect to appeal directly to CAS as if UIM or its *National Associations* had rendered a decision finding no anti-doping rule violation. If the CAS panel determines that an anti-doping rule violation was committed and that WADA acted reasonably in electing to appeal directly to CAS, then WADA's costs and attorneys fees in prosecuting the appeal shall be reimbursed to WADA by UIM or its *National Associations*.

[Comment to Article 13.3: Given the different circumstances of each anti-doping rule violation investigation and results management process, it is not feasible to establish a fixed time period for UIM to render a decision before WADA may intervene by appealing directly to CAS. Before taking such action, however, WADA will consult with UIM and give UIM an opportunity to explain why it has not yet rendered a decision. Nothing in this rule prohibits UIM from also having rules which authorize it to assume jurisdiction for matters in which the results management performed by one of its National Associations has been inappropriately delayed.]

13.4 Appeals from Decisions Granting or Denying a Therapeutic Use Exemption

Decisions by WADA reversing the grant or denial of a TUE may be appealed exclusively to CAS by the *Driver*, UIM, or *National Anti-Doping Organization* or other body designated by a *National Association* which granted or denied the exemption. Decisions to deny TUE's, and which are not reversed by WADA, may be appealed by *International-Level Drivers* to CAS and by other *Drivers* to the national level reviewing body described in Article 13.2.2. If the national level reviewing body reverses the decision to deny a TUE, that decision may be appealed to CAS by WADA.

When UIM, *National Anti-Doping Organizations* or other bodies designated by *National Associations* fail to take action on a properly submitted TUE application within a reasonable time, their failure to decide may be considered a denial for purposes of the appeal rights provided in this Article.

13.5 Appeal from Decisions Pursuant to Article 12

Decisions by UIM pursuant to Article 12 may be appealed exclusively to CAS by the *National Association*.

13.6 Time for Filing Appeals

The time to file an appeal to CAS shall be twenty-one (21) days from the date of receipt of the decision by the appealing party. The above notwithstanding, the following shall apply in connection with appeals filed by a party entitled to

appeal but which was not a party to the proceedings having lead to the decision subject to appeal:

- a) Within ten (10) days from notice of the decision, such party/ies shall have the right to request from the body having issued the decision a copy of the file on which such body relied;
- b) If such a request is made within the ten-day period, then the party making such request shall have twenty-one (21) days from receipt of the file to file an appeal to CAS.

The above notwithstanding, the filing deadline for an appeal or intervention filed by *WADA* shall be the later of:

- (a) Twenty-one (21) days after the last day on which any other party in the case could have appealed, or
- (b) Twenty-one (21) days after *WADA*'s receipt of the complete file relating to the decision.

ARTICLE 14 *NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS' INCORPORATION OF UIM RULES, REPORTING AND RECOGNITION*

14.1 Incorporation of UIM Anti-Doping Rules

All *National Associations* shall comply with these Anti-Doping Rules. These Anti-Doping Rules shall also be incorporated either directly or by reference into each *National Associations* Rules. All *National Associations* shall include in their regulations the procedural rules necessary to effectively implement these Anti-Doping Rules. Each *National Association* shall obtain the written acknowledgement and agreement, in the form attached as Appendix 2, of all *Drivers* subject to *Doping Control* and *Driver Support Personnel* for such *Drivers*. Notwithstanding whether or not the required form has been signed, the Rules of each *National Association* shall specifically provide that all *Drivers*, *Driver Support Personnel* and other *Persons* under the jurisdiction of the *National Association* shall be bound by these Anti-Doping Rules.

14.2 Statistical Reporting

14.2.1 *National Associations* shall report to UIM at the end of every year results of all *Doping Controls* within their jurisdiction sorted by *Driver* and identifying each date on which the *Driver* was tested, the entity conducting the test, and whether the test was *In-Competition* or *Out-of-Competition*. UIM may periodically publish *Testing* data received from *National Associations* as well as comparable data from *Testing* under UIM's jurisdiction.

14.2.2 UIM shall publish annually a general statistical report of its Doping Control activities during the calendar year with a copy provided to WADA.

14.3 Doping Control Information Clearinghouse

When a *National Association* has received an *Adverse Analytical Finding* on one of its *Drivers* it shall report the following information to UIM and WADA within fourteen (14) days of the process described in Article 7.1.2 and 7.1.3: the *Driver's* name, country, sport and discipline within the sport, whether the test was *In-Competition* or *Out-of-Competition*, the date of *Sample* collection and the analytical result reported by the laboratory. The *National Association* shall also regularly update UIM and WADA on the status and findings of any review or proceedings conducted pursuant to Article 7 (*Results Management*), Article 8 (*Right to a Fair Hearing*) or Article 13 (*Appeals*), and comparable information shall be provided to UIM and WADA within 14 days of the notification described in Article 7.1.9, with respect to other violations of these Anti-Doping Rules. In any case in which the period of *Ineligibility* is eliminated under Article 10.5.1 (*No Fault or Negligence*) or reduced under Article 10.5.2 (*No Significant Fault or Negligence*), UIM and WADA shall be provided with a written reasoned decision explaining the basis for the elimination or reduction. Neither UIM nor WADA shall disclose this information beyond those persons within their organisations with a need to know until the *National Association* has made public disclosure or has failed to make public disclosure as required in Article 14.4 below.

14.4 Public Disclosure

14.4.1 Neither UIM nor its *National Association* shall publicly identify *Drivers* whose *Samples* have resulted in *Adverse Analytical Findings*, or who were alleged to have violated other Articles of these Anti-Doping Rules until it has been determined in a hearing in accordance with Article 8 that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred, or such hearing has been waived, or the assertion of an anti-doping rule violation has not been timely challenged or the *Driver* has been *Provisionally Suspended*. Once a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules has been established, it shall be publicly reported within 20 days. UIM or its *National Association* must also report within 20 days appeal decisions on an anti-doping rule violation. UIM or its *National Association* shall also, within the time period for publication, send all hearing and appeal decisions to WADA.

14.4.2 In any case where it is determined, after a hearing or appeal, that the *Driver* or other *Person* did not commit an anti-doping rule violation, the decision may be disclosed publicly only with the consent of the *Driver* or other *Person* who is the subject of the decision. UIM or its *National Association* shall use reasonable efforts to obtain such consent, and UIM consent is obtained, shall publicly disclose the decision in its

entirety or in such redacted form as the *Driver* or other *Person* may approve.

14.4.3 Neither UIM nor its *National Association* or WADA accredited laboratory, or official of either, shall publicly comment on the specific facts of a pending case (as opposed to general description of process and science) except in response to public comments attributed to the *Driver*, other *Person* or their representatives.

14.5 Recognition of Decisions by UIM and National Associations

Any decision of UIM or a *National Association* regarding a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules shall be recognized by all *National Associations*, which shall take all necessary action to render such results effective.

ARTICLE 15 RECOGNITION OF DECISIONS BY OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Subject to the right to appeal provided in Article 13, the *Testing*, TUE's and hearing results or other final adjudications of any *Signatory* to the *Code* which are consistent with the *Code* and are within the *Signatory's* authority, shall be recognized and respected by UIM and its *National Associations*. UIM and its *National Associations* may recognize the same actions of other bodies which have not accepted the *Code* if the rules of those bodies are otherwise consistent with the *Code*.

[Comment to Article 15: Where the decision of a body that has not accepted the Code is in some respects Code compliant and in other respects not Code compliant, UIM or its National Association should attempt to apply the decision in harmony with the principles of the Code. For example, if in a process consistent with the Code a non-Signatory has found a Driver to have committed an anti-doping rule violation on account of the presence of a Prohibited Substance in his body but the period of Ineligibility applied is shorter than the period provided for in the Code, then UIM or its National Association should recognize the finding of an anti-doping rule violation and they should conduct a hearing consistent with Article 8 to determine whether the longer period of Ineligibility provided in the Code should be imposed.]

ARTICLE 16 STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

No action may be commenced under these Anti-Doping Rules against a *Driver* or other *Person* for a violation of an anti-doping rule contained in these Anti-Doping Rules unless such action is commenced within eight years from the date the violation occurred.

ARTICLE 17 UIM COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO WADA

The UIM will report to *WADA* on the UIM's compliance with the *Code* every second year and shall explain reasons for any noncompliance.

ARTICLE 18 AMENDMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF ANTI-DOPING RULES

18.1 These Anti-Doping Rules may be amended from time to time by the *UIM* Executive.

18.2 Except as provided in Article 18.5, these Anti-Doping Rules shall be interpreted as an independent and autonomous text and not by reference to existing law or statutes.

18.3 The headings used for the various Parts and Articles of these Anti-Doping Rules are for convenience only and shall not be deemed part of the substance of these Anti-Doping Rules or to affect in any way the language of the provisions to which they refer.

18.4 The INTRODUCTION and the APPENDIX I DEFINITIONS shall be considered integral parts of these Anti-Doping Rules.

18.5 These Anti-Doping Rules have been adopted pursuant to the applicable provisions of the *Code* and shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with applicable provisions of the *Code*. The comments annotating various provisions of the *Code* may, where applicable, assist in the understanding and interpretation of these Anti-Doping Rules.

18.6 Notice to a Driver or other *Person* who is a member of a *National Association* may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the *National Association*.

18.7 These Anti-Doping Rules shall come into full force and effect on 1 January 2009 (the "**Effective Date**"). They shall not apply retrospectively to matters pending before the Effective Date; provided, however, that:

18.7.1 Any case pending prior to the Effective Date, or brought after the Effective Date based on an anti-doping rule violation that occurred prior to the Effective Date, shall be governed by the predecessor to these Anti-Doping Rules in force at the time of the anti-doping rule violation, subject to any application of the principle of *lex mitior* by the hearing panel determining the case.

18.7.2 Any Article 2.4 whereabouts violation (whether a filing failure or a missed test) declared by UIM under rules in force prior to the Effective Date that has not expired prior to the Effective Date and that would qualify as a whereabouts violation under Article 11 of the *International Standard for Testing* shall be carried forward and may be relied upon, prior to expiry, as one of the three Filing Failures and/or

Missed Tests giving rise to an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.4 of these Anti-Doping Rules. [Note: where existing whereabouts violations are carried over to the new regime, any restrictions under the old rules on combining those whereabouts violations with other whereabouts violations must also be carried over. Hence:] Unless otherwise stated by UIM, however:

- a. a filing failure that is carried forward in this manner may only be combined with (post-Effective Date) Filing Failures;
- b. a missed test that is carried forward in this manner may only be combined with (post-Effective Date) Missed Tests; and
- c. a filing failure or missed test declared by any Anti-Doping Organization other than [UIM and a National Association] prior to the Effective Date may not be combined with any Filing Failure or Missed Test declared under these Anti-Doping Rules.]

18.7.3 Where a period of *Ineligibility* imposed by UIM under rules in force prior to the Effective Date has not yet expired as of the Effective Date, the *Person* who is *Ineligible* may apply to UIM for a reduction in the period of *Ineligibility* in light of the amendments made to the *Code* as from the Effective Date. To be valid, such application must be made before the period of *Ineligibility* has expired.

18.7.4 Subject always to Article 10.7.5, anti-doping rule violations committed under rules in force prior to the Effective Date shall be taken into account as prior offences for purposes of determining sanctions under Article 10.7. Where such pre-Effective Date anti-doping rule violation involved a substance that would be treated as a Specified Substance under these Anti-Doping Rules, for which a period of *Ineligibility* of less than two years was imposed, such violation shall be considered a Reduced Sanction violation for purposes of Article 10.7.1.

APPENDIX 1 - DEFINITIONS

Adverse Analytical Finding. A report from a laboratory or other approved *Testing* entity that identifies in a *Sample* the presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* (including elevated quantities of endogenous substances) or evidence of the *Use of a Prohibited Method*.

Anti-Doping Organization. A *Signatory* that is responsible for adopting rules for initiating, implementing or enforcing any part of the *Doping Control* process. This includes, for example, the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, other *Major Event Organizations* that conduct *Testing* at their *Events*, WADA, InterNational Associations, and *National Anti-Doping Organizations*.

Driver. Any *Person* who participates in sport at the international level (as defined by each International Association), the national level (as defined by each *National Anti-Doping Organization*, including but not limited to those *Persons* in its *Registered Testing Pool*), and any other competitor in sport who is otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of any *Signatory* or other sports organization accepting the *Code*. All provisions of the *Code*, including, for example, *Testing*, and TUE's must be applied to international and national-level competitors. Some *National Anti-Doping Organizations* may elect to test and apply anti-doping rules to recreational-level or masters competitors who are not current or potential national caliber competitors. *National Anti-Doping Organizations* are not required, however, to apply all aspects of the *Code* to such *Persons*. Specific national rules may be established for Doping Control for non-international-level or national-level competitors without being in conflict with the *Code*. Thus, a country could elect to test recreational-level competitors but not require TUE's or whereabouts information. In the same manner, a *Major Event Organization* holding an *Event* only for masters-level competitors could elect to test the competitors but not require advance TUE or whereabouts information. For purposes of Article 2.8 (Administration or *Attempted Administration*) and for purposes of anti-doping information and education, any *Person* who participates in sport under the authority of any *Signatory*, government, or other sports organization accepting the *Code* is a *Driver*.

[Comment to Driver: This definition makes it clear that all international and national-caliber Drivers are subject to the anti-doping rules of the Code, with the precise definitions of international and national level sport to be set forth in the anti-doping rules of the UIM and National Anti-Doping Organizations, respectively. At the national level, anti-doping rules adopted pursuant to the Code shall apply, at a minimum, to all persons on national teams and all persons qualified to compete in any national championship in any sport. That does not mean, however, that all such Drivers must be included in a National Anti-Doping Organization's Registered Testing Pool. The definition also allows each National Anti-Doping Organization, if it chooses to do so, to expand its anti-doping control program beyond national-caliber Drivers to competitors at lower levels of competition. Competitors at all levels of competition should receive the benefit of anti-doping information and education.]

Driver Support Personnel. Any coach, trainer, manager, agent, team staff, official, medical, paramedical personnel, parent or any other *Person* working with, treating or assisting a Driver participating in or preparing for sports *Competition*.

Attempt. Purposely engaging in conduct that constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in the commission of an anti-doping rule violation. Provided, however, there shall be no anti-doping rule violation based solely on an *Attempt* to commit a violation if the *Person* renounces the attempt prior to it being discovered by a third party not involved in the *Attempt*.

Atypical Finding. A report from a laboratory or other WADA-approved entity which requires further investigation as provided by the *International Standard* for Laboratories or related Technical Documents prior to the determination of an *Adverse Analytical Finding*.

CAS. The Court of Arbitration for Sport.

Code. The World Anti-Doping Code.

Competition. A single race, match, game or singular athletic contest. For example, a basketball game or the finals of the Olympic 100-meter dash in athletics. For stage races and other athletic contests where prizes are awarded on a daily or other interim basis the distinction between a *Competition* and an *Event* will be as provided in the rules of the applicable International Association.

Consequences of anti-doping rule violations. A Driver's or other *Person's* violation of an anti-doping rule may result in one or more of the following: (a) Disqualification means the *Driver's* results in a particular *Competition* or *Event* are invalidated, with all resulting consequences including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes; (b) Ineligibility means the *Driver* or other *Person* is barred for a specified period of time from participating in any *Competition* or other activity or funding as provided in Article 10.9; and (c) Provisional Suspension means the *Driver* or other *Person* is barred temporarily from participating in any *Competition* prior to the final decision at a hearing conducted under Article 8 (Right to a Fair Hearing).

Disqualification. See *Consequences of anti-doping rule violations*, above.

Doping Control. All steps and processes from test distribution planning through to ultimate disposition of any appeal including all steps and processes in between such as provision of whereabouts information, sample collection and handling, laboratory analysis, TUE's, results management and hearings.

Event. A series of individual *Competitions* conducted together under one ruling body (e.g., the Olympic Games, FINA World Championships, or Pan American Games).

Event Period. The time between the beginning and end of an *Event*, as established by the ruling body of the *Event*.

In-Competition. Unless provided otherwise in the rules of an International Association or other relevant *Anti-Doping Organization*, “*In-Competition*” means the period commencing twelve hours before a *Competition* in which the *Driver* is scheduled to participate through the end of such *Competition* and the *Sample* collection process related to such *Competition*.

Independent Observer Program. A team of observers, under the supervision of WADA, who observe and may provide guidance on the *Doping Control* process at certain *Events* and report on their observations.

Individual Sport. Any sport that is not a *Team Sport*.

Ineligibility. See *Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations* above.

International Event. An *Event* where the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, an International Association, a *Major Event Organization*, or another international sport organization is the ruling body for the *Event* or appoints the technical officials for the *Event*.

International-Level Driver. *Driver* designated by one or more International Associations as being within the *Registered Testing Pool* for an International Association.

International Standard. A standard adopted by WADA in support of the *Code*. Compliance with an *International Standard* (as opposed to another alternative standard, practice or procedure) shall be sufficient to conclude that the procedures addressed by the *International Standard* were performed properly. *International Standards* shall include any Technical Documents issued pursuant to the *International Standard*.

Major Event Organizations. The continental associations of *National Olympic Committees* and other international multi-sport organizations that function as the ruling body for any continental, regional or other *International Event*.

Marker. A compound, group of compounds or biological parameter(s) that indicates the *Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method*.

Metabolite. Any substance produced by a biotransformation process.

Minor. A natural *Person* who has not reached the age of majority as established by the applicable laws of his or her country of residence.

National Anti-Doping Organization. The entity(ies) designated by each country as possessing the primary authority and responsibility to adopt and implement anti-doping rules, direct the collection of *Samples*, the management of test results, and

the conduct of hearings, all at the national level. This includes an entity which may be designated by multiple countries to serve as regional *Anti-Doping Organization* for such countries. If this designation has not been made by the competent public authority(ies), the entity shall be the country's *National Olympic Committee* or its designee.

National Event. A sport *Event* involving international or national-level *Drivers* that is not an *International Event*.

National Association. A national or regional entity which is a member of or is recognized by UIM as the entity governing the UIM's sport in that nation or region.

National Olympic Committee. The organization recognized by the International Olympic Committee. The term *National Olympic Committee* shall also include the National Sport Confederation in those countries where the National Sport Confederation assumes typical *National Olympic Committee* responsibilities in the anti-doping area.

No Advance Notice. A *Doping Control* which takes place with no advance warning to the *Driver* and where the *Driver* is continuously chaperoned from the moment of notification through *Sample* provision.

No Fault or Negligence. The *Driver's* establishing that he or she did not know or suspect, and could not reasonably have known or suspected even with the exercise of utmost caution, that he or she had *Used* or been administered the *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method*.

No Significant Fault or Negligence. The *Driver's* establishing that his or her fault or negligence, when viewed in the totality of the circumstances and taking into account the criteria for *No Fault or Negligence*, was not significant in relationship to the anti-doping rule violation.

Out-of-Competition. Any *Doping Control* which is not *In-Competition*.

Participant. Any *Driver* or *Driver Support Personnel*.

Person. A natural *Person* or an organization or other entity.

Possession. The actual, physical possession, or the constructive possession (which shall be found only if the person has exclusive control over the *Prohibited Substance/Method* or the premises in which a *Prohibited Substance/Method* exists); provided, however, that if the person does not have exclusive control over the *Prohibited Substance/Method* or the premises in which a *Prohibited Substance/Method* exists, constructive possession shall only be found if the person knew about the presence of the *Prohibited Substance/Method* and intended to exercise control over it. Provided, however, there shall be no anti-doping rule violation based solely on possession if, prior to receiving notification of any kind that the *Person* has committed an anti-doping rule violation, the *Person* has taken

concrete action demonstrating that the *Person* never intended to have possession and has renounced possession by explicitly declaring it to an *Anti-Doping Organization*. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this definition, the purchase (including by any electronic or other means) of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* constitutes possession by the *Person* who makes the purchase.

[Comment: Under this definition, steroids found in a Driver's car would constitute a violation unless the Driver establishes that someone else used the car; in that event, the Anti-Doping Organization must establish that, even though the Driver did not have exclusive control over the car, the Driver knew about the steroids and intended to have control over the steroids. Similarly, in the example of steroids found in a home medicine cabinet under the joint control of a Driver and spouse, the Anti-Doping Organization must establish that the Driver knew the steroids were in the cabinet and that the Driver intended to exercise control over the steroids.]

Prohibited List. The List identifying the *Prohibited Substances* and *Prohibited Methods*.

Prohibited Method. Any method so described on the *Prohibited List*.

Prohibited Substance. Any substance so described on the *Prohibited List*.

Provisional Hearing. For purposes of Article 7.6, an expedited abbreviated hearing occurring prior to a hearing under Article 8 (Right to a Fair Hearing) that provides the *Driver* with notice and an opportunity to be heard in either written or oral form.

Provisional Suspension. See *Consequences* above.

Publicly Disclose or Publicly Report. To disseminate or distribute information to the general public or persons beyond those persons entitled to earlier notification in accordance with Article 14.

Registered Testing Pool. The pool of top level *Drivers* established separately by each InterNational Association and *National Anti-Doping Organization* who are subject to both *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition Testing* as part of that InterNational Association's or National Anti-Doping Organization's test distribution plan.

Retroactive TUE. As defined in the *International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions*.

Sample. Any biological material collected for the purposes of *Doping Control*.

[Comment to Sample: It has sometimes been claimed that the collection of blood samples violates the tenets of certain religious or cultural groups. It has been determined that there is no basis for any such claim.]

Signatories. Those entities signing the *Code* and agreeing to comply with the *Code*, including the International Olympic Committee, InterNational Associations, International Paralympic Committee, *National Olympic Committees*, National Paralympic Committees, *Major Event Organizations*, *National Anti-Doping Organizations*, and WADA.

Specified Substances. As defined in Article 4.2.2.

Substantial Assistance. For purposes of Article 10.5.3, a *Person* providing *Substantial Assistance* must: (1) fully disclose in a signed written statement all information he or she possesses in relation to anti-doping rule violations, and (2) fully cooperate with the investigation and adjudication of any case related to that information, including, for example, presenting testimony at a hearing if requested to do so by an *Anti-Doping Organization* or hearing panel. Further, the information provided must be credible and must comprise an important part of any case which is initiated or, if no case is initiated, must have provided a sufficient basis on which a case could have been brought.

Tampering. Altering for an improper purpose or in an improper way; bringing improper influence to bear; interfering improperly; obstructing, misleading or engaging in any fraudulent conduct to alter results or prevent normal procedures from occurring; or providing fraudulent information to an *Anti-Doping Organization*.

Target Testing. Selection of *Drivers* for *Testing* where specific *Drivers* or groups of *Drivers* are selected on a non-random basis for *Testing* at a specified time.

Team Sport. A sport in which the substitution of players is permitted during a *Competition*.

Testing. The parts of the *Doping Control* process involving test distribution planning, *Sample* collection, *Sample* handling, and *Sample* transport to the laboratory.

Trafficking. Selling, giving, transporting, sending, delivering or distributing a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* (either physically or by any electronic or other means) by a *Driver*, *Driver Support Personnel* or any other *Person* subject to the jurisdiction of an *Anti-Doping Organization* to any third party; provided, however, this definition shall not include the actions of bona fide medical personnel involving a *Prohibited Substance* used for genuine and legal therapeutic purposes or other acceptable justification, and shall not include actions involving *Prohibited Substances* which are not prohibited in *Out-of-Competition Testing* unless the circumstances as a whole demonstrate such *Prohibited Substances* are not intended for genuine and legal therapeutic purposes.

TUE. As defined in Article 2.6.1.

TUE Panel. As defined in Article 4.4.3.

UNESCO Convention. The International Convention against Doping in Sport adopted by the 33rd session of the UNESCO General Conference on 19 October 2005 including any and all amendments adopted by the States Parties to the Convention and the Conference of Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport.

Use. The utilization, application, ingestion, injection or consumption by any means whatsoever of any *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method*.

WADA. The World Anti-Doping Agency.

APPENDIX 2 - Acknowledgment and Agreement

I, as a member of [National Association] and/or a participant in a [National Association or UIM] authorized or recognized event, hereby acknowledge and agree as follows:

- 1.** I have received and had an opportunity to review the UIM Anti-Doping Rules.
- 2.** I consent and agree to comply with and be bound by all of the provisions of the UIM Anti-Doping Rules, including but not limited to, all amendments to the Anti-Doping Rules and all International Standards incorporated in the Anti-Doping Rules.
- 3.** I acknowledge and agree that [National Associations and UIM] have jurisdiction to impose sanctions as provided in the UIM Anti-Doping Rules.
- 4.** I also acknowledge and agree that any dispute arising out of a decision made pursuant to the UIM Anti-Doping Rules, after exhaustion of the process expressly provided for in the UIM Anti-Doping Rules, may be appealed exclusively as provided in Article 13 of the UIM Anti-Doping Rules to an appellate body for final and binding arbitration, which in the case of International-Level Drivers is the Court of Arbitration for Sport.
- 5.** I acknowledge and agree that the decisions of the arbitral appellate body referenced above shall be final and enforceable, and that I will not bring any claim, arbitration, lawsuit or litigation in any other court or tribunal.
- 6.** I have read and understand this Acknowledgement and Agreement.

Date

Print Name (Last Name, First Name)

Date of Birth
(Day/Month/Year)

Signature (or, UIM a minor, signature of
legal guardian)