



RESULTS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE

Implementing the *WADA International Standard for Results Management*

Version 1.0, in effect as from 1 January 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
ARTICLE 1 RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDUCTING <i>RESULTS MANAGEMENT</i>	4
ARTICLE 2 REVIEW AND NOTIFICATION REGARDING POTENTIAL ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS	4
2.1 <i>ADVERSE ANALYTICAL FINDING</i>	4
2.2 <i>ATYPICAL FINDING</i>	7
2.3 MATTERS NOT INVOLVING AN <i>ADVERSE ANALYTICAL FINDING</i> OR <i>ATYPICAL FINDING</i>	7
2.4 MATTERS INVOLVING AN <i>ADVERSE ANALYTICAL FINDING</i> OR <i>ATYPICAL FINDING</i>	9
2.5 “B” SAMPLE ANALYSIS	9
ARTICLE 3 <i>PROVISIONAL SUSPENSIONS</i>	11
ARTICLE 4 PROCEEDING BY THE NADP	12
ARTICLE 5 NOTICE OF CONCLUSION OF THE PROCEEDING AND NOTICE OF CHARGE	14
ARTICLE 6 JURISDICTION CRITERIA	15
ARTICLE 7 APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS ON REQUEST WITHOUT HEARING	16
ARTICLE 8 PROCEDURE FOR THE SUSPENSION OF THE PERIODS OF <i>INELIGIBILITY</i> OR OTHER <i>CONSEQUENCES</i> IMPOSED UNDER <i>ADSC</i> ARTICLE 11.7.1	16
ARTICLE 9 PARTIES OF FIRST INSTANCE PROCEEDINGS	17
ARTICLE 10 TERMINATION OF PROCEEDINGS	17
ARTICLE 11 START OF FIRST HEARING PROCEEDINGS	18
ARTICLE 12 SINGLE HEARING BEFORE <i>CAS</i>	19
ARTICLE 13 FIRST HEARING PROCEEDING – DISCUSSION	19
ARTICLE 14 FIRST INSTANCE PROCEEDING – DECISION	20
ARTICLE 15 REVIEW OF <i>TUEC</i> ’S DECISIONS	21
ARTICLE 16 REVIEW OF THE DECISIONS OF THE NADP REGARDING “FILING FAILURE” AND/OR “MISSED TEST”	21
ARTICLE 17 APPEAL AGAINST <i>PROVISIONAL SUSPENSION</i> DECISIONS	21
ARTICLE 18 APPEAL AGAINST FIRST INSTANCE DECISIONS	22
ARTICLE 19 CROSS-APPEAL	23
ARTICLE 20 EXCLUSION AND OBJECTION	23
ARTICLE 21 LAPSING AND SUSPENSION OF PROCEDURAL TIME LIMITS	24
ARTICLE 22 NOTICES AND COMMUNICATIONS	24
ANNEX A – REVIEW OF A POSSIBLE FAILURE TO COMPLY	26
ANNEX B – <i>RESULTS MANAGEMENT</i> FOR WHEREABOUTS FAILURES	27
ANNEX C – <i>RESULTS MANAGEMENT</i> REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE <i>ATHLETE BIOLOGICAL PASSPORT</i>	32
DEFINITIONS	40

INTRODUCTION

The *Results Management Procedure* (hereinafter “RMP”) implements the *WADA International Standards for Results Management* (hereinafter “ISRM”) and it is deemed to form an integral and material part of the NADO Italia’s *Anti-Doping Sports Code* (hereinafter “ADSC”). In the event of any conflict between the ISRM and the RMP, the ISRM shall prevail.

The comments annotating various provisions of the ISRM are incorporated by reference into the RMP, shall be treated as if set out fully herein, and shall be used to interpret this RMP.

Interpretation

Unless otherwise specified, references to Articles are references to Articles of the RMP.

The Annexes to the RMP have the same mandatory status as the rest of the Document.

Terms used in this RMP that are defined terms from the *Code* and from the *ADSC* are italicized. Terms that are defined in this or another *WADA International Standard* are underlined.

General Principle

Results Management under the RMP and the *ADSC* establishes a process designed to resolve anti-doping rule violation matters in a fair, expeditious and efficient manner.

ARTICLE 1 **RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDUCTING *RESULTS MANAGEMENT***

- 1.1 Except as otherwise provided in Articles 7.6, 7.8 of the *Anti-Doping Sports Code (ADSC)* and in *WADA Code (Code)* Article 7.1, *Results Management* shall be the responsibility of, and shall be governed by, the procedural rules of NADO Italia when it is the authority that initiated and directed *Sample* collection (or, if no *Sample* collection is involved, if NADO Italia first provides notice to an *Athlete* or other Person of a potential anti-doping rule violation and then diligently pursues that anti-doping rule violation). Any dispute between NADO Italia and other *Anti-Doping Organization* over which organization has *Results Management Authority* in respect of a particular matter shall be settled by *WADA* in accordance with *Code* Article 7.1.
- 1.2 *Results Management* in relation to a potential *Whereabouts Failure* (a *Filing Failure* or a *Missed Test*) shall be administered by NADO Italia if the *Athlete* files whereabouts information with NADO Italia, as provided in the ISRM and in the RMP. If NADO Italia determines a *Filing Failure* or a *Missed Test*, it shall submit that information to *WADA* through *ADAMS*, where it will be made available to other relevant *Anti-Doping Organizations*.
- 1.3 Other circumstances in which NADO Italia shall take responsibility for conducting *Results Management* in respect of anti-doping rule violations involving *Athletes* and other *Persons* under its authority shall be determined by reference to and in accordance with *Code* Article 7.
- 1.4 *WADA* may direct NADO Italia to conduct *Results Management* in particular circumstances. If NADO Italia refuses to conduct *Results Management* within a reasonable deadline set by *WADA*, such refusal shall be considered an act of non-compliance, and *WADA* may direct another *Anti-Doping Organization* with authority over the *Athlete* or other *Person*, that is willing to do so, to take *Results Management* responsibility in place of NADO Italia or, if there is no such *Anti-Doping Organization*, any other *Anti-Doping Organization* that is willing to do so. In such case, NADO Italia shall reimburse the costs and attorney's fees of conducting *Results Management* to the other *Anti-Doping Organization* designated by *WADA*, and a failure to reimburse costs and attorney's fees shall be considered an act of non-compliance.

ARTICLE 2 **REVIEW AND NOTIFICATION REGARDING POTENTIAL ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS**

2.1 ***Adverse Analytical Finding***

- 2.1.1 The results from all analyses must be sent to NADO Italia in encoded form, in a report signed by an authorized representative of the *Laboratory*. All communication must be conducted confidentially.
- 2.1.2 Upon learning of an *Adverse Analytical Finding* of the A *Sample* analysis, NADO Italia will establish the *Athlete's* identity and check whether: a *Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE)* was granted or a *TUE* application is pending consistent with the *International Standard*

for *Therapeutic Use Exemptions* (ISTUE); it is apparent that the *Adverse Analytical Finding* was caused by an ingestion of the relevant *Prohibited Substance* through a permitted route; or whether there is any apparent departure from the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations* (ISTI) or *International Standard for Laboratories* (ISL) that caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*. This may include a review of the Laboratory Documentation Package produced by the Laboratory to support the *Adverse Analytical Finding* (if available at the time of the review) and relevant *Doping Control* form(s) and *Testing* documents.

2.1.3 If the initial review reveals that the *Athlete* has an applicable *TUE*, then NADO Italia shall conduct such follow up review as necessary to determine if the specific requirements of the *TUE* have been complied with.

2.1.4 If the *Adverse Analytical Finding* involves a *Prohibited Substance* permitted through (a) specific route(s) as per the *Prohibited List* (hereinafter the “List”), NADO Italia shall consult any relevant available documentation (e.g. *Doping Control* form) to determine whether the *Prohibited Substance* appears to have been administered through a permitted route and, if so, shall consult an expert to determine whether the *Adverse Analytical Finding* is compatible with the apparent route of ingestion.

2.1.5 If the review of the *Adverse Analytical Finding* does not reveal:

- the existence of a *TUE* or a procedure pending for the granting thereof in accordance with the ISTUE;
- correspondence between the level of the *Prohibited Substance* found in the *Sample* and the *TUE* granted;
- any non-compliance with the ISTI or the ISL that may have caused the *Adverse Analytical Finding*;
- that the *Adverse Analytical Finding* was caused by an ingestion of the relevant *Prohibited Substance* through an authorized route,

NADO Italia, through the NADP, will promptly inform the *Athlete*, Club, National Sports Federation/Associated Sports Discipline/Sports Promotion Entity and other relevant sports organizations of:

- a. the *Adverse Analytical Finding* (AAF);
- b. the fact that the AAF may result in an anti-doping rules violation (*ADSC* Article 2.1 and/or 2.2) and the applicable *Consequences*;
- c. the *Athlete's* right to request the analysis of the “B” *Sample* within three (3) days, it being understood that, in the absence of such a request within the indicated period, the analysis of “B” *Sample* shall be considered to have been waived;
- d. the opportunity for the *Athlete* and/or the *Athlete's* representative to attend the “B” *Sample* opening and analysis in accordance with the ISL;
- e. the *Athlete's* right to request copy of the analytical documentation pertaining to *Samples* “A” and “B”, if the analysis of the B *Sample* is required;
- f. the opportunity for the *Athlete* to provide a written observations and/or to request

- to be heard, within 7 (seven) days from the receipt of the notice, if the “B” Sample Analysis is not requested, or within seven (7) days from the notice set out in Article 2.5.8;
- g. the opportunity for the *Athlete* to provide *Substantial Assistance* as set out under *ADSC* Article 11.7.1, to admit the anti-doping rule violation and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of *Ineligibility* under *ADSC* Article 11.8.1 of the (if applicable) or to seek to enter into a case resolution agreement under *ADSC* Article 11.8.2 and RMP Article 7;
- h. any matters relating to *Provisional Suspension* (including the possibility for the *Athlete* to accept a voluntary *Provisional Suspension*) as per Article 3 (if applicable).

2.1.6 In addition, in the event that the *Adverse Analytical Finding* relates to the *Prohibited Substances* set out below, NADO Italia, through the NADP, shall:

- a. Salbutamol or Formoterol: draw the attention of the *Athlete* in the notification letter that the *Athlete* can prove, through a controlled pharmacokinetic study, that the *Adverse Analytical Finding* was the consequence of a Therapeutic dose by inhalation up to the maximum dose indicated under class S3 of the List. The *Athlete’s* attention shall in addition be drawn to the key guiding principles for a controlled pharmacokinetic study and they shall be provided with a list of Laboratories, which could perform the controlled pharmacokinetic study. The *Athlete* shall be granted a deadline of seven (7) days to indicate whether they intend to undertake a controlled pharmacokinetic study, failing which NADO Italia may proceed with the *Results Management*;
- b. Urinary human chorionic gonadotrophin: follow the procedures set out at Article 6 of the 2019 Technical Document for the Reporting & Management of Urinary Human Chorionic Gonadotrophin (hCG) and Luteinizing Hormone (LH) Findings in Male *Athletes* (ID2019CG/LH) or any subsequent version of the Technical Document;
- c. Other *Prohibited Substance* subject to specific *Results Management* requirements in a *Technical Document* or other document issued by *WADA*: follow the procedures set out in the relevant *Technical Document* or other document issued by *WADA*.

2.1.7 The *Athlete’s* own Club shall be required to promptly notify the *Athlete* of the *Adverse Analytical Finding* if this needs to be delivered to its location as well as the NSF/ASD/SPE concerned, ensuring and checking with the *Athlete* and the Club that the aforesaid notice has been received and, if not, arrange for such notice to be served directly. In any event, for the purposes of calculating the time limit under Article 2.5 the *Athlete* shall be deemed to have been notified of the *Adverse Analytical Finding* upon notice being served on the Club.

2.1.8 The NADP, in the event that it considers not to consider the *Adverse Analytical Finding* as an infringement of the anti-doping legislation, shall so notify the *Athlete*, the *Athlete’s* International Federation, the *Athlete’s* National Federation, the National *Anti-Doping Organization* if different from NADO Italia, and *WADA*.

2.2 *Atypical Finding*

- 2.2.1 Upon learning of an *Atypical Finding* of the “A” *Sample*, NADO Italia will identify the *Athlete* ex-officio and check whether a *TUE* was granted or a *TUE* application is pending consistent with the *ISTUE* or whether such *Atypical Finding* was caused by failure to comply with the *ISTI* or the *ISL* and/or it is apparent that the ingestion of the *Prohibited Substance* was through a permitted route.
- 2.2.2 If that review does not reveal an applicable *TUE*, an apparent departure from the *ISTI* or the *ISL* that caused the *Atypical Finding* or an ingestion through a permitted route, the NADP shall conduct the required investigation, also according to the relevant *WADA Technical Documents*. Upon completion of the investigations, NADP will notify the conclusions to the *Athlete*, the *Athlete’s International Federation*, *WADA*, Club, NSF/ASD/SPE and any other relevant *Anti-Doping Organizations*.

NADO Italia, through the NADP, will notify the *Atypical Finding* before completing the investigations as aforesaid under the following circumstances:

- a) if NADP determines the “B” *Sample* should be analyzed but only after notifying the *Athlete* with such notice to include a description of the *Atypical Finding* and the information described in Article 2.1.5, (c) to (e);
 - b) if NADO Italia receives a request, either from a *Major Event Organisation* shortly before one of its *International Events* or a request from a sport organisation responsible for meeting an imminent deadline for selecting team members for an *International Event*, to disclose whether any *Athlete* identified on a list provided by the *Major Event Organisation* or sport organisation has a pending *Atypical Finding*, NADO Italia, through the NADP, shall so identify any such *Athlete* after first providing notice of the *Atypical Finding* to the *Athlete*;
 - c) if the *Atypical Finding* is, in the opinion of qualified medical or expert personnel, likely to be connected to a serious pathology that requires urgent medical attention.
- 2.2.3 If after the investigation is completed NADO Italia decides to pursue the *Atypical Finding* as an *Adverse Analytical Finding*, then the procedure shall follow the provisions of Article 2.1 mutatis mutandis.

2.3 Matters not Involving an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or *Atypical Finding*

2.3.1 Specific cases

2.3.1.1 Report of a potential Failure to Comply

The pre-adjudication phase of *Results Management* of a possible Failure to Comply shall take place as provided in Annex A – Review of a Possible

Failure to Comply.

2.3.1.2 Whereabouts Failures

The pre-adjudication phase of *Results Management* of potential Whereabouts Failures shall take place as provided in Annex B – *Results Management for Whereabouts Failures*.

2.3.1.3 *Athlete Biological Passport Findings*

The pre-adjudication phase of *Results Management* of *Atypical Passport Findings* or Passports submitted to an Expert by the Athlete Passport Management Unit when there is no *Atypical Passport Finding* shall take place as provided in Annex C – *Results Management Requirements and Procedures for the Athlete Biological Passport*.

2.3.2 Notification for specific cases under Article 2.3 and other anti-doping rules violations

Anyone who in any way whatsoever becomes aware of any doping violation shall be required to notify the NADP thereof forthwith.

At such time as NADO Italia considers that the *Athlete* or other *Person* may have committed (an) anti-doping rule violation(s), it, through the NADP, shall promptly notify the *Athlete* or other *Person* of:

- a) the relevant anti-doping rule violation(s) and the applicable *Consequences*;
- b) the relevant factual circumstances upon which the allegations are based;
- c) the relevant evidence in support of those facts that NADP considers demonstrate that the *Athlete* or other *Person* may have committed (an) anti-doping rule violation(s);
- d) the *Athlete* or other *Person's* right to provide written observations and/or to request to be heard within seven (7) days from the receipt of the notice;
- e) the opportunity for the *Athlete* or other *Person* to provide *Substantial Assistance* as set out in *ADSC* Article 11.7.1, to admit the anti-doping rule violation and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of *Ineligibility* in *ADSC* Article 11.8.1 (if applicable) or seek to enter into a case resolution agreement in *ADSC* Article 11.8.2 and RMP Article 7; and
- f) any matters relating to *Provisional Suspension* (including the possibility for the *Athlete* or other *Person* to accept a voluntary *Provisional Suspension*) as per Article 3 (if applicable).

In the event that an *Athlete* or other *Person* is suspected to have violated the prohibition against participation during *Ineligibility* pursuant to *ADSC* Article 11.14, the NADP shall proceed accordingly.

2.4 Matters Involving an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or *Atypical Finding*

If the review of the *Adverse* or *Atypical Findings* shows such irregularities as to affect the validity of the analyses of Laboratory results, then the NADO Italia, through the NADP, will start further investigations lying within its jurisdiction, notifying the NSF/ASD/SPE, *WADA*, the International Federation concerned and the *Athlete's* NADO (if different from NADO Italia).

If the decision of the National Anti-Doping Tribunal (NADT) concerns an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or *Atypical Finding*, and after any deadline to appeal has elapsed and no appeal has been filed against the decision, NADO Italia, through the NADP, shall promptly notify the relevant Laboratory that the matter has been finally disposed of.

2.5 “B” *Sample Analysis*

- 2.5.1** Within three (3) days of the date of the adverse finding notification the *Athlete* has the right to request that a “B” *Sample Analysis* be conducted at his/her own expenses. Under penalty of rejection, the request for “B” *Sample Analysis* must be submitted to NADO Italia together with receipt of payment of the relevant administrative fees according to the Financial Schedule of Fees available on NADO Italia’s website (www.nadoitalia.it).

Upon the waiving of such right being notified or upon three (3) days having expired to no effect, NADO Italia will start the applicable disciplinary proceedings.

- 2.5.2** Further to a request for the “B” *Sample Analysis*, NADO Italia will inform the *Athlete*, his/her Club, the NSF/ASD/SPE, the International Federation concerned and the *Athlete's* NADO (if different from NADO Italia) and *WADA* about the place, time and date of commencement of operations so that no more than seven (7) days elapse between the latter and the date of the aforesaid request.

- 2.5.3** The B *Sample* analysis will be performed by the same Laboratory that analyzed the A *Sample*, unless there are exceptional circumstances, as determined by *WADA* and with *WADA's* prior written approval, which prevent the “B” *Sample* analysis from being performed in the same Laboratory.

- 2.5.4** As early as the phase of identification of the B *Sample*, the *Athlete* is entitled to attend the “B” *Sample Analysis* process either in person or through his/her representative whose proxy must be sent to NADO Italia within twenty- four (24) hours prior to the date set for such operation, together with the appointment of an expert, if appropriate.

The “B” *Sample Analysis* process may also be attended by a representative of the NSF/ASD/SPE concerned and a NADO Italia officer, an interpreter (if necessary), a representative of *WADA* or an Independent Witness.

- 2.5.5 If the *Athlete* requests the B *Sample* analysis but claims that they and/or their representative is not available on the scheduled date indicated by NADO Italia, it shall liaise with the Laboratory and propose (at least) two (2) alternative dates, taking into account the reasons for the *Athlete's* unavailability and the need to avoid any degradation of the *Sample* and ensure timely *Results Management*.

If the *Athlete* and their representative claim not to be available on the alternative dates proposed, the *Results Management Authority* shall instruct the Laboratory to proceed regardless and appoint an Independent Witness to verify that the “B” *Sample* container shows no signs of *Tampering* and that the identifying numbers match that on the collection documentation.

In any case the procedure described in the ISL Article 5.3.6.2.3 will be followed.

- 2.5.6 During the “B” *Sample* Analysis phase, the instructions of the Laboratory must be strictly followed. The Laboratory has the right to expel any *Person*, including the *Athlete* and/or his/her representative, if he/she does not follow the instructions given, disturbs or interferes with the B *Sample* opening or the Analytical testing process.

Any behavior that has determined or attempted to determine the incorrect performance of the procedure, will be reported by the Laboratory to NADO Italia, for the evaluation and possible configurability of the violation of *ADSC* Article 2.5.

- 2.5.7 The *Athlete* is entitled to request the NADP to provide copy of the Laboratory documents pertaining to A and – if “B” *Sample* Analysis is conducted – B *Samples*, together with receipt of the applicable administrative fees according to the Financial Schedule of Fees available on NADO Italia’s website (www.nadoitalia.it).

- 2.5.8 If the “B” *Sample* Analysis confirms the A *Sample* findings, NADO Italia will, after receiving notice from the Laboratory, promptly inform the individuals as under Article 2.1.5, a), b), e), f), g), h).

- 2.5.9 If the “B” *Sample* Analysis does not confirm the adverse findings of the first analysis, it will be considered to be negative. Moreover, in the absence of further evidence and in the light of the specific circumstances of the case at hand, NADO Italia may declare the proceedings to have ended, notifying the individuals as under Article 2.1.5.

2.6 Identification of Prior *Anti-Doping Rule Violations*

Before giving an *Athlete* or other *Person* notice of a potential anti-doping rule violation, NADO Italia shall refer to *ADAMS* and contact *WADA* and other relevant *Anti-Doping Organizations* to determine whether any prior anti-doping rule violation exists.

ARTICLE 3 ***PROVISIONAL SUSPENSIONS***

3.1 *Mandatory Provisional Suspension after an Adverse Analytical Finding or Adverse Passport Finding*

Following an *Adverse Analytical Finding* or an *Adverse Passport Finding* related to any Non Specified Substance or *Prohibited Method* included in the List, NADO Italia, through the NADP, shall apply with the NADT for the infliction of a *Provisional Suspension* on the *Athlete*.

A mandatory *Provisional Suspension* may be eliminated if: (i) the *Athlete* demonstrates to the NADT that the violation is likely to have involved a *Contaminated Product*, or (ii) the violation involves a *Substance of Abuse* and the *Athlete* establishes entitlement to a reduced period of *Ineligibility* under ADSC Article 11.2.4.1. The decision of the NADT not to eliminate a mandatory *Provisional Suspension* on account of the *Athlete's* assertion regarding a *Contaminated Product* shall not be appealable.

3.2 *Optional Provisional Suspension Based on an Adverse Analytical Finding for Specified Substances, Specified Methods, Contaminated Products, or Other Anti-Doping Rule Violations*

Following an *Adverse Analytical Finding* related to any *Specified Substance* in the List, NADO Italia, through the NADP, may apply with the NADT for the infliction of a *Provisional Suspension* on the *Athlete*.

NADO Italia, through the NADP, may also apply with the NADT to seek *Provisional Suspension* of individuals considered as responsible for other anti-doping rule violations.

3.3 *Common rules – Mandatory and Optional Provisional Suspension*

3.3.1 In the cases of the Article 3.1 and 3.2, the NADT will, as a matter of urgency as well as *ex parte*, reach its decision serving immediate notice to the NADP, the individual concerned, the Club, the NSF/ASD/SPE as well as the relevant *International Federation*, National *Anti-Doping Organization* (if different from NADO Italia) and *WADA*. By the same decision, a mandatory period of three (3) days is granted to the individual concerned to produce evidence in order to possible withdrawal of the *Provisional Suspension*.

3.3.2 The Party shall, within three (3) days, request the NADT which adopted the *Provisional Suspension*, to review the decision enclosing the supporting evidence. The NADT shall immediately and in any case no later than four (4) days hold the hearing, in order to hear the individual concerned. At the end of the hearing, the NADT decides, giving immediate notice to the NADP, to the individual concerned, to the Club, to the National Sports Federation/Associated Sports Discipline/Sports Promotion Entity and other relevant Sports Organizations and to *WADA*. This is without prejudice to the right of the *Athlete* or of any other *Person* to appeal against the *Provisional Suspension* decision, within the deadline set out in Article 17.1.

- 3.3.3** All suspension measures are effective until the date on which it is notified (or deemed to be notified). The period of *Provisional Suspension* shall end with the final decision of the hearing panel, unless earlier lifted under Article 3.3.2. However, the period of *Provisional Suspension* shall not exceed the maximum length of the period of *Ineligibility* that may be imposed on the *Athlete* or other *Person* based on the relevant anti-doping rule violation(s). A *Provisional Suspension* means that an *Athlete* or other *Person* is barred temporarily from participating in any capacity in any *Competition* or activity as per *ADSC* Article 11.14.1, prior to the final decision at a hearing.
- 3.3.4** Suspension measure will lapse if the “B” *Sample* analysis does not confirm the “A” *Sample* analysis result, in the event the case is dismissed or if the *Athlete* and/or other individual concerned is acquitted or if a decision not to proceed against him/her is adopted. In any such circumstances, the *Athlete*, Club and/or any other individuals concerned shall not be entitled to any right of offset of whatsoever kind. In circumstances where the *Athlete* or the *Athlete's* team has been removed from an *Event* based on a violation of *ADSC* Article 2.1 and the subsequent B *Sample* analysis does not confirm the A *Sample* finding, then, if it is still possible for the *Athlete* or team to be reinserted, without otherwise affecting the *Event*, the *Athlete* or team may continue to take part in the *Event*.
- 3.3.5** The period of *Provisional Suspension* already served must be deducted in the event a disciplinary sanction is imposed.
- 3.3.6** The *Athlete* and/or other *Person* shall have the right to file an appeal against a measure pursuant to Article 17.

3.4 Voluntary Acceptance of *Provisional Suspension*

As per *Code* Article 7.4.4, *Athletes* on their own initiative may voluntarily accept a *Provisional Suspension*, giving written notice to the NADP and the NADT, if done so prior to the later of: (i) the expiration of ten (10) days from the report of the B *Sample* (or waiver of the B *Sample*) or ten (10) days from notification of any other anti-doping rule violation, or (ii) the date on which the *Athlete* first competes after such report or notification.

Other *Persons* on their own initiative may voluntarily accept a *Provisional Suspension*, giving notice to the NADP, if done so within ten (10) days from notification of the anti-doping rule violation. Upon such voluntary acceptance, the *Provisional Suspension* shall have the full effect and be treated in the same manner as if the *Provisional Suspension* had been imposed; provided, however, at any time after voluntarily accepting a *Provisional Suspension*, the *Athlete* or other *Person* may withdraw such acceptance, giving written notice to the NADP, in which event the *Athlete* or other *Person* shall not receive any credit for time previously served during the *Provisional Suspension*.

ARTICLE 4 PROCEEDING BY THE NADP

- 4.1** Upon learning of alleged anti-doping rule violations, the NADP may start disciplinary proceedings immediately or reflect this information in an appropriate register called “*Related Deeds*” if the facts are deemed to be generic, the offenders cannot be identified or if any other

reason presently prevents proceedings from starting.

- 4.2 When establishing the facts pertaining to a potential anti-doping rule violation, the NADP will start disciplinary proceedings against the person under investigation by serving notice as per Article 2.1.5, Article 2.2.3, Article 2.3.2 and 2.5.8.
- 4.3 The notice provided to the *Athlete* or other *Person* shall simultaneously be provided by the NADP to the *Athlete's* or other *Person's* National *Anti-Doping Organization(s)* (if different from NADO Italia), International Federation and *WADA* and shall promptly be reported into *ADAMS*, if applicable. Every NSF/ASD/SPE and their registered and affiliated members shall be required to provide assistance, if so requested, in the service of process for the individuals summoned to appear before the NADP and in the investigations started by the latter.
- 4.4 The disciplinary proceedings against the *Athlete* or other *Person* may take place remotely according to the indications provided by the NADP. During the hearing, the person under investigation shall have the right to rely on the aid of his/her own legal counsel or person of age enjoying his/her trust and, where necessary, an interpreter at his/her own expense. If the person under investigation is a *Minor* or a *Protected Person*, then the hearing must be attended by the holders of parental responsibility.
- 4.5 Within twenty-four (24) hours prior to the date of the hearing, the person under investigation shall be required to confirm his/her presence and notify the NADP office of the personal details of those attending the hearing.
- 4.6 Failure to personally appear at the hearing or claiming the right to silence by the person under investigation shall not result in the investigation being interrupted and/or postponed.
- 4.7 The person under investigation shall have the right to request the postponement of the hearing by filing an appropriate application containing the specific grounds thereof to be submitted to the NADP office at least two (2) days prior to the date set for the summons. The NADP shall promptly reach a decision notifying the person under investigation thereof. The postponement of the hearing may also be decided ex-officio by the NADP for logistic and/or organizational reasons.
- 4.8 Upon receipt of the *Athlete's* or other *Person's* explanation, the NADP may, without limitation, request further information and/or documents from the *Athlete* or other *Person* within a set deadline or liaise with third parties in order to assess the validity of the explanation.
- 4.9 The NADP shall have the power to likewise summon any other person, including a non-registered person, considered as witness of fact. Should such other person fail to appear or to provide written observations without providing any lawful and well-grounded reason for his/her impediment, then the provisions under Article 3.2 hereof shall apply. For the purpose of pursuing its own investigation goals, the NADP may also instruct that witness statements be compared between the individuals that have been summoned.
- 4.10 Should the person summoned as witness of fact be found to be liable the relevant charges shall be immediately notified to him/her, as per article 2.3, and the hearing, if any, shall be interrupted

and postponed to a later date in order to start investigations, provided that he/she shall have the right to waive such postponement as well as the appointment of a legal counsel so that he/she may be heard on the alleged charges forthwith.

ARTICLE 5 NOTICE OF CONCLUSION OF THE PROCEEDING AND NOTICE OF CHARGE

5.1 If, after receipt of the *Athlete* or other *Person's* explanation or expiry of the deadline to provide such explanation, or after the hearing of the *Athlete* or other *Person*, the NADP is (still) satisfied that the *Athlete* or other *Person* has committed (an) anti-doping rule violation(s), it shall promptly notify, in writing, the *Athlete* or other *Person* and/or or his/her legal counsel, if appointed, with the anti-doping rule violation(s) they are asserted to have breached. In this letter of notice of conclusion of the proceeding, the NADP:

- a) shall set out the provision(s) of its anti-doping rules asserted to have been violated by the *Athlete* or other *Person*;
- b) shall provide a detailed summary of the relevant facts upon which the assertion is based;
- c) shall indicate the specific *Consequences* being sought in the event that the asserted antidoping rule violation(s) is/are upheld and that such *Consequences* shall have binding effect on all *Signatories* in all sports and countries as per *Code* Article 15;
- d) shall grant a deadline of twenty (20) days from receipt of the letter of notice of conclusion of the proceeding (which may be extended only in exceptional cases) to the *Athlete* or other *Person* to admit the anti-doping rule violation asserted and to accept the proposed *Consequences* by signing, dating and returning an acceptance of *Consequences* form, which shall be enclosed with the letter;
- e) informs the *Athlete* or other *Person* that, for the eventuality that she/he does not accept in writing the proposed *Consequences* within the deadline of twenty (20) days from receipt of the letter of notice of conclusion of the proceeding, the NADP will refer the person under investigation to the NADT within ten (10) days;
- f) informs the *Athlete* or other *Person* that they may be able to obtain a suspension of *Consequences* if they provide *Substantial Assistance* under *ADSC* Article 11.7.1, may admit the anti-doping rule violation(s) within twenty (20) days from receipt of the notice and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of *Ineligibility* under *ADSC* Article 11.8.1 (if applicable) and/or seek to enter into a case resolution agreement by admitting the anti-doping rule violation(s) under *ADSC* Article 11.8.2 and under RMP Article 7.
- g) shall set out any matters relating to *Provisional Suspension* as per Article 3 (if applicable).

5.2 The notice of charge referred to in Article 5.1 e) is lodged by the NADP to the NADT with copy of the relevant investigation file and sent to the *Athlete* or other *Person* and/or or his/her legal counsel, if appointed. It contains the decision adopted by the NADP and indicates the right of the *Athlete* or other *Person* to request a hearing within twenty (20) days from the notice. The person under investigation, *WADA* and the International Federation shall have the right to (i) view the documents in the case only after they have been filed with the NADT and (ii) make copies thereof at their own expense, save for *WADA* and International Federation concerned who shall not be required to pay any administrative fee.

The notice of charge shall indicate that the *Athlete* or other *Person* may be able to obtain a suspension of *Consequences* if they provide *Substantial Assistance* under *ADSC* Article 11.7.1, may admit the anti-doping rule violation(s) within twenty (20) days from receipt of the letter of charge and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of *Ineligibility* under *ADSC* Article 11.8.1 (if applicable) and/or seek to enter into a case resolution agreement by admitting the anti-doping rule violation(s) under *ADSC* Article 11.8.2 and under RMP Article 7.

It shall set out any matters relating to *Provisional Suspension* as per Article 3 (if applicable).

The notice of charge shall be notified by NADO Italia also to the *Athlete's* National *Anti-Doping Organization(s)*, if different from NADO Italia, International Federation, International Olympic Committee and International Paralympic Committee, if applicable, as parties to the first instance judgement and notified to the relevant NSF/ASD/SPE and Club and *WADA*, and, if applicable, it shall be reported promptly into *ADAMS*.

- 5.3 In absence of agreement after the notice of the conclusion of the proceeding, the notice of charge to an *Athlete* or other *Person* subject to *Provisional Suspension* pursuant to Article 3 must be transmitted to the NADT promptly and, in any case, no later than thirty (30) days from the date of notification of the suspension measure referred to above, except in case of needs related to the investigations, request of B *Sample* analysis, time limits to submit defensive brief or if appeals against a *Provisional Suspension* are pending.
- 5.4 If an *Athlete* or other *Person* retires while the NADO Italia's *Results Management* process is underway, NADO Italia's retains authority to complete its *Results Management* process. If an *Athlete* or other *Person* retires before any *Results Management* process has begun, and NADO Italia would have had *Results Management Authority* over the *Athlete* or other *Person* at the time the *Athlete* or other *Person* committed an anti-doping rule violation, NADO Italia has authority to conduct *Results Management*.
- 5.6 Upon request of the Judicial Authorities, the NADP shall provide a copy of the decision and related documents in the case.

ARTICLE 6 JURISDICTION CRITERIA

- 6.1 The NADT has the authority to pass first instance judgement for all *ADSC* violations committed by *Athletes* who are not included in the NADO Italia's RTP and in the RTP of the relevant International Federation or are not *International-Level Athletes* as well as *ADSC* violations committed by other registered and not registered individuals.
- 6.2 The NADT has also the authority to pass first instance judgement for *ADSC* violations committed by *Athletes* who are included in the NADO Italia's RTP and in the RTP of the relevant International Federation or are *International-Level Athletes*, or violations arising from participating in an International sports *Event*, as well as judgements connected therewith. It also has the authority to pass first instance judgement on disciplinary proceedings lying within the province of another ADO if the latter has delegated such proceedings to NADO Italia.
- 6.3 The NADT has the exclusive authority to review the decisions adopted by NADO Italia with

respect to Failures due to “Filing Failure” and/or “Missed Test” if so requested by the *Athlete*.

- 6.4 The NADAB has the authority to decide on appeal against *Provisional Suspension* rulings, as under Article 17, issued by the NADT.
- 6.5 Appeals against the decisions of the TUEC whereby the latter rejects the granting of a *TUE* may be lodged to NADAB.
- 6.6 Appeals against first instance decisions adopted by the NADT may be lodged to NADAB, according to the Article 18.

ARTICLE 7 APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS ON REQUEST WITHOUT HEARING

- 7.1 During the management of the results, after the notice of conclusion of the proceeding, and/or after the notice of charge and, in any case, prior to the hearing before the NADT, it is the right of the *Athlete* or other *Person* to admit the violation of the disputed anti-doping rule violation, to waive the hearing and agree with the NADP the *Consequences* arising from the violation committed. The agreement, signed by the NADP and the *Athlete* or other *Person*, must contain the nature and extent of the sanctions, as well as any other item inherent to the agreement. The signed agreement is ratified by the Director of NADO Italia.
- 7.2 The ratified agreements adopted pursuant to Article 7.1 will be reported, according to Article 22, to *WADA*, the International Federation concerned or by another competent ADO, with right to appeal under *ADSC* Article 18.
- 7.3 If new facts or facts emerge which were not known to the NADP at the time of the agreement and which would not have enabled the agreement to be defined in the terms signed, the procedure may be reopened.
- 7.4 Publication of the ratification of the agreement is subject to the provisions of *ADSC* Article 19.
- 7.5 This Article shall not apply in cases of second or further infringement.

ARTICLE 8 PROCEDURE FOR THE SUSPENSION OF THE PERIODS OF INELIGIBILITY OR OTHER CONSEQUENCES IMPOSED UNDER ADSC

ARTICLE 11.7.1

8.1 Before the Decision Becomes Final

Before the disciplinary action taken against him or her becomes final, the *Athlete* or other *Person* being subject to sanctions may benefit from a suspension of a part of the *Ineligibility* period as under *ADSC* Article 11.7.1.

The application for suspension, signed personally by the individual concerned and containing the reasons upon which it is based, must be submitted to the NADP. Subject to investigations

and findings as may be necessary, the NADP shall, within thirty (30) days which may be extended to additional thirty (30) days in the event of particularly complex investigations, may approve the application for suspension.

The suspension of *Consequences* for *Substantial Assistance* may also be adopted *ex-officio* by the NADP where substantial assistance was provided before the NADP during the investigation phase.

8.2 After the Decision Becomes Final

Once the disciplinary measure taken against him or her becomes final, the individual being subject to sanctions may benefit from a suspension of a part of the *Ineligibility* period as under *ADSC* Article 11.7.1.2 by applying with the NADP, subject to approval by *WADA* and the relevant International Federation.

The application for suspension, duly signed and containing the reasons upon which it is based, must be submitted to the NADP. Subject to investigations and findings as may be necessary, the NADP shall, within thirty (30) days which may be extended to additional thirty (30) days in the event of particularly complex investigations, submit the suspension proposal to *WADA* and the relevant International Federation for their evaluation and opinion, expressly stating the measure deemed as applicable or a motivated request for rejection.

8.3 Common Rules

For the purposes of identifying the procedure as outlined here above, reference shall be made to the date on which the application for suspension is submitted.

ARTICLE 9 PARTIES OF FIRST INSTANCE PROCEEDINGS

- 9.1 The following entities shall be deemed to be parties to first instance proceedings: person under investigation and NADO Italia, through the NADP.

ARTICLE 10 TERMINATION OF PROCEEDINGS

If, following the review and notification pursuant to Article 2, the PNA considers not to proceed with the charge, it shall send the documents, with a request for filing, to the NADT. The NADT shall, *ex-parte*:

- a) uphold the request and cause the case to be dismissed;
- b) reject the request and send the documents back to the NADP for further investigations, stating the additional investigations deemed as necessary;
- c) reject the request, asking the NADP to proceed *ex* Article 5.

The decisions under Article 10 a) shall be sent to *WADA*, the relevant International Federation, the *National Anti-Doping Organization* of the *Person's* country of residence (if different from NADO Italia), the International Olympic Committee, and International Paralympic Committee (where applicable) and notified to the relevant NSF/ASD/SPE and Club.

ARTICLE 11 START OF FIRST HEARING PROCEEDINGS

11.1 If the *Athlete* or other *Person* requests a hearing within twenty (20) days from the date of receipt of the notice of charge, the NADT shall schedule the hearing within forty (40) days, that shall be held in a reasonable timeframe to ensure the *Results Management* (including the Hearing Process at first instance) will be concluded within six (6) months from the notification as per Article 2. If the *Athlete* does not request the hearing within the indicated deadline, the hearing will be conducted, in chamber of council and without the *Athlete* or other *Person* having been heard, within a reasonable timeframe as above from the submission of the investigation file according to Article 5.1 e).

The timeliness is assured, save for cases involving complex issues or delays not in the control of NADO Italia.

The charged person shall have the right to formally waive the requested hearing or refrain from disputing the disciplinary charges pressed against him/her. Such waiver must be submitted to the NADT and the other parties to the case within ten (10) days prior to the date set for the hearing. In this event, the NADT shall decide in chamber of council and without the *Athlete* or other *Person* having been heard. The decision shall be notified as pursuant to Article 14.

11.2 The date of the hearing must be notified to the parties to the case at least twenty (20) days in advance.

11.3 In the event that the order concerns an *Athlete* or other *Person* subject to *Provisional Suspension* pursuant to Article 3, the term to set the hearing is seven (7) days and the date of the hearing must fall within the following thirty (30) days.

11.4 Within and not later than ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing, the parties may file a defence brief with the NADT containing their own, evidentiary allegations, arguments and defense submissions and, under penalty of cancellation, any measures of enquiry (e.g. admission of witnesses, opinions by experts appointed by the court, appointment of defense experts, if any). The aforesaid brief shall, under penalty of exclusion, be notified to the other parties to the case within the same deadline of ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing according to the same terms and conditions as under Article 22.

11.5 Within and not later than five (5) days prior to the date of the hearing, the parties shall have the power to file a reply brief to those referred to in Article 11.4. The aforesaid reply brief shall, under penalty of exclusion, be notified to the other parties to the case within the same deadline of five (5) days prior to the date of the hearing according to the same terms and conditions as under Article 22.

11.6 The NADT shall be responsible for notifying the procedural briefs to *WADA* and the relevant International Federation, if appropriate.

11.7 No submissions or defence briefs shall be allowed other than those listed above or may be filed after the final deadlines as set forth.

11.8 The parties to the case shall have the right to seek the postponement of the hearing by filing an appropriate application containing specific grounds for such postponement. The application must be sent to the office of the NADT at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing, except in cases of proven emergency. If the application is filed by the *Athlete* or other *Person*, it must be notified to the

NADP for its perusal and opinion. The President of the NADT shall reach a final decision within two (2) days after the application is filed. The acceptance of the postponement shall not cause the deadlines set for the submission of the briefs to be postponed if such deadlines have already expired.

The postponement of the hearing may also be ordered *ex parte* by the President of the NADT due to logistic and/or organizational reasons. Again, any such postponement shall not cause the deadlines set for the submission of the briefs to be postponed if such deadlines have already expired.

- 11.9 Hearings may also take place remotely by the participants joining together using technology, according to the indications provided by the NADT.

ARTICLE 12 SINGLE HEARING BEFORE CAS

12.1 Pursuant to *Code* Article 8.5, anti-doping rule violations asserted against *International Level Athletes*, *National-Level Athletes* or other *Persons* may, with the consent of the *Athlete* or other *Person*, NADO Italia and *WADA*, be heard in a single hearing directly at *CAS* under *CAS* appellate procedures, with no requirement for a prior hearing, or as otherwise agreed by the parties.

12.2 If the *Athlete* or other *Person* and NADO Italia agree to proceed with a single hearing before *CAS*, it shall be the responsibility of NADO Italia to liaise in writing with *WADA* to determine whether it agrees to the proposal. Should *WADA* not agree (in its entire discretion), then the case shall be heard by the NADT.

ARTICLE 13 FIRST HEARING PROCEEDING – DISCUSSION

13.1 Disputes shall be discussed in closed session, unless the *Athlete* or other *Person* requests a public hearing, or unless NADO Italia requests a public hearing and the *Athlete* or other *Person* agrees to the same, and recording thereof, by filing a motivated motion with the NADT within seven (7) days of the date set for the hearing. After receipt of the written consent of the *Athlete* or other *Person*, the NADT shall uphold the motion unless the need for confidentiality and/or protection of the individuals involved in the proceedings otherwise requires, in accordance with the ISRM.

13.2 The *Athlete* or other *Person* shall have the right to (i) appear in person, if not a *Protected Person*, or through the holder of parental responsibility, if a *Minor* or a *Protected Person*, (ii) be aided by his/her own counsel during the hearing and (iii) seek the support of an interpreter, if necessary, whose personal details must be notified to the NADT within twenty-four (24) hours prior to the date set for the hearing so that accreditation papers may be issued.

13.3 Failure to appear at the hearing by the party and/or his/her counsel shall not result in the proceedings being suspended, interrupted or postponed inasmuch as proceedings shall continue in their absence.

13.4 Failure to appear at the hearing by the accused without a sound reason may constitute a conduct which may be considered when reaching a decision.

13.5 The NADP shall attend the proceedings with one or more members; the International Federation and *WADA* may attend the hearing through their own representatives.

- 13.6** The Chairman of the Panel or a member appointed by him/her shall report on the case and then the parties shall be heard, keeping the discussion as brief as possible.
- 13.7** The Chairman of the Panel may ask questions to the parties or dispute facts stated by the accused or witnesses during the preliminary phase.
- 13.8** If a new fact or a fact that proves different compared to the way it is stated in the referral deed is brought to light during the hearing, the NADP shall change the accusation and charge the accused, if in attendance, who shall have the right to either accept cross examination immediately or request a postponement of the hearing. If the accused is not in attendance, the NADP may ask the Chairman of the Panel to cause any such different charge to be reflected in the hearing report and that such report be sent to the accused. In this event, the Chairman of the Panel shall suspend the hearing and set a new hearing for the continuation of proceedings.
- 13.9** A brief report of the hearing shall be drawn up by the Office of the NADT.

13.10 Measures of Enquiry

- 13.10.1** The Panel shall either accept or reject the measures of enquiry requested by the party by resolution adopted during the hearing.
- 13.10.2** To the extent as it shall deem necessary, the Panel may seek the opinion of an expert. To this end, it shall define the (i) questions to be dealt with, including on an *inter partes* basis, (ii) deadline by which the expert opinion must be filed, and the parties' memos must be submitted, and (iii) the date of the next hearing. The parties may also rely on the aid of their own expert, whose personal details must be notified as pursuant to Article 13.2.
- 13.10.3** The Panel shall be vested with the broadest preliminary investigation powers and may likewise entrust the NADP with the performance of specific investigations or further appraisals.

ARTICLE 14 FIRST INSTANCE PROCEEDING – DECISION

- 14.1** Following the hearing, the text of the decision shall be immediately read out to the parties, unless the complexity or magnitude of the matters to be decided upon or the need to renew individual deeds lead the Chairman of the Panel to deem it appropriate to postpone such reading to another hearing or arrange for such text to be notified in writing without reading it out during the hearing.
- 14.2** If it is not possible to draft the grounds immediately during the closed session meeting, it shall be done within thirty (30) days after the text of the decision has been notified.
- 14.3** The operative part and the decision with grounds shall be notified to the parties pursuant to Article 22. The operative part with the former also being notified to the relevant NSF/ASD/SPE and Club.

ARTICLE 15 REVIEW OF TUEC'S DECISIONS

- 15.1** The *Athlete* shall have the right to file an appeal with the NADAB, in accordance with the applicable procedural rules, against any decision of rejection of a *TUE* by the TUEC of NADO Italia.
- 15.2** Appeals shall not cause a stay of a rejection decision adopted by the TUEC of NADO Italia.

ARTICLE 16 REVIEW OF THE DECISIONS OF THE NADP REGARDING FILING FAILURE AND/OR MISSED TEST

- 16.1** The *Athlete* may, within and not later than ten (10) days of receipt of notice of Failure by the NADP, apply with the NADT for a review of the decisions adopted regarding Filing Failure or Missed Test. Under penalty of exclusion, the *Athlete* shall be required to produce receipt of payment of the administrative fees as per Financial Schedule of Fees available on NADO Italia's website (www.nadoitalia.it).
- 16.2** The request for review must also be notified to the NADP within the same deadline. The NADP will, within five (5) days, submit the case file to the NADT together with an accompanying note, if appropriate.
- 16.3** The Panel shall proceed with the review in closed session based on the documents acquired, without prejudice to the right to seek further information from the *Athlete* and NADP.
- 16.4** The review shall end fourteen (14) days after receipt of the *Athlete's* request and the decision shall be notified to the *Athlete* and NADP no later than seven (7) days after the date of the decision.
- 16.5** If the request for review is upheld, the Panel shall cause for the NADP's decision to be cancelled, stating the grounds and notifying the *Athlete*, NADP, WADA and the relevant *International Federation*.
- 16.6** In the event the request for review is rejected, the Panel shall inform the *Athlete* and NADP thereof, with the latter discharging the resulting formalities.
- 16.7** The decision whereby the Panel confirms the measures taken by the NADP shall be final. If the decision of the Panel is to revoke the measures taken by the NADP, *WADA* and the *International Federation* shall have the right of appeal against that decision, in accordance with *Code* Article 13.

ARTICLE 17 APPEAL AGAINST *PROVISIONAL SUSPENSION* DECISIONS

- 17.1** An appeal against a *Provisional Suspension* as under Article 3 may be filed by the *Athlete* or other *Person* upon whom the *Provisional Suspension* is imposed. The appeal must be filed with the NADAB according to the applicable procedural rules, within and not later than ten (10) days after notice of the decision of *Provisional Suspension*.

ARTICLE 18 APPEAL AGAINST FIRST INSTANCE DECISIONS

- 18.1** First instance decisions – except for the decisions involving *Athletes* who are included in the *Registered Testing Pool* (RTP) of the relevant International Federation or *International Level Athlete* or in cases arising from the participation in *International Events* – adopted, as pursuant to Article 6, by the NADT may be appealed in writing before NADAB, in accordance with the applicable procedural rules, within and not later than fifteen (15) days of receipt of the decision, without prejudice to other deadlines granted by *WADA* in the cases governed by *Code* Article 13.
- 18.2** First instance decisions adopted, as pursuant to Article 6, by the NADT for *ADSC* violations committed by *Athletes* who are *International-Level Athletes*, or violations arising from participating in an *International Event*, may be lodged to *CAS*, according to the applicable procedural rules. The decisions adopted by *CAS* may be appealed against before the Swiss Federal Tribunal, observing the procedures established by the said jurisdictional body.
- 18.3** All of the decisions referred to in *ADSC* Article 18.2 may be subject to appeal.
- 18.4** The following individuals shall have the right to appeal against first instance decisions adopted by the NADT: the *Athlete* or Other Person being sanctioned; NADP; relevant International Federation; National *Anti-Doping Organization* of the country where the *Athlete* or Other Person have their residence; *WADA*; IOC and 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.
- 18.5** The parties to the case at first instance shall be considered to be parties to the appeal proceedings, without prejudice to the right to attend or right to appeal for other parties who were not parties to the case.
- 18.6** If none of the parties appeals against a first instance decision, then *WADA* shall have the right to file an appeal against such decision directly with the *CAS* as pursuant to *Code* Article 13.1.3.
- 18.7** The appeal shall not result in a stay of a first instance decision.
- 18.8** The appeal lodged with the NADAB must be notified to the other parties as pursuant to Article 22, while reference shall be made to the specific provisions of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (*CAS*) with respect to the terms and conditions for lodging an appeal before such body and notifying it to the parties concerned.
- 18.9** The appeal must be lodged by *WADA*, depending on the circumstance that arises subsequently, within: (a) twenty-one (21) days after expiry of the deadline by which the other parties to first instance proceedings were to file an appeal; (b) twenty-one (21) days after receipt of the complete case file pertaining to the first instance decision.

ARTICLE 19 CROSS-APPEAL

19.1 If one of the parties has filed an appeal against a first instance decision, the other parties may file an incidental appeal according to the NADAB applicable procedural rules and according to the applicable procedural rules of *CAS*, if competent, and the *ADSC* Article 18.2.4.

ARTICLE 20 EXCLUSION AND OBJECTION

- 20.1** The judge shall be required to abstain from attending proceedings if:
- a) he/she or one of his/her close relatives has an interest in the case he/she brought before him/her;
 - b) he/she or his/her spouse is a next of kin of one of the parties or counsels in the case brought before him/her;
 - c) he/she holds serious enmity towards or has conflicts with one of the parties or any of the counsels in the case brought before him/her;
 - d) he/she carried out investigation tasks with respect to the case brought before him/her or related cases or acted as legal or technical expert in such cases.
- 20.2** In all other cases where serious grounds exist, including those indicated in the ISRM, the judge shall be required to abstain from attending proceedings.
- 20.3** A decision on the request for abstention submitted by the member shall be reached by the Panel, excluding the member submitting such request, *ex parte* within fifteen (15) days of the request being submitted. The decision so adopted shall be final.
- 20.4** If each party believes that the conditions under a), b), c) or d) of Article 20.1 (obligation for the judge to abstain) are fulfilled, they may seek the challenge of the members of NADT by submitting a written request, to be signed personally by the party or his/her own counsel holding appropriate proxy. The request must contain the specific grounds for the challenge as well as the evidence provided within three (3) days of the reason warranting the challenge being disclosed. The office of the NADT shall cause a notice to be served on the other parties to the case and the challenged member, who may submit his/her own comments within the following three (3) days.
- 20.5** A decision on the request for challenge submitted by the party shall be reached by the Panel, excluding the challenged member, *ex parte* within fifteen (15) days of the request being submitted. The decision so adopted shall be final.
- 20.6** A challenge will cause disciplinary proceedings to be suspended, without prejudice to the effects of any *Provisional Suspension* inflicted under Article 3, unless such measure has already expired.
- 20.7** The order upholding the request for challenge shall exclude the challenged judge from the case. The challenge shall be declared inadmissible if the request is not submitted as specified under the previous paragraph.
- 20.8** If the challenge is deemed to be inadmissible or rejected, the challenged judge may take part in the proceedings.
- 20.9** Under the order whereby the challenge is deemed to be inadmissible or rejected, the Panel may rule that

the unsuccessful party should bear the cost of proceedings as per Financial Schedule of Fees available on NADO Italia's website (www.nadoitalia.it).

- 20.10 The order whereby the request for challenge is upheld or rejected shall be notified by the office of the NADT to the applicant, the judge being challenged as well the other parties to the case.
- 20.11 To the extent as applicable, the foregoing paragraphs shall also apply to any expert appointed by the court.

ARTICLE 21 LAPSING AND SUSPENSION OF PROCEDURAL TIME LIMITS

- 21.1 The lapsing of procedural time limits relating to proceedings started before the NADT shall be suspended *ipso facto* for a summer period not exceeding thirty (30) days per year or in other periods of the year to be identified by decision of the President of NADT and shall become effective again as of the end of the suspension period. The decision shall be published on NADO Italia's website (www.nadoitalia.it). If the lapsing of procedural time limits starts during the suspension period, then time limits shall be deemed to start at the end of such period.
- 21.2 Limited to the periods during which NADO Italia office is closed, the operations of organizations providing support to anti-doping bodies may suffer disruptions.
- 21.3 When calculating procedural time limits, the starting day shall not be calculated, whereas the final day will. If the day of expiry of time limits falls on a holiday, then the expiry shall be postponed *ipso facto* to the first working day thereafter. The time limits expressly defined as final under the ADSRs shall be considered as such.

ARTICLE 22 NOTICES AND COMMUNICATIONS

- 22.1 NADO Italia shall notify *Athletes*, other *Persons* and other *Anti-Doping Organizations* with a right of appeal under *Code* Article 13.2.3 and *WADA* of the decisions as provided in *Code* Article 14 and in the ISRM Article 9.2.
- 22.2 Without prejudice to the provisions as under 22.3 here below, notices to be served by the NADP and the NADT shall be delivered either by registered mail with acknowledgement of receipt, fax, cable, courier or email as follows:
- if sent to private individuals: to the address chosen for the purposes of the proceedings or, failing which, to the address shown in the anti-doping *Sample* collection report as well as the address filed with the records at the time of registering with the relevant NSF/ASD/SPE; to the place of residence or such other place as specified by the judicial authorities for non-registered individuals;
 - if sent to clubs: to the registered office as filed with the records at the time of registration with the relevant NSF/ASD/PSE.
- 22.3 Notices to be served by the NADP for Filing Failure and Missed Test shall be delivered by registered email or registered letter.

- 22.4** The NSF/ASD/PSE, relevant sports organizations and/or club the *Athlete* is registered with shall, where requested, be required to ensure that the individual concerned has received the foregoing notices and, if not, see to it forthwith.
- 22.5** In the event of a registered individual being unavailable, notification shall be deemed to have been served by delivering the deed to the relevant NSF/ASD/PSE and/or Club.
- 22.6** In the event of a non-registered individual being unavailable, notification shall be deemed to have been served by filing the deed with the NADP's office or the NADT to the extent as lying within their respective province.
- 22.7** For the purposes of checking the timely service of process, reference shall be made solely to the date shown on the postmark set by the Post Office accepting the registered mail with acknowledgement of receipt or certifying delivery to the courier or receipt by fax, cable or email.
- 22.8** During the hearing held before the NADP or, failing which, in the first act of defence, the parties shall be required to state the email address where they wish to receive communications. Failing this, communications may be forwarded to any personal email address of the *Athlete* already known to the relevant NSF/ASD/SPE and/or International Federation.

ANNEX A – REVIEW OF A POSSIBLE FAILURE TO COMPLY

A.1 Responsibility

A.1.1 NADO Italia is responsible for ensuring that:

- a) When the possible Failure to Comply comes to its attention, it notifies *WADA*, and instigates review of the possible Failure to Comply based on all relevant information and documentation;
- b) The *Athlete* or other *Person* is informed of the possible Failure to Comply in writing and has the opportunity to respond in accordance with Article 2.3.2;
- c) The review is conducted without unnecessary delay and the evaluation process is documented; and
- d) If it decides not to move forward with the matter, its decision is notified in accordance with Article 10.

A.1.2 The DCO is responsible for providing a detailed written report of any possible Failure to Comply.

A.2 Requirements

A.2.1 Any potential Failure to Comply shall be reported by the DCO to NADO Italia and/or followed up by the Testing Authority and reported to the Results Management Authority as soon as practicable.

A.2.2 If NADO Italia determines that there has been a potential Failure to Comply, the *Athlete* or other *Person* shall be promptly notified in accordance with Article 2.3.2 and further *Results Management* shall be conducted as per Article 2 *et seq.*

A.2.3 Any additional necessary information about the potential Failure to Comply shall be obtained from all relevant sources (including the *Athlete* or other *Person*) as soon as possible and recorded.

A.2.4 NADO Italia shall establish a system for ensuring that the outcomes of its reviews into potential Failures to Comply are considered for *Results Management* action and, if applicable, for further planning and *Target Testing*.

ANNEX B – RESULTS MANAGEMENT FOR WHEREABOUTS FAILURES

B.1 Determining a Potential Whereabouts Failure

B.1.1 Three (3) Whereabouts Failures by an *Athlete* within any 12-month period amount to an anti-doping rule violation under *Code* Article 2.4. The Whereabouts Failures may be any combination of Filing Failures and/or Missed Tests declared in accordance with Article B.3 and adding up to three (3) in total.

B.1.2 The 12-month period referred to in *Code* Article 2.4 starts to run on the date that an *Athlete* commits the first Whereabouts Failure being relied upon in support of the allegation of a violation of *Code* Article 2.4. If two (2) more Whereabouts Failures occur during the ensuing 12-month period, then *Code* Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation is committed, irrespective of any *Samples* successfully collected from the *Athlete* during that 12-month period. However, if an *Athlete* who has committed one (1) Whereabouts Failure does not go on to commit a further two (2) Whereabouts Failures within the 12-months, at the end of that 12-month period, the first Whereabouts Failure “expires” for purposes of *Code* Article 2.4, and a new 12-month period begins to run from the date of their next Whereabouts Failure.

B.1.3 For purposes of determining whether a Whereabouts Failure has occurred within the 12-month period referred to in *Code* Article 2.4:

- a) A Filing Failure will be deemed to have occurred (i) where the *Athlete* fails to provide complete information in due time in advance of an upcoming quarter, on the first day of that quarter, and (ii) where any information provided by the *Athlete* (whether in advance of the quarter or by way of update) transpires to be inaccurate, on the (first) date on which such information can be shown to be inaccurate; and
- b) A Missed Test will be deemed to have occurred on the date that the *Sample* collection was unsuccessfully attempted.

B.1.4 Whereabouts Failures committed by the *Athlete* prior to retirement as defined in ISTI Article 4.8.7.3 may be combined, for purposes of *Code* Article 2.4, with Whereabouts Failures committed by the *Athlete* after the *Athlete* again becomes available for *Out-of-Competition Testing*.

B.2 Requirements for a Potential Filing Failure or Missed Test

B.2.1 An *Athlete* may only be declared to have committed a Filing Failure where NADO Italia establishes each of the following:

- a) That the *Athlete* was duly notified: (i) that they had been designated for inclusion in a *Registered Testing Pool*; (ii) of the consequent requirement to make Whereabouts Filing; and (iii) of the *Consequences* of any Failure to Comply with that requirement;
- b) That the *Athlete* failed to comply with that requirement by the applicable deadline;
- c) In the case of a second or third Filing Failure, that they were given notice, in accordance with Article B.3.2(d), of the previous Filing Failure, and (if that Filing Failure revealed deficiencies in the Whereabouts Filing that would lead to further Filing Failures if not rectified) was advised in

the notice that in order to avoid a further Filing Failure they must file the required Whereabouts Filing (or update) by the deadline specified in the notice (which must be within 48 hours after receipt of the notice) and yet failed to rectify that Filing Failure by the deadline specified in the notice; and

- d) That the *Athlete's* failure to file was at least negligent. For these purposes, the *Athlete* will be presumed to have committed the failure negligently upon proof that they were notified of the requirements yet did not comply with them. That presumption may only be rebutted by the *Athlete* establishing that no negligent behavior on their part caused or contributed to the failure.

B.2.2 While *Code* Article 5.2 specifies that every *Athlete* must submit to *Testing* at any time and place upon request by an *Anti-Doping Organization* with *Testing* Authority over them, in addition, an *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* must specifically be present and available for *Testing* on any given day during the 60-minute time slot specified for that day in their Whereabouts Filing, at the location that the *Athlete* has specified for that time slot in such filing. Where this requirement is not met by the *Athlete*, it shall be pursued as an apparent Missed Test. If the *Athlete* is tested during such a time slot, the *Athlete* must remain with the DCO until the *Sample* collection has been completed, even if this takes longer than the 60-minute time slot. A failure to do so shall be pursued as an apparent violation of *Code* Article 2.3 (refusal or failure to submit to *Sample* collection).

B.2.3 To ensure fairness to the *Athlete*, where an unsuccessful attempt has been made to test an *Athlete* during one of the 60-minute time slots specified in their Whereabouts Filing, any subsequent unsuccessful attempt to test that *Athlete* (by the same or any other *Anti-Doping Organization*) during one of the 60-minute time slots specified in their Whereabouts Filing may only be counted as a Missed Test (or, if the unsuccessful attempt was because the information filed was insufficient to find the *Athlete* during the time slot, as a Filing Failure) against that *Athlete* if that subsequent attempt takes place after the *Athlete* has received notice, in accordance with Article B.3.2(d), of the original unsuccessful attempt.

B.2.4 An *Athlete* may only be declared to have committed a Missed Test where NADO Italia can establish each of the following:

- a) that when the *Athlete* was given notice that they had been designated for inclusion in the *Registered Testing Pool*, they were advised that they would be liable for a Missed Test if they were unavailable for *Testing* during the 60-minute time slot specified in their Whereabouts Filing at the location specified for that time slot;
- b) that a DCO attempted to test the *Athlete* on a given day in the quarter, during the 60-minute time slot specified in the *Athlete's* Whereabouts Filing for that day, by visiting the location specified for that time slot;
- c) that during that specified 60-minute time slot, the DCO did what was reasonable in the circumstances (i.e. given the nature of the specified location) to try to locate the *Athlete*, short of giving the *Athlete* any advance notice of the test;
- d) that Article B.2.3 does not apply or (if it applies) was complied with; and
- e) that the *Athlete's* non-availability for *Testing* at the specified location during the specified 60-minute time slot was at least negligent. For these purposes, the *Athlete* will be presumed to have

been negligent upon proof of the matters set out at sub-Articles B.2.4 (a) to (d). That presumption may only be rebutted by the *Athlete* establishing that no negligent behavior on their part caused or contributed to their failure (i) to be available for *Testing* at such location during such time slot, and (ii) to update their most recent Whereabouts Filing to give notice of a different location where they would instead be available for *Testing* during a specified 60-minute time slot on the relevant day.

B.3 Results Management for a Potential Whereabouts Failure

B.3.1 In accordance with *Code* Articles 7.1.6, NADO Italia is the Results Management Authority in relation to potential Whereabouts Failures committed by an *Athlete* that files whereabouts information towards NADO Italia.

B.3.2 When a Whereabouts Failure appears to have occurred, NADO Italia shall proceed as follows:

- a) If the apparent Whereabouts Failure has been uncovered by an attempt to test the *Athlete*, NADO Italia shall timely obtain an Unsuccessful Attempt Report from the DCO. If the Testing Authority is different from the Results Management Authority, it shall provide the Unsuccessful Attempt Report to the Results Management Authority without delay, and thereafter it shall assist the Results Management Authority as necessary in obtaining information from the DCO in relation to the apparent Whereabouts Failure.
- b) NADO Italia shall timely review the file (including any Unsuccessful Attempt Report filed by the DCO) to determine whether all of the Article B.2.1 requirements (in the case of a Filing Failure) or all of the Article B.2.4 requirements (in the case of a Missed Test) are met. It shall gather information as necessary from third parties (e.g., the DCO whose test attempt uncovered the Filing Failure or triggered the Missed Test) to assist it in this task.
- c) If NADO Italia concludes that any of the relevant requirements have not been met (so that no Whereabouts Failure should be declared), it shall so advise *WADA*, the International Federation, and the *Anti-Doping Organization* that uncovered the Whereabouts Failure, if different from NADO Italia, giving reasons for its decision. Each of them shall have a right of appeal against that decision in accordance with *Code* Article 13.
- d) If NADO Italia concludes that all of the relevant requirements as set out in B.2.1 (Filing Failure) and B.2.4 (Missed Test) have been met, it should notify the *Athlete* within fourteen (14) days of the date of the apparent Whereabouts Failure. The notice shall include sufficient details of the apparent Whereabouts Failure to enable the *Athlete* to respond meaningfully, and shall give the *Athlete* a reasonable deadline to respond, advising whether they admit the Whereabouts Failure and, if they do not admit to the Whereabouts Failure, then an explanation as to why not. The notice should also advise the *Athlete* that three (3) Whereabouts Failures in any 12-month period is a *Code* Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation, and should note whether they had any other Whereabouts Failures recorded against them in the previous twelve (12) months. In the case of a Filing Failure, the notice must also advise the *Athlete* that in order to avoid a further Filing Failure they must file the missing whereabouts information by the deadline specified in the notice, which must be within 48 hours after receipt of the notice.

- e) If the *Athlete* does not respond within the specified deadline, NADO Italia shall record the notified Whereabouts Failure against them.

If the *Athlete* does respond within the deadline, NADO Italia shall consider whether their response changes its original decision that all of the requirements for recording a Whereabouts Failure have been met.

- i. If so, it shall so advise the *Athlete*, *WADA*, the International Federation, and the *Anti-Doping Organization* that uncovered the Whereabouts Failure, if different from NADO Italia, giving reasons for its decision. Each of them shall have a right of appeal against that decision in accordance with *Code* Article 13.
- ii. If not, it shall so advise the *Athlete* (with reasons) and specify a reasonable deadline by which they may request an administrative review of its decision. The Unsuccessful Attempt Report shall be provided to the *Athlete* at this point if it has not been provided to them earlier in the process.
- f) If the *Athlete* does not request an administrative review by the specified deadline, NADO Italia shall record the notified Whereabouts Failure against them. If the *Athlete* does request an administrative review before the deadline, it shall be carried out, based on the papers only, by one or more person not previously involved in the assessment of the apparent Whereabouts Failure. The purpose of the administrative review shall be to determine anew whether or not all of the relevant requirements for recording a Whereabouts Failure are met.
- g) If the conclusion following administrative review is that all of the requirements for recording a Whereabouts Failure are not met, NADO Italia shall so advise the *Athlete*, *WADA*, the International Federation and the *Anti-Doping Organization* that uncovered the Whereabouts Failure, if different from NADO Italia, giving reasons for its decision. Each of them shall have a right of appeal against that decision in accordance with *Code* Article 13. On the other hand, if the conclusion is that all of the requirements for recording a Whereabouts Failure are met, it shall notify the *Athlete* and shall record the notified Whereabouts Failure against them.

B.3.3 NADO Italia reports a decision to record a Whereabouts Failure against an *Athlete* to *WADA* and all other relevant *Anti-Doping Organizations*, on a confidential basis, via *ADAMS*.

B.3.4 Where three (3) Whereabouts Failures are recorded against an *Athlete* within any 12-month period, NADO Italia shall notify the *Athlete* and other *Anti-Doping Organizations* in accordance with Article 2.3.2 alleging violation of *Code* Article 2.4 and proceed with *Results Management* in accordance with Article 2 et seq. If NADO Italia fails to bring such proceedings against an *Athlete* within 30-days of *WADA* receiving notice of the recording of that *Athlete's* third Whereabouts Failure in any 12-month period, then NADO Italia shall be deemed to have decided that no anti-doping rule violation was committed, for purposes of triggering the appeal rights set out at *Code* Article 13.2.

B.3.5 An *Athlete* asserted to have committed a *Code* Article 2.4 anti-doping rule violation shall have the right to have such assertion determined at a full evidentiary hearing in accordance with *Code* Article 8 and Articles 8 and 10 of the *International Standard for Results Management*. The hearing panel shall not be bound by any determination made during the *Results Management* process, whether as to the adequacy of any explanation offered for a Whereabouts Failure or otherwise. Instead, the burden

shall be on the *Anti-Doping Organization* bringing the proceedings to establish all of the requisite elements of each alleged Whereabouts Failure to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel. If the hearing panel decides that one (or two) Whereabouts Failure(s) have been established to the required standard, but that the other alleged Whereabouts Failure(s) has/have not, then no *Code Article 2.4* anti-doping rule violation shall be found to have occurred. However, if the *Athlete* then commits one (or two, as applicable) further Whereabouts Failure(s) within the relevant 12-month period, new proceedings may be brought based on a combination of the Whereabouts Failure(s) established to the satisfaction of the hearing panel in the previous proceedings (in accordance with *Code Article 3.2.3*) and the Whereabouts Failure(s) subsequently committed by the *Athlete*.

- B.3.6** A finding that an *Athlete* has committed a *Code Article 2.4* anti-doping rule violation has the following *Consequences*: (a) imposition of a period of *Ineligibility* in accordance with *Code Article 10.3.2* (first violation) or *Code Article 10.9* (subsequent violation(s)); and (b) in accordance with *Code Article 10.10 (Disqualification)*, unless fairness requires otherwise) of all individual results obtained by the *Athlete* from the date of the *Code Article 2.4* anti-doping rule violation through to the date of commencement of any *Provisional Suspension* or *Ineligibility* period, with all of the resulting *Consequences*, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes. For these purposes, the anti-doping rule violation shall be deemed to have occurred on the date of the third Whereabouts Failure found by the hearing panel to have occurred. The impact of any *Code Article 2.4* anti-doping rule violation by an individual *Athlete* on the results of any team for which that *Athlete* has played during the relevant period shall be determined in accordance with *Code Article 11*.

ANNEX C – RESULTS MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE *ATHLETE BIOLOGICAL PASSPORT*

C.1 Administrative Management

C.1.1 The requirements and procedures described in this Annex apply to all modules of the *Athlete Biological Passport* except where expressly stated or implied by the context.

C.1.2 These processes shall be administered and managed by an *Athlete* Passport Management Unit on behalf of the Passport Custodian. The *Athlete* Passport Management Unit will initially review profiles to facilitate targeting recommendations for the Passport Custodian when appropriate or refer to the Experts as required. Management and communication of the biological data, *Athlete* Passport Management Unit reporting and Expert reviews shall be recorded in *ADAMS* and be shared by the Passport Custodian with other *Anti-Doping Organizations* with Testing Authority over the *Athlete* to coordinate further Passport *Testing* as appropriate. A key element for *Athlete Biological Passport* management and communication is the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit report in *ADAMS*, which provides an overview of the current status of the *Athlete's* Passport including the latest targeting recommendations and a summary of the Expert reviews.

C.1.3 This Annex describes a step-by-step approach to the review of an *Athlete's* Passport:

- a) the review begins with the application of the Adaptive Model.
- b) in case of an *Atypical Passport Finding* or when the Athlete Passport Management Unit considers that a review is otherwise justified, an Expert conducts an initial review and returns an evaluation based on the information available at that time.
- c) in case of a “Likely doping” initial review, the Passport is then subjected to a review by three (3) Experts including the Expert who conducted the initial review.
- d) in case of a “Likely doping” consensus of the three (3) Experts, the process continues with the creation of an *Athlete Biological Passport* Documentation Package.
- e) an *Adverse Passport Finding* is reported by the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit to the Passport Custodian if the Experts’ opinion is maintained after review of all information available at that stage, including the *Athlete Biological Passport* Documentation Package.
- f) the *Athlete* is notified of the *Adverse Passport Finding* and offered the opportunity to provide explanations.
- g) if after review of the explanations provided by the *Athlete*, the Experts maintain their unanimous conclusion that it is highly likely that the *Athlete* Used a *Prohibited Substance* or a *Prohibited Method*, an anti-doping rule violation is asserted against the *Athlete* by the Passport Custodian.

C.2 Initial Review Phase

C.2.1 Review by the Adaptive Model

- C.2.1.1.** In *ADAMS*, the Adaptive Model automatically processes data on the biological *Markers* of the *Athlete Biological Passport*. These *Markers* include primary *Markers* that are defined as the most specific to doping and secondary *Markers* that provide supporting evidence of doping in isolation or in combination with other *Markers*. The Adaptive Model predicts for an individual an expected range within which a series of *Marker* values falls assuming a normal physiological condition. Outliers correspond to those values outside of the 99%-range, from a lower limit corresponding to the 0.5th percentile to an upper limit corresponding to the 99.5th percentile (1:100 chance or less that this result is due to normal physiological variation). A specificity of 99% is used to identify both haematological and steroidal *Atypical Passport Findings*. In the case of sequence deviations (sequence *Atypical Passport Findings*), the applied specificity is 99.9% (1:1000 chance or less that this is due to normal physiological variation).
- C.2.1.2.** An *Atypical Passport Finding* is a result generated by the Adaptive Model in *ADAMS* which identifies either a primary *Marker(s)* value(s) as being outside the *Athlete's* intra-individual range or a longitudinal profile of a primary *Marker* values (sequence deviations) as being outside expected ranges, assuming a normal physiological condition. An *Atypical Passport Finding* requires further attention and review.
- C.2.1.3.** The *Athlete* Passport Management Unit may also submit a Passport to the Expert when there is no *Atypical Passport Finding* (see C.2.2.4 below).
- C.2.1.4.** *Atypical Passport Finding* – Haematological Module
- C.2.1.4.1.** For the Haematological Module, the Adaptive Model automatically processes in *ADAMS* two primary *Markers*, haemoglobin concentration (HGB) and stimulation index OFF-score (OFFS), and two secondary *Markers*, the reticulocyte percentage (RET%) and the Abnormal Blood Profile Score (ABPS). An *Atypical Passport Finding* is generated when a HGB and /or OFFS value of the last test falls outside the expected intra-individual ranges. Furthermore, the longitudinal profile composed of (up to) the last five valid HGB and/or OFFS values is also considered as an *Atypical Passport Finding* when deviating from the expected ranges, as determined by the Adaptive Model (sequence *Atypical Passport Finding*). An *Atypical Passport Finding* is only generated by the Adaptive Model based on values of the primary *Markers* HGB and OFFS or the sequence thereof.
- C.2.1.4.2.** In case of an *Atypical Passport Finding* the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall advise the *Results Management Authority* (or Testing Authority as applicable) in the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit report, or via the Passport Custodian where appropriate, on whether the *Sample*, or any accompanying urine *Sample*, should be subjected to analysis for Agents

Affecting Erythropoiesis analysis when the Adaptive Model detects an abnormality in the secondary *Markers* RET% and/or ABPS.

C.2.1.5. *Atypical Passport Finding* – Steroidal Module

C.2.1.5.1 For the Steroidal Module, the Adaptive Model automatically processes in *ADAMS* one primary *Marker*, the T/E ratio, and four (4) secondary *Markers*, the ratios A/T, A/Etio, 5 α Adiol/5 β Adiol and 5 β Adiol/E.

C.2.1.5.2 Ratios coming from a *Sample* that showed signs of heavy microbial degradation, and ratios for which one or both of the concentrations were not measured accurately by the Laboratory as established in the *Technical Document* for Endogenous Anabolic Androgenic Steroids (TDEAAS), shall not be processed by the Adaptive Model. In the case where the Laboratory reports a confounding factor that may otherwise cause an alteration in the steroid profile, such as the presence of ethanol glucuronide in the *Sample*, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall evaluate whether the steroid profile can still be considered as valid and processed by the Adaptive Model and the *Sample* be subjected to a Confirmation Procedure (see TDEAAS).

C.2.1.5.3 An *Atypical Passport Finding* is generated when a value of the T/E ratio falls outside the expected intra-individual ranges. In addition, the “*longitudinal steroid profile*” composed of (up to) the last five (5) valid values of the T/E ratio is also considered as atypical when deviating from the expected ranges, as determined by the Adaptive Model (sequence *Atypical Passport Finding*).

C.2.1.5.4 In the case of a “*longitudinal steroidal profile*”, an *Atypical Passport Finding* caused by an atypically high T/E value will trigger an *Atypical Passport Finding* Confirmation Procedure Request notification through *ADAMS* as established in the TDEAAS. When the Adaptive Model determines an abnormality in any of the other ratios of the “*steroid profile*” (A/T, A/Etio, 5 α Adiol/5 β Adiol and 5 β Adiol/E), the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit should advise the *Results Management* Authority (or Testing Authority as applicable) in the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit report, or via the Passport Custodian where appropriate, on whether the *Sample* should be subjected to a Confirmation Procedure.

C.2.1.6. Suspicious Steroid Profiles – Steroidal Module

C.2.1.6.1 If the *Sample* constitutes the first and unique result in a Passport, or if the *Sample* cannot be matched to a *Doping Control* Form in *ADAMS*, *ADAMS* will flag the result as a Suspicious Steroid Profile (SSP) if the steroid profile of the *Sample* meets any of the SSP criteria established in the TD EAAS, and the Laboratory and the Testing Authority will receive an SSP-Confirmation Procedure Request (CPR) notification from *ADAMS*. In such cases, the Testing Authority, upon consultation by the Laboratory, shall confirm, in

writing within seven (7) days, whether or not the SSP result shall be confirmed by the Laboratory. The Testing Authority may consult with their APMU, or the Passport Custodian where applicable, in order to reach a decision. If the Testing Authority advises the Laboratory not to proceed with Confirmation Procedures, then it shall provide the reasons for this decision to the Laboratory, which shall update the *ADAMS* test report for the *Sample* accordingly. In the absence of any justification from the Testing Authority, the Laboratory shall proceed with the confirmation analyses (for further details, see TD EAAS).

C.2.1.7. Departure from *WADA Athlete Biological Passport* requirements

C.2.1.7.1 If there is a departure from *WADA Athlete Biological Passport* requirements for *Sample* collection, transport and analysis, the biological *Marker* result obtained from this *Sample* affected by the non-conformity shall not be considered in the Adaptive Model calculations (for example, RET% can be affected but not HGB under certain transportation conditions).

C.2.1.7.2 A *Marker* result which is not affected by the non-conformity can still be considered in the Adaptive Model calculations. In such case, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall provide the specific explanations supporting the inclusion of the result(s). In all cases, the *Sample* shall remain recorded in the *Athlete's* Passport. The Experts may include all results in their review provided that their conclusions may be validly supported when taking into account the effects of the non-conformity.

C.2.2 The Initial Expert Review

C.2.2.1 A Passport generating an *Atypical Passport Finding*, or for which a review is otherwise justified, shall be sent by the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit to an Expert for review in *ADAMS*. This should take place within seven (7) days following the generation of the *Atypical Passport Finding* in *ADAMS*. The review of the Passport shall be conducted based on the Passport and other basic information (e.g. *Competition* schedules), which may be available, such that the Expert is blinded to the identity of the *Athlete*.

C.2.2.2 If a Passport has been recently reviewed by an Expert and the Passport Custodian is in the process of executing a specific multi-*Sample Testing* strategy on the *Athlete*, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit may delay the review of a Passport generating an *Atypical Passport Finding* triggered by one of the *Samples* collected in this context until completion of the planned series of tests. In such situations, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall clearly indicate the reason for delaying the review of the Passport in the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit report.

C.2.2.3 If the first and unique result in a Passport is flagged as an *Atypical Passport Finding* by the Adaptive Model, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit may recommend the collection of an additional *Sample* before initiating the initial Expert review.

C.2.2.4 Review in the absence of an *Atypical Passport Finding*

C.2.2.4.1 A Passport may also be sent for Expert review in the absence of an *Atypical Passport Finding* where the Passport includes other elements otherwise justifying a review.

These elements may include, without limitation:

- a) Data not considered in the Adaptive Model;
- b) Any abnormal levels and/or variations of *Marker(s)*;
- c) Signs of hemodilution in the haematological Passport;
- d) Steroid levels in urine below the corresponding Limit of Quantification of the assay;
- e) Intelligence in relation to the *Athlete* concerned.

C.2.2.4.2 An Expert review initiated in the above-mentioned situations may result in the same consequences as an Expert review triggered by an *Atypical Passport Finding*.

C.2.2.5 Expert Evaluation

C.2.2.5.1 When evaluating a Passport, an Expert weighs the likelihood that the Passport is the result of the *Use* of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* against the likelihood that the Passport is the result of a normal physiological or pathological condition in order to provide one of the following opinions: “Normal”, “Suspicious”, “Likely doping” or “Likely medical condition”. For a “Likely doping” opinion, the Expert shall come to the conclusion that the likelihood that the Passport is the result of the *Use* of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* outweighs the likelihood that the Passport is the result of a normal physiological or pathological condition.

C.2.2.5.2 To reach a conclusion of “Likely doping” in the absence of an *Atypical Passport Finding*, the Expert shall come to the opinion that it is highly likely that the Passport is the result of the *Use* of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* and that it is highly unlikely that the Passport is the result of a normal physiological or pathological condition.

C.2.3 Consequences of the Initial Review

Depending on the outcome of the initial review, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit will take the following action:

Expert Evaluation	Athlete Passport Management Unit Action
“Normal”	Continue normal Testing plan.
“Suspicious”	Provide recommendations to the Passport Custodian for Target Testing, Sample analysis and/or requesting further information as required.
“Likely doping”	Send to a panel of three (3) Experts, including the initial Expert, as per section C.2 of this Annex C.
“Likely medical condition”	Inform the Athlete as soon as possible via the Passport Custodian (or send to other Experts).

C.3 Review by Three (3) Experts

C.3.1 In the event that the opinion of the appointed Expert in the initial review, pending other explanation to be provided at a later stage, is that of “Likely doping”, the Passport shall then be sent by the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit to two (2) additional Experts for review. This should take place within seven (7) days after the reporting of the initial review. These additional reviews shall be conducted without knowledge of the initial review. These three (3) Experts now constitute the Expert Panel, composed of the Expert appointed in the initial review and these two (2) other Experts.

C.3.2 The review by the three (3) Experts must follow the same procedure, where applicable, as presented in section C.2.2 of this Annex. The three (3) Experts shall each provide their individual reports in *ADAMS*. This should take place within seven (7) days after receipt of the request.

C.3.3 The *Athlete* Passport Management Unit is responsible for liaising with the Experts and for advising the Passport Custodian of the subsequent Expert assessment. The Experts can request further information, as they deem relevant for their review, notably information related to medical conditions, *Competition* schedule and/or *Sample(s)* analysis results. Such requests are directed via the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit to the Passport Custodian.

C.3.4 A unanimous opinion among the three (3) Experts is necessary in order to proceed further towards declaring an *Adverse Passport Finding*, which means that all three (3) Experts render an opinion of “Likely doping”. The conclusion of the Experts must be reached with the three (3) Experts assessing the *Athlete’s* Passport with the same data.

C.3.5 To reach a conclusion of “Likely doping” in the absence of an *Atypical Passport Finding*, the Expert Panel shall come to the unanimous opinion that it is highly likely that the Passport is the result of the *Use* of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Method* and that there is no reasonably conceivable hypothesis under which the Passport is the result of a normal physiological condition and highly unlikely that it is the result of pathological condition.

C.3.6 In the case when two (2) Experts evaluate the Passport as “Likely doping” and the third Expert as “Suspicious” asking for more information, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall confer with the Expert Panel before they finalize their opinion. The group can also seek advice from an appropriate outside Expert, although this must be done while maintaining strict confidentiality of the *Athlete’s* Personal Information.

C.3.7 If no unanimity can be reached among the three (3) Experts, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall report the Passport as “Suspicious”, update the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit report, and recommend that the Passport Custodian pursue additional *Testing* and/or gather intelligence on the *Athlete* (refer to Information Gathering and Intelligence Sharing Guidelines), as appropriate.

C.4 Conference Call, Compilation of the *Athlete Biological Passport* Documentation Package and Joint Expert Report

C.4.1 If a unanimous opinion of “Likely doping” is rendered by all three (3) Experts, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall declare a “Likely doping” evaluation in the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit report in *ADAMS* and should organize a conference call with the Expert Panel to initiate the next steps for the case, including proceeding with the compilation of the *Athlete Biological Passport* Documentation Package (see *Technical Document* for *Athlete* Passport Management Units) and drafting of the joint Expert report. In preparation for this conference call, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit should coordinate with the Passport Custodian to compile any potentially relevant information to share with the Experts (e.g. suspicious analytical findings, relevant intelligence and relevant pathophysiological information).

C.4.2 Once completed, the *Athlete Biological Passport* Documentation Package shall be sent by the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit to the Expert Panel, who will review it and provide a joint Expert report to be signed by all three (3) Experts. The conclusion within the joint Expert report shall be reached without interference from the Passport Custodian. If necessary, the Expert Panel may request complementary information from the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit.

C.4.3 At this stage, the identity of the *Athlete* is not mentioned but it is accepted that specific information provided may allow to identify the *Athlete*. This shall not affect the validity of the process.

C.5 Issuing an *Adverse Passport Finding*

C.5.1 If the Expert Panel confirms their unanimous position of “likely doping”, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall declare an *Adverse Passport Finding* in *ADAMS* that includes a written statement of the *Adverse Passport Finding*, the *Athlete Biological Passport* Documentation Package and the joint Expert report.

C.5.2 After reviewing the *Athlete Biological Passport* Documentation Package and joint Expert report, the Passport Custodian shall:

- a) Notify the *Athlete* of the *Adverse Passport Finding* in accordance with Article 2.3.2;

- b) Provide the *Athlete* the *Athlete Biological Passport* Documentation Package and the joint Expert report;
- c) Invite the *Athlete* to provide their own explanation, in a timely manner, of the data provided to the Passport Custodian.

C.6 Review of Explanation from *Athlete* and Disciplinary Proceedings

C.6.1 Upon receipt of any explanation and supporting information from the *Athlete*, which should be received within the specified deadline, the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall forward it to the Expert Panel for review with any additional information that the Expert Panel considers necessary to render its opinion in coordination with both the Passport Custodian and the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit. At this stage, the review is no longer anonymous. The Expert Panel shall reassess or reassert the case and reach one of the following conclusions:

- a) Unanimous opinion of “Likely doping” by the Experts based on the information in the Passport and any explanation provided by the *Athlete*; or
- b) Based on the available information, the Experts are unable to reach a unanimous opinion of “Likely doping” set forth above.

C.6.2 If the Expert Panel expresses the opinion set forth in section C.6.1(a), then the Passport Custodian shall be informed by the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit, shall charge the *Athlete* in accordance with Article 5 and continue with *Results Management* in accordance with the ISRM.

C.6.3 If the Expert Panel expresses the opinion set forth in section C.6.1(b), the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit shall update the *Athlete* Passport Management Unit report and recommend the Passport Custodian to pursue additional *Testing* and/or gather intelligence on the *Athlete* (refer to Information Gathering and Intelligence Sharing Guidelines), as appropriate. The Passport Custodian shall notify the *Athlete* and *WADA* of the outcome of the review.

C.7 Passport Re-setting

C.7.1 In the event the *Athlete* has been found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation based on the Passport, the *Athlete's* Passport shall be reset by the Passport Custodian at the start of the relevant period of *Ineligibility* and a new Biological Passport ID shall be assigned in *ADAMS*. This maintains the *Athlete's* anonymity for potential *Athlete* Passport Management Unit and Expert Panel reviews conducted in the future.

C.7.2 When an *Athlete* is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation on any basis other than the *Athlete Biological Passport*, the haematological and/or Steroidal Passport will remain in effect, except in those cases where the *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* caused an alteration of the haematological or steroidal *Markers*, respectively (e.g. for *AAF* reported for anabolic androgenic steroids, which may affect the *Markers* of the steroid profile, or for the *Use* of Erythropoiesis Stimulating Agents or blood transfusions, which would alter the haematological *Markers*). The Passport Custodian shall consult with their *Athlete* Passport Management Unit following an *Adverse Analytical Finding* to determine whether a Passport reset is warranted. In such instances, the *Athlete's* profile(s) would be reset from the time of the beginning of the sanction.

Definitions

Defined Terms from the *Code* and from the *ADSC*

ADAMS: The Anti-Doping Administration and Management System is a Web-based database management tool for data entry, storage, sharing, and reporting designed to assist stakeholders and *WADA* in their anti-doping operations in conjunction with data protection legislation.

Administration: Providing, supplying, supervising, facilitating, or otherwise participating in the *Use* or *Attempted Use* by another *Person* of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method*. However, this definition shall not include the actions of bona fide medical personnel involving a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method 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 that such *Prohibited Substances* are not intended for genuine and legal therapeutic purposes or are intended to enhance sport performance.

Adverse Analytical Finding: A report from a *WADA*-accredited laboratory or other *WADA*-approved laboratory that, consistent with the *International Standard* for Laboratories, establishes in a *Sample* the presence of a *Prohibited Substance* or its *Metabolites* or *Markers* or evidence of the *Use* of a *Prohibited Method*.

Adverse Passport Finding: A report identified as an *Adverse Passport Finding* as described in the applicable *International Standards*.

Anti-Doping Organization: *WADA* or 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*, International Federations, and *National Anti-Doping Organizations*.

Anti-Doping Sport Code (ADSC): The Code, adopted by NADO Italia, implementing the *World Anti-Doping Code* and the *International Standards*.

Athlete: Any *Person* who Competes in sport under the aegis of the relevant International Federation and/or the Italian National Olympic Committee (CONI) and Italian Paralympic Committee (IPC).

Athlete Biological Passport: The program and methods of gathering and collating data as described in the *International Standard* for Testing and Investigations and *International Standard* for Laboratories.

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 *WADA*-accredited laboratory or other *WADA*-approved laboratory 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*.

Atypical Passport Finding: A report described as an *Atypical Passport Finding* as described in the applicable *International Standards*.

CAS: The Court of Arbitration for Sport.

Code: The World Anti-Doping Code.

Competition: A single race, match, game or singular sport contest. For example, a basketball game or the finals of the Olympic 100-meter race in athletics. For stage races and other sport 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 Federation.

Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations (“Consequences”): An *Athlete’s* or other *Person’s* violation of an anti-doping rule may result in one or more of the following: (a) *Disqualification* means the *Athlete’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 *Athlete* or other *Person* is barred on account of an anti-doping rule violation for a specified period of time from participating in any *Competition* or other activity or funding as provided in *Code* Article 10.14.1; (c) *Provisional Suspension* means the *Athlete* or other *Person* is barred temporarily from participating in any *Competition* or activity prior to the final decision at a hearing conducted under Article 8; (d) *Financial Consequences* means a financial sanction imposed for an anti-doping rule violation or to recover costs associated with an anti-doping rule violation; and (e) *Public Disclosure* means the dissemination or distribution of information to the general public or *Persons* beyond those *Persons* entitled to earlier notification in accordance with *Code* Article 14. Teams in *Team Sports* may also be subject to *Consequences* as provided in *Code* Article 11.

Contaminated Product: A product that contains a *Prohibited Substance* that is not disclosed on the product label or in information available in a reasonable Internet search.

Delegated Third Parties: Any *Person* to which an *Anti-Doping Organization* delegates any aspect of *Doping Control* or anti-doping *Education* programs including, but not limited to, third parties or other *Anti-Doping Organizations* that conduct *Sample* collection or other *Doping Control* services or anti-doping educational programs for the *Anti-Doping Organization*, or individuals serving as independent contractors who perform *Doping Control* services for the *Anti-Doping Organization* (e.g., non-employee *Doping Control Officers* or chaperones). This definition does not include *CAS*.

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 and the enforcement of *Consequences*, including all steps and processes in

between, including but not limited to, *Testing*, investigations, whereabouts, *TUEs*, *Sample* collection and handling, laboratory analysis, *Results Management* and investigations or proceedings relating to violations of *Code* Article 10.14 (Status During *Ineligibility* or *Provisional Suspension*).

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

Financial Consequences: See *Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations* above.

In-Competition: The period commencing at 11:59 p.m. on the day before a *Competition* in which the *Athlete* is scheduled to participate through the end of such *Competition* and the *Sample* collection process related to such *Competition*. Provided, however, *WADA* may approve, for a particular sport, an alternative definition if an International Federation provides a compelling justification that a different definition is necessary for its sport; upon such approval by *WADA*, the alternative definition shall be followed by all *Major Event Organizations* for that particular sport.

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

Institutional Independence: Hearing panels on appeal shall be fully *Independent Institutionally* from the *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for *Results Management*. They must therefore not in any way be administered by, connected or subject to the *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for *Results Management*.

International Event: An *Event* or *Competition* where the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, an International Federation, 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 Athlete: *Athletes* who compete in sport at the international level, as defined by each International Federation, consistent with the *International Standard* for *Testing* and *Investigations*.

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 variable(s) that indicates the *Use* of a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method*.

Minor: A natural *Person* who has not reached the age of eighteen years.

National Anti-Doping Appeal Body: The National Anti-Doping Appeal Panel competent to judge appeals against first instance decisions of the NADT as pursuant to *Code* Article 13.2 and against any decision of rejection of a *TUE* by the TUEC of NADO Italia.

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*, manage test results and conduct *Results Management* at the national level. 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-Level Athlete: An *Athlete* included in the national RTP; *Athletes* included in the Club Olimpico (who receive funding from Sports movement); an *Athlete* who currently or in the last six (6) months has represented Italy at senior level; an *Athlete* who has been selected to represent Italy in International *Events* or Competitions, not classified as International-Level *Athlete* by the relevant International Federation.

Operational Independence: This means that (1) board members, staff members, commission members, consultants and officials of the *Anti-Doping Organization* with responsibility for *Results Management* or its affiliates (e.g., member federation or confederation), as well as any *Person* involved in the investigation and pre-adjudication of the matter cannot be appointed as members and/or clerks (to the extent that such clerk is involved in the deliberation process and/or drafting of any decision) of hearing panels of that *Anti-Doping Organization* with responsibility for *Results Management* and (2) hearing panels shall be in a position to conduct the hearing and decision-making process without interference from the *Anti-Doping Organization* or any third party. The objective is to ensure that members of the hearing panel or individuals otherwise involved in the decision of the hearing panel, are not involved in the investigation of, or decisions to proceed with, the case.

Out-of-Competition: Any period which is not *In-Competition*.

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 or intends to exercise control over the *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* or the premises in which a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* exists); provided, however, that if the *Person* does not have exclusive control over the *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* or the premises in which a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* exists, constructive *Possession* shall only be found if the *Person* knew about the presence of the *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited 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.

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, or class of substances, so described on the *Prohibited List*.

Provisional Hearing: For purposes of *ADSC* Article 8.4, an expedited abbreviated hearing occurring prior to a hearing under Article 3.3 that provides the *Athlete* with notice and an opportunity to be heard in either written or oral form.

Provisional Suspension: See *Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations* above.

Publicly Disclose: See *Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations* above.

Registered Testing Pool (RTP): The pool of highest-priority *Athletes* established separately at the international level by International Federations and at the national level by *National Anti-Doping Organizations*, who are subject to focused *In-Competition* and *Out-of-Competition Testing* as part of that International Federation's or *National Anti-Doping Organization's* test distribution plan and therefore are required to provide whereabouts information as provided in *Code* Article 5.5 and the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations*. In Italy, NADO Italia's *Registered Testing Pool* is defined as set out in *ADSC* Article 6.5.

Results Management: The process encompassing the timeframe between notification as per Article 5 of the *International Standard for Results Management*, or in certain cases (e.g., *Atypical Finding*, *Athlete Biological Passport*, *Whereabouts Failure*), such pre-notification steps expressly provided for in Article 5 of the *International Standard for Results Management*, through the charge until the final resolution of the matter, including the end of the Hearing Process at first instance or on appeal (if an appeal was lodged).

Results Management Procedure (RMP): The document adopted by NADO Italia and implementing the *International Standard for Results Management*, regulating the results management procedure from the review and notification of a potential anti-doping rule violation until the appeals. The RMP is published on NADO Italia's website (www.nadoitalia.it).

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

Signatories: Those entities accepting the *Code* and agreeing to implement the *Code*, as provided in Article 23.

Specified Method: See *Code* Article 4.2.2.

Specified Substance: See *Code* Article 4.2.2.

Substance of Abuse: See *Code* Article 4.2.3.

Substantial Assistance: For purposes of Article 10.7.1, a *Person* providing *Substantial Assistance* must: (1) fully disclose in a signed written statement or recorded interview all information he or she

possesses in relation to anti-doping rule violations or other proceeding described in Article 10.7.1.1, and (2) fully cooperate with the investigation and adjudication of any case or matter 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 or proceeding which is initiated or, if no case or proceeding is initiated, must have provided a sufficient basis on which a case or proceeding could have been brought.

Tampering: Intentional conduct which subverts the *Doping Control* process but which would not otherwise be included in the definition of *Prohibited Methods*. *Tampering* shall include, without limitation, offering or accepting a bribe to perform or fail to perform an act, preventing the collection of a *Sample*, affecting or making impossible the analysis of a *Sample*, falsifying documents submitted to an *Anti-Doping Organization* or TUE committee or hearing panel, procuring false testimony from witnesses, committing any other fraudulent act upon the *Anti-Doping Organization* or hearing body to affect *Results Management* or the imposition of *Consequences*, and any other similar intentional interference or *Attempted* interference with any aspect of *Doping Control*.

Target Testing: Selection of specific *Athletes* for *Testing* based on criteria set forth in the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations*.

Technical Document: A document adopted and published by *WADA* from time to time containing mandatory technical requirements on specific anti-doping topics as set forth in an *International Standard*.

Technical Document for Testing and Investigations (TD_TI): The document adopted by NADO Italia implementing the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations*, published on NADO Italia's website (www.nadoitalia.it).

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

Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE): A *Therapeutic Use Exemption* allows an *Athlete* with a medical condition to use a *Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method*, but only if the conditions set out in Article 4.4 and the *International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions* are met.

Therapeutic Use Exemptions' Application Procedure (TUE_AP): The procedure adopted by NADO Italia for the TUEs' application, published on NADO Italia's website (www.nadoitalia.it).

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.

Defined Terms from the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations*

Doping Control Officer (or DCO): An official who has been trained and authorized by the Sample Collection Authority to carry out the responsibilities given to DCOs in the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations*.

Expert: The Expert(s) and/or Expert Panel, with knowledge in the concerned field, chosen by the *Anti-Doping Organization* and/or Athlete Passport Management Unit, are responsible for providing an evaluation of the Passport. The Expert must be external to the *Anti-Doping Organization*.

For the Haematological Module, the Expert panel should consist of at least three (3) Experts who have qualifications in one or more of the fields of clinical and Laboratory haematology, sports medicine or exercise physiology, as they apply to blood doping. For the Steroidal Module, the Expert panel should be composed of at least three (3) individuals with qualifications in the fields of Laboratory steroid analysis, steroid doping and metabolism and/or clinical endocrinology. For both modules, an Expert panel should consist of Experts with complementary knowledge such that all relevant fields are represented. The Expert panel may include a pool of at least three (3) appointed Experts and any additional ad hoc Expert(s) who may be required upon request of any of the appointed Experts or by the Athlete Passport Management Unit of the *Anti-Doping Organization*.

Sample Collection Authority: The organization that is responsible for the collection of Samples in compliance with the requirements of the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations*, whether (1) the Testing Authority itself; or (2) a Delegated Third Party to whom the authority to conduct Testing has been granted or sub-contracted. The Testing Authority always remains ultimately responsible under the *Code* for compliance with the requirements of the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations* relating to collection of Samples.

Sample Collection Session: All of the sequential activities that directly involve the *Athlete* from the point that initial contact is made until the *Athlete* leaves the Doping Control Station after having provided their Sample(s).

Testing Authority: The *Anti-Doping Organization* that authorizes Testing on *Athletes* it has authority over. It may authorize a Delegated Third Party to conduct Testing pursuant to the authority of and in accordance with the rules of the *Anti-Doping Organization*. Such authorization shall be documented. The *Anti-Doping Organization* authorizing Testing remains the Testing Authority and ultimately responsible under the *Code* to ensure the Delegated Third Party conducting the Testing does so in compliance with the requirements of the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations*.

Unsuccessful Attempt Report: A detailed report of an unsuccessful attempt to collect a Sample from an *Athlete* in a Registered Testing Pool or Testing pool setting out the date of the attempt, the location visited, the exact arrival and departure times at the location, the steps taken at the location to try to find the *Athlete* (including details of any contact made with third parties), and any other relevant details about the attempt.

Whereabouts Filing: Information provided by or on behalf of an *Athlete* in a *Registered Testing Pool* (or *Testing pool* if applicable) that sets out the *Athlete's* whereabouts during the following quarter, in accordance with ISTI Article 4.8.

Defined Terms from the *International Standard* for Laboratories

Adaptive Model: A mathematical model designed to identify unusual longitudinal results from *Athletes*. The model calculates the probability of a longitudinal profile of *Marker* values assuming that the *Athlete* has a normal physiological condition.

Athlete Passport Management Unit (APMU): A unit composed of a *Person* or *Persons* that is responsible for the timely management of *Athlete Biological Passports* in *ADAMS* on behalf of the *Passport Custodian*.

Confirmation Procedure (CP): An *Analytical Testing Procedure* that has the purpose of confirming the presence and/or, when applicable, confirming the concentration/ratio/score and/or establishing the origin (exogenous or endogenous) of one or more specific *Prohibited Substances*, *Metabolite(s)* of a *Prohibited Substance*, or *Marker(s)* of the *Use of a Prohibited Substance* or *Prohibited Method* in a *Sample*.

Independent Witness: A *Person*, invited by the *Testing Authority*, the *Laboratory* or *WADA* to witness parts of the *Analytical Testing* process. The *Independent Witness* shall be independent of the *Athlete* and his/her representative(s), the *Laboratory*, the *Sample Collection Authority*, the *Testing Authority* / *Results Management Authority* or *WADA*, as applicable. The *Independent Witness* may be indemnified for his/her service.

Laboratory(ies): (A) *WADA*-accredited laboratory(ies) applying *Test Methods* and processes to provide evidentiary data for the detection and/or identification of *Prohibited Substances* or *Prohibited Methods* on the *Prohibited List* and, if applicable, quantification of a *Threshold Substance* in *Samples* of urine and other biological matrices in the context of *Doping Control* activities.

Laboratory Documentation Package: The material produced by the *Laboratory* to support an analytical result such as an *Adverse Analytical Finding* as set forth in the *WADA Technical Document* for *Laboratory Documentation Packages* (TD LDOC).

Limit of Quantification (LOQ): Analytical parameter of assay technical performance. Lowest concentration of an *Analyte* in a *Sample* that can be quantitatively determined with acceptable precision and accuracy (i.e. acceptable *Measurement Uncertainty*) under the stated test conditions

Threshold Substance: An exogenous or endogenous *Prohibited Substance*, *Metabolite* or *Marker* of a *Prohibited Substance* for which the identification and quantitative determination (e.g. concentration, ratio, score) in excess of a pre-determined *Decision Limit*, or, when applicable, the establishment of an exogenous origin, constitutes an *Adverse Analytical Finding*. *Threshold Substances* are identified as such in the *Technical Document* on *Decision Limits* (TD DL).

Defined Term from the *International Standard for Therapeutic Use Exemptions*

Therapeutic: Of or relating to the treatment of a medical condition by remedial agents or methods; or providing or assisting in a cure.

Defined Term from the *International Standard for Protection of Privacy and Personal Information*

Personal Information: Information, including without limitation Sensitive Personal Information, relating to an identified or identifiable *Participant* or relating to other *Person* whose information is Processed solely in the context of an *Anti-Doping Organization's Anti-Doping Activities*.

Defined Terms Specific to the *International Standard for Results Management*

Athlete Biological Passport Documentation Package: The material compiled by the Athlete Passport Management Unit to support an *Adverse Passport Finding* such as, but not limited to, analytical data, Expert Panel comments, evidence of confounding factors as well as other relevant supporting information.

Expert Panel: The Experts, with knowledge in the concerned field, chosen by the *Anti-Doping Organization* and/or Athlete Passport Management Unit, who are responsible for providing an evaluation of the Passport. For the Haematological Module, Experts should have knowledge in one or more of the fields of clinical haematology (diagnosis of blood pathological conditions), sports medicine or exercise physiology. For the Steroidal Module, the Experts should have knowledge in Laboratory analysis, steroid doping and/or endocrinology. For both modules, an Expert Panel should consist of Experts with complementary knowledge such that all relevant fields are represented. The Expert Panel may include a pool of at least three appointed Experts and any additional ad hoc Expert(s) who may be required upon request of any of the appointed Experts or by the Athlete Passport Management Unit of the *Anti-Doping Organization*.

Failure to Comply: A term used to describe anti-doping rule violations under *Code* Articles 2.3 and/or 2.5.

Filing Failure: A failure by the *Athlete* (or by a third party to whom the *Athlete* has delegated the task) to make an accurate and complete Whereabouts Filing that enables the *Athlete* to be located for *Testing* at the times and locations set out in the Whereabouts Filing or to update that Whereabouts Filing where necessary to ensure that it remains accurate and complete, all in accordance with Article 4.8 of the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations* and Annex B.2 of the *International Standard for Results Management*.

Hearing Process: The process encompassing the timeframe between the referral of a matter to a hearing panel or tribunal until the issuance and notification of a decision by the hearing panel (whether at first instance or on appeal).

Missed Test: A failure by the *Athlete* to be available for *Testing* at the location and time specified in the 60-minute time slot identified in their Whereabouts Filing for the day in question, in accordance with Article 4.8 of the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations* and Annex B.2 of the *International Standard for Results Management*.

Passport: A collation of all relevant data unique to an individual *Athlete* that may include longitudinal profiles of *Markers*, heterogeneous factors unique to that particular *Athlete* and other relevant information that may help in the evaluation of *Markers*.

Passport Custodian: The *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for *Result Management* of the *Athlete's Passport* and for sharing any relevant information associated to that *Athlete's Passport* with other *Anti-Doping Organization(s)*.

Results Management Authority: The *Anti-Doping Organization* responsible for conducting *Results Management* in a given case.

Whereabouts Failure: A Filing Failure or a Missed Test.