

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

IOC DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

DECISION

**REGARDING TATIANA CHERNOVA
BORN ON 29 JANUARY 1988, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ATHLETE, ATHLETICS**

(Rule 59.2.1 of the Olympic Charter)

Pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (the “**Rules**”) and, in particular but without limitation, Articles 2, 5.1, 7.3.3, 8 and 9 thereof:

I. FACTS

1. Tatiana CHERNOVA (hereinafter the “**Athlete**”), participated in the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (the “**2008 Olympic Games**”).
2. From 15 August 2008 to 16 August 2016, the Athlete competed in the Women’s heptathlon event in which she ranked 3rd and for which he was awarded a bronze medal.
3. On 17 August 2016, during the night following the event, the Athlete was requested to provide a urine sample for a doping control. Such sample was identified with the number 1842775.
4. The A-Sample 1842775 was analysed during the 2008 Olympic Games by the WADA-accredited Laboratory in Beijing. Such analysis did not result in an adverse analytical finding at that time.
5. After the conclusion of the 2008 Olympic Games, all the samples collected upon the occasion of the 2008 Olympic Games were transferred to the WADA-accredited “Laboratoire suisse d’analyse du dopage” in Lausanne, Switzerland (“the **Lausanne Laboratory**”) for long-term storage.
6. The IOC decided to perform further analyses on samples collected during the 2008 Olympic Games. These additional analyses were performed in order to possibly detect Prohibited Substances which were not identified by the analysis performed at the time of the 2008 Olympic Games.
7. In accordance with the provisions of the applicable International Standards for Laboratories (the “**ISL**”), the IOC decided that the reanalysis process would be conducted as follows:
 - An initial analysis was to be conducted on the remains of the A-samples
 - If such initial analysis resulted in the indication of the potential presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers (“Presumptive Adverse Analytical Finding” - PAAF), the full confirmation analysis process (double confirmation) was to be conducted on the B-Sample, which would be split for the occasion into a B1- and a B2 Sample (becoming thus the equivalent of an A- and B-Sample).
8. The decision to proceed based on split B-samples was made in principle for all the re-analysis.

9. This choice was made in view of the fact that during the transfer of the samples from the Beijing laboratory to the Lausanne Laboratory, the A-Samples were not individually resealed nor transported in sealed containers.
10. At that time, resealing of A-Samples (or transport in sealed containers) was not a requirement pursuant to the then applicable ISL (2008).
11. However, it was felt that the option to rely on the B-Sample constituted an additional precaution securing the strength and reliability of the analytical process.
12. A similarly precautionous approach was adopted with regard to the implementation of the analytical process and notably of its first phase (opening and splitting of the B-Sample into a B1- and B2-Sample, sealing of the B2-Sample and analysis of the B1-Sample).
13. Pursuant to the ISL, the presence of the Athlete is not a requirement for this first phase of the B-Sample analysis.
14. The IOC nevertheless decided, again as a matter of principle, that, whenever this was practically possible, the Athlete would be offered the opportunity to attend the above described first phase of the B-sample procedure.
15. The remains of the A-Sample of the Athlete were subject to initial analysis. Such analysis resulted in a Presumptive Adverse Analytical Finding (“**PAAF**”) as it indicated the potential presence of a Prohibited Substance: dehydrochloromethyltestosterone (turinabol).
16. On 11 July 2016, the Athlete through her NOC was informed of the PAAF and of the possibility to attend the opening and splitting of the B-Sample into a B1- and B2-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B1-Sample. The process was initially scheduled to take place between 18 and 26 July 2016.
17. On 14 July 2016, the Athlete sent directly to the IOC her completed PAAF Notification Appendix in which she indicated that she would not attend the opening, splitting of the B-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B1-Sample, neither personally nor through a representative.
18. In her PAAF Notification Appendix, the Athlete wrote the following comment:

“I confirm the opening of the B-Sample.”
19. On the same day, the IOC informed the Athlete that the opening, splitting of the B-Sample and the sealing of the B2-Sample would occur on 18 July 2016 at the Laboratory followed by the analysis of the B1-Sample.
20. On 18 July 2016, the IOC informed the Athlete that the process had been rescheduled to start on 22 July 2016 to enable the NOC to attend the process.
21. The opening and splitting of the B-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample occurred on 22 July 2016 at the Laboratory.
22. The Athlete did not attend the opening and splitting of the B-Sample and was not represented on this occasion.
23. As provided in the ISL, the opening and splitting was attended by an independent witness.

24. The results of the B1-Sample analysis were reported on 28 July 2016. These results establish the presence of the metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, namely dehydrochlormethyltestosterone (turinabol).
25. Such results constitute an Adverse Analytical Finding ("AAF"). They were reported to the IOC in accordance with article 7.2.1 of the Rules.
26. Further to the verifications set forth in Art. 7.2.2 of the Rules and in application of Art. 7.2.3 of the Rules, the IOC President, Mr Thomas Bach, was informed of the existence of the AAF and the essential details available concerning the case.
27. Pursuant to Art. 7.2.4 of the Rules, the IOC President set up a Disciplinary Commission, consisting in this case of:
 - Mr Denis Oswald (Chairman, Switzerland), who is a member of the IOC Legal Affairs Commission
 - Mr Juan Antonio Samaranch (Spain)
 - Mr Ugur Erdener (Turkey)
28. On 29 July 2016, the IOC notified the Athlete through her NOC of the above-mentioned AAF and of the institution of disciplinary proceedings to be conducted by the Disciplinary Commission. The IOC also informed the Athlete of her right to request and attend the opening of the B2-Sample and its analysis, either in person and/or through a representative, which was initially scheduled to take place on 8 or 9 August 2016. The Athlete was finally informed of her right to request a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
29. The Athlete did not reply.
30. On 10 August 2016, the IOC granted the Athlete an additional deadline to indicate whether she accepted the Adverse Analytical Finding, whether she requested the opening and analysis of the B2-Sample and whether she requested a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
31. On the same day, the Athlete sent to the IOC her completed AAF Notification Appendix in which she indicated that she did not accept the Adverse Analytical Finding and requested the opening and analysis of the B2-Sample. She further indicated that she would not attend the process, neither personally nor through a representative. She finally requested a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
32. On 11 August 2016, the IOC informed the Athlete that the opening of her B2-Sample would occur on 15 August 2016 at the Laboratory, followed by its analysis.
33. The opening of the B2-Sample took place on 15 August 2016.
34. The opening of the B2-Sample was conducted in the presence of an independent witness.
35. The results of the analysis were reported on 19 August 2016. They confirmed the presence in the B2-Sample of the Prohibited Substance already detected in the B1-Sample: dehydrochlormethyltestosterone (turinabol).
36. On 22 August 2016, the IOC notified the B2-Sample results to the Athlete. She was invited to indicate whether she accepted the Adverse Analytical Finding and whether she

requested the B2-Sample laboratory documentation package. The Athlete was further informed of the possibility to present her defence in writing and/or to attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission.

37. On 25 August 2016, the Athlete sent to the IOC her completed Disciplinary Commission Form in which she indicated that she did not accept the Adverse Analytical Finding and requested a copy of the B2-Sample laboratory documentation package. She further indicated that she would attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission personally and would be assisted on this occasion. She finally indicated that she would also present a writing defence.
38. In her Disciplinary Commission Form, the Athlete wrote the following comment:

“I will inform you concerning a final decision on points 4 [attendance] and 5 [representative] after obtaining laboratory documents of point 2 [documentation package].”
39. On 11 November 2016, the IOC provided the Athlete with a copy of the B1- and B2-Sample laboratory documentation packages as well as with additional documentation related to her sample, in particular the handling of the sample in Beijing and its transfer to the WADA accredited laboratory in Lausanne.
40. In the same letter, the IOC informed the Athlete that the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission was scheduled to be held on 12 December 2016. She was invited to confirm by 21 November 2016 whether she would participate in the hearing and invited her to submit her written defence by 1 December 2016.
41. On the same day, the NOC and the IF were invited to send a representative to the hearing and to file written observations by 1 December 2016.
42. On 25 November 2016, the Athlete confirmed that she would participate in the hearing via videoconference and that she would submit a written defence.
43. On 6 December 2016, the IOC sent a reminder to the Athlete and she was granted an additional deadline until 8 December 2016 to file her written defence.
44. The NOC and the IF did not file any written observations.
45. On 8 December 2016, Mr Hannu Kalkas, attorney-at-law, acting as the Athlete’s representative, submitted a statement of defence, together with an expert opinion issued by Dr Douwe de Boer. The content of the submissions will be discussed below.
46. On 10 December 2016, Mr Jean-Pierre Morand, IOC external legal counsel, requested the Disciplinary Commission to include in the present proceedings the Report, Part 2 dated 9 December 2016 of the Independent Person, Mr Richard H. McLaren (the **“McLaren Report, Part 2”**).
47. The hearing of the Disciplinary Commission was held on 12 December 2016 at the IOC Headquarters in Lausanne, Switzerland.
48. The Athlete and her counsel, Mr Kalkas, participated in the hearing via videoconference. The Athlete’s expert, Mr Douwe de Boer, was heard by videoconference.
49. The IOC was represented by Mrs Tamara Soupiron, IOC legal counsel, as well as Mr Jean-Pierre Morand and Mr Nicolas Français, IOC external legal counsels.

50. Prof Martial Saugy, Former Director of the Lausanne Laboratory, was heard as an expert witness.
51. On 13 December 2016, the Athlete's counsel submitted an additional expert opinion signed by Dr Douwe de Boer.
52. On 15 December 2016, the IOC filed an answer to the additional expert opinion of Dr de Boer signed by Prof Martial Saugy.
53. On 17 March 2017, the IOC communicated to the Disciplinary Commission the fact that it had been informed that the Athlete had been subject to two further proceedings concerning further anti-doping rules violations.
54. In the first case, which concerned a sample collected on 15 August 2009, the Athlete was found to have the same doping substance (oral turinabol) in her sample. The Athlete did not challenge the decision issued by the Disciplinary Anti-Doping Committee of the RUSADA on 15 January 2015.
55. The second case is a decision issued in first instance by the CAS (CAS 2016/O/4469). An appeal is pending.
56. This second case is an ABP (Athlete Biological Passport) case. In this case, the Athlete, through the same expert, Dr Douwe de Boer, is challenging the validity of certain values in the passport, which according to the Athlete's expert opinion would have resulted from the Athlete's use of oral turinabol.
57. The Athlete's counsel filed observations in respect of this additional submission on 3 April 2017.

II. APPLICABLE RULES

58. These proceedings are conducted in application of the Rules.
59. Art. 2.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

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

- 2.1.1 *It is each Athlete's personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Athletes are responsible for any Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in their bodily Specimens. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete's part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping violation under Article 2.1.*
- 2.1.2 *Excepting those substances for which a quantitative reporting threshold is specifically identified in the Prohibited List, the detected presence of any quantity of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.*
- 2.1.3 *As an exception to the general rule of Article 2.1, the Prohibited List may establish special criteria for the evaluation of Prohibited Substances that can also be produced endogenously."*

60. Art. 2.2 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method

2.2.1 The success or failure of the Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method is not material. It is sufficient that the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method was Used or Attempted to be used for an anti-doping rule violation to be committed.”

61. Art. 5.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“The IOC is responsible for Doping Control during the Period of the Olympic Games. The IOC is entitled to delegate all or part of its responsibility for Doping Control to one or several other organisations.

The Period of the Olympic Games, or In-Competition Period, is defined as “the period commencing on the date of the opening of the Olympic village for the Olympic Games, namely, 27 July 2008 up until and including the day of the closing ceremony of the Olympic Games, namely, 24 August 2008.

All Athletes participating at the Olympic Games shall be subject, during the Period of the Olympic Games, to Doping Control initiated by the IOC at any time or place, with No Advance Notice. Such Doping Control may include Testing for all Prohibited Substances and all Prohibited Methods referred to in the Prohibited List.

The IOC shall have the right to conduct or cause to conduct Doping Control during the Period of the Olympic Games, and is responsible for the subsequent handling of such cases.”

62. Art. 7.2.5 of the Rules provides as follows:

“The IOC President or a person designated by him shall, in confidence, promptly notify the Athlete or other Person concerned, the Athlete’s or other Person’s chef de mission, the International Federation concerned and a representative of the Independent Observer Program of:

- a) the adverse analytical finding;*
- b) the Athlete’s right to request the analysis of the B sample or, failing such request, that the B sample analysis may be deemed waived;*
- c) the right of the Athlete and/or the Athlete’s representative to attend the B sample opening and analysis if such analysis is requested;*
- d) the Athlete’s right to request copies of the A and B sample laboratory package, which includes information as required by the International Standard for Laboratories;*
- e) the anti-doping rule violation or of the additional investigation that will be conducted as to whether there is an anti-doping rule violation;*
- f) the composition of the Disciplinary Commission.*

It shall be the responsibility of the chef de mission to inform, in confidence, the relevant National Anti-Doping Organisation of the Athlete.”

63. Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Notice to an Athlete or other Person who has been accredited pursuant to the request of the NOC, may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the NOC. Notification to the Chef de Mission or the President or the General Secretary of the NOC of the Athlete or other Person shall be deemed to be a delivery of notice to the NOC.”

64. Art. 8.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“A violation of these Rules in connection with Doping Control automatically leads to Disqualification of the Athlete with all other consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.”

65. Art. 9.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“An Anti-Doping Rule violation occurring during or in connection with the Olympic Games may lead to Disqualification of all of the Athlete’s results obtained in the Olympic Games with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes, except as provided in Article 9.1.1.”

66. Art. 9.1.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

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

67. Art. 9.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

“The management of anti-doping rule violations and the conduct of additional hearings as a consequence of hearings and decisions of the IOC, including with regard to the imposition of sanctions over and above those relating to the Olympic Games, shall be managed by the relevant International Federation.”

III. DISCUSSION

A. Anti-Doping Rule Violation

68. The presence of metabolites of a Prohibited Substance has been established by the Laboratory in 2016 in the sample n° 1842775 that the Athlete provided on 17 August 2008 upon the occasion of the 2008 Olympic Games.
69. The substance detected in the Athlete’s sample, i.e. dehydrochlormethyltestosterone (turinabol) is an exogenous anabolic steroid. It is listed in the WADA 2008 Prohibited List and in all subsequent lists.
70. The Disciplinary Commission is satisfied that the samples which have been re-analysed by the Laboratory are unequivocally linked to the Athlete and that no relevant departure from the WADA International Standards occurred.
71. Moreover, and despite the arguments submitted by the Athlete in this respect, which are discussed below, the Disciplinary Commission is further satisfied that the analytical results are valid and do properly establish the presence of the Prohibited Substance at stake in the Athlete’s samples.
72. Based on the above, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 2.1 of the Rules consisting in the presence of a Prohibited Substance in the Athlete’s body is established.
73. In addition, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping rule violation could also be held as established if the circumstances were considered in the perspective of art. 2.2 of the Rules.

74. In this respect, the Disciplinary Commission observes that the nature of the substance which was found in the Athlete's sample (i.e. a traditional doping substance) makes this result consistent with the use of a Prohibited Substance specifically ingested to deliberately improve performance.
75. The Disciplinary Commission, which has now handled multiple cases arising out of the re-analysis of samples from the 2008 and 2012 Olympic Games, observes that the presence of metabolites of this particular substance has been established in a remarkably high number of cases, which resulted from the re-analysis of the samples collected in Beijing 2008 and London 2012.
76. This constitutes an indication that said substance has been in widespread use by athletes, who were doping at that time.
77. Prior to the application of a new detection strategy searching for metabolites remaining detectable over a much longer period of time and which began to apply only from late 2012 /2013, the detection window of said substance was limited to much shorter period of time (5 to 10 days).
78. The search for the newly established so called "long term" metabolites significantly extended the detection window (up to 50 and more days). Such a significant extension of the detection window is the obvious explanation for the unfortunately spectacular and unprecedented high number of positive cases which were revealed by the re-analysis process.
79. Doping is a planned process in which the detection window is a key parameter. The athletes using the substance at the time, and/or the persons who were supporting them in this respect, planned with the detection window applicable at the time. They did not expect that the detection window would subsequently be significantly extended, by virtue of a new method capable of detecting long-term metabolites during a much longer period of time.
80. This explains why athletes, who had in the past effectively managed to avoid positive anti-doping controls were caught. It is an illustration of the effectiveness of the re-analysis process and of its purpose, which is essentially to give those, who think they can outsmart the anti-doping controls, the message that they will never be safe.
81. In any event for the purpose of these proceedings, it is not necessary to examine exhaustively whether the Athlete could establish how the substance entered her body, as the mere establishment of presence suffices to justify the application of the consequences provided for under the Rules.
82. In conclusion, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping violation is established pursuant to both Art. 2.1 and Art. 2.2 of the Rules.

B. Arguments of the Athlete

i. Preliminary issue concerning the filing of the McLaren Report, Part II

83. The Athlete is not expressly disputing the filing of the McLaren Report, Part II. However, the Athlete's counsel argues that this document does not establish that the Athlete committed an anti-doping rule violation. He admits that this report clearly demonstrates a major doping problem in Russia but contests the fact that it could be related to the Athlete.
84. The IOC is justifying the filing of the report by the fact that it establishes the fact that at the relevant time (i.e. up until late 2012), the substance, which was actually found in the

Athlete's samples, was a doping substance widely used in Russia. In the IOC's view, whilst this does not directly relate to the commission of the anti-doping rule violation by the Athlete, it does constitute relevant circumstantial evidence supporting the analytical findings: the analysis has identified a specific substance very commonly used in the environment of the Athlete.

85. The Disciplinary Commission observes that the content of the report has been publicly issued and is available to anybody. It is therefore part of common knowledge and its acceptance or exclusion from the file could not change that.
86. On the other hand, the Disciplinary Commission underlined that the report was indeed not related to the Athlete and, as such, could not permit to draw a conclusion in her respect.
87. Even if it is in itself not a sufficient element to draw specific conclusion, the fact that according to the McLaren Report, Part 2, turinabol appears to have been widely used in Russia in this period can only bring additional comfort in regard of the finding of the Laboratory, which, in this context, is not surprising.

ii. Validity of the identification of the substance

88. Based on the opinion of her appointed expert, Dr de Boer, the Athlete submits that the results of the B1-aliquot analysis do not unequivocally identify the substance at stake.
89. Dr de Boer also notes the fact that the results obtained for the B1-Sample are not identical to the results obtained in the B2-Sample.
90. Both issues are answered by Prof Martial Saugy. Prof Saugy observes first that the identification of the substance had been conducted in accordance with the Technical Document in force. The identification criterias are clearly fulfilled.
91. The results of the two samples are further consistent. The small differences between the two samples may result from differences in sensitivity of the instrument used on two different days. Furthermore, turinabol is not a threshold substance and quantification is not an issue. The substance has been identified in both samples and duly reported accordingly.
92. The Disciplinary Commission has reviewed the arguments set forth in Dr de Boer's opinion and the explanations provided by Prof Saugy during the hearing and in their respective expert opinions.
93. The Disciplinary Commission has no hesitation to conclude that the arguments submitted by Dr De Boer are not putting in question the analytical findings and the presumption that they were validly established by the Laboratory.
94. The Disciplinary Commission first notes that Dr de Boer suggested that there would be a departure from the technical document. In his first opinion, Dr de Boer referred to the document presently in force, i.e. TD201515IDCR.
95. After having been asked to identify more clearly a departure under the technical document, Dr de Boer came back with complex explanations, which however and in substance meant that he had initially referred to a previous version of the technical document, which was no longer in force.
96. De Boer effectively maintained his argument suggesting that the new technical document would probably be a "simplified version".

97. The Disciplinary Commission does not see any reason to follow such an unconvincing and contorted explanation.
98. As underlined by Prof Saugy, the Disciplinary Commission observes that the presence of the substance is confirmed in both samples. In both cases, the identification criterias are fulfilled and no departure from the ISL and/or the applicable technical document has been established or even credibly alleged.
99. The comfort of the Disciplinary Commission in reaching the conclusion that the analytical findings are valid and that the substance identified in her samples was oral turinabol is reinforced by the fact that the Athlete was found to have used this very same substance one year later. In this case, she did not attempt to challenge the result.
100. On the contrary, her argument in the further ABP case that her blood results were influenced by the fact that she was using oral turinabol is a direct admission that she has been using that substance, at least in 2009.
101. Based thereon, the proposition that the substance identified by the Laboratory in 2008 (with all identification criterias fulfilled) would effectively not be that substance is a rather difficult one to sustain.
102. In this respect, the Disciplinary Commission notes that the fact that Dr de Boer would have accepted to appear as an expert in these proceedings to challenge the validity of the establishment of the presence of oral turinabol, whilst he had previously appeared in another proceedings to sustain an argument based on the fact that the same Athlete did use the substance in question is, to say the least, troubling.
103. The fact that the issue is considered in two different time periods may make theoretically possible to sustain both positions. However, the Disciplinary Commission observes that this does not reinforce the overall credibility of the expert and of the explanations he has been providing in these proceedings.
104. In any event the Athlete did not meet her burden to rebut the presumption according to which the WADA accredited laboratory is presumed to have conducted the analysis in accordance with the ISL and other applicable technical documents.
105. In conclusion, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping rule violation is thus established pursuant to both Art. 2.1 and Art. 2.2 of the Rules.

C. Consequences of the anti-doping rule violation

106. Under the Rules, the consequences of anti-doping rule violations are limited to consequences in connection with the 2008 Olympic Games.
107. In application of Art. 8.1 and 9.1 of the Rules, the results achieved by the Athlete during the 2008 Olympic Games shall be annulled, with all resulting consequences (notably withdrawal of medals, diplomas, pins etc.).
108. In application of Art. 9.3 of the Rules, the further management of the consequences of the anti-doping rule violations, and in particular the imposition of sanctions over and above those related to the 2008 Olympic Games, shall be conducted by the relevant International Federation, i.e. the International Association of Athletics Federations (“IAAF”).

* * * * *

CONSIDERING the above, pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 and, in particular, 2, 5.1, 7.3.3, 8 and 9 thereof.

THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE
DECIDES

- I. The Athlete, Tatiana CHERNOVA:
 - (i) is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (presence and/or use, of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an athlete's bodily specimen),
 - (ii) is disqualified from the Women's heptathlon event in which she participated upon the occasion of the Olympic Games Beijing 2008,
 - (iii) has the bronze medal, the medallist pin and the diploma obtained in the Women's heptathlon event withdrawn and is ordered to return the same.
- II. The IAAF is requested to modify the results of the above-mentioned event accordingly and to consider any further action within its own competence.
- III. The Russian Olympic Committee shall ensure full implementation of this decision.
- IV. The Russian Olympic Committee shall notably secure the return to the IOC, as soon as possible, of the bronze medal, the medallist pin and the diploma awarded in connection the Women's heptathlon event to the Athlete.
- V. This decision enters into force immediately.

Lausanne, 19 April 2017

In the name of the IOC Disciplinary Commission



Denis Oswald, Chairman



Juan Antonio Samaranch



Ugur Erdener