

**INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE**

**IOC DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION**

**DECISION**

**REGARDING MAYA MANEZA  
BORN ON 1 NOVEMBER 1985, KAZAKHSTAN, ATHLETE, WEIGHTLIFTING**

(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. Maya MANEZA (hereinafter the “**Athlete**”), participated in the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (the “**2008 Olympic Games**”).
2. The Athlete was registered to compete in the Women’s 63 kg weightlifting event, which was scheduled to take place on 12 August 2008, but she finally did not start the competition for an unknown reason.
3. On 6 August 2008, the Athlete was requested to provide a urine sample for a doping control. Such sample was identified with the number 1845035.
4. The A-Sample 1845035 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 **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 notably performed with improved analytical methods using more sensitive equipment and/or searching for new metabolites 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 a 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 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 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 similar 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 such first phase of the B-Sample analysis.
14. The IOC nevertheless decided, once 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: stanozolol.
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 to the IOC through her NOC her first completed PAAF Notification Appendix in which she wrote the following comment:

*“Further to your notification, I have reviewed the Anti-Doping Rules for the Beijing Olympic Games. Article 6.5 of said rules states that any violation discovered as a result of re-analysis shall be dealt with in accordance with the Beijing OG Anti-Doping Rules. Article 7.2.5 mentions that the athlete has the right to request the analysis of the B sample if an adverse analytical finding is reported further to the analysis of the A sample. I then object that the B sample be opened as no adverse analytical finding has been reported further to the analysis of my A sample. I further challenge that the 2016 rules apply as the case shall be governed by the 2008 rules.”*
18. On the same day, the IOC informed the Athlete through her NOC that her comments would be brought to the attention of the Disciplinary Commission. She was granted an additional deadline until 18 July 2016 to indicate whether she would attend the process, either personally and/or through a representative.
19. On 18 July 2016, the Athlete sent to the IOC through her NOC her second PAAF Notification Appendix in which she indicated that she would not personally attend the opening, splitting of the B-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B1-Sample but that she would be represented on this occasion by Mr Alimzhan Akayev.

20. On the same day, the IOC informed the Athlete through her NOC that the opening, splitting of the B-Sample and the sealing of the B2-Sample would occur on 22 July 2016 at the Laboratory followed by the analysis of the B1-Sample.
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 represented by Mr Akayev 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 stanozolol.
25. Such results constitute an Adverse Analytical Finding. 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;
  - Mrs Gunilla Lindberg (Sweden)
  - 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. In the same communication, the Athlete was advised that failing to request the opening and analysis of the B2-Sample, she would be considered as having waived her right to have the B2-Sample analysed.
30. The Athlete did not reply.
31. On 8 August 2016, the IOC granted the Athlete an additional deadline until 10 August 2016 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.
32. In the same communication, the IOC advised the Athlete that the previous correspondences were deemed notified to her in accordance with Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules. The Athlete was further advised that in the event she did not respond, the IOC might elect not to proceed with the analysis of the B2-Sample and to proceed directly to the disciplinary proceedings on the B1-Sample analysis results only.

33. On the same day, the NOC and the IF were requested by the IOC to take further actions with the National Federation (“**NF**”) concerned in order to contact the Athlete. They were also requested to provide the IOC with the full contact details of the Athlete. The IOC reminded the NOC of the content of Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules.
34. On 9 August 2016, the IF provided the IOC with the email address of the Athlete’s NF.
35. On 12 August 2016, the IOC sent a reminder to the Athlete through her NOC and her NF. The content of Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules was reminded to the Athlete. The IOC also advised the Athlete that due to the lack of response, it had been decided not to proceed with the analysis of the B2-Sample. The IOC invited the Athlete to indicate by 17 August 2016 whether she would attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission and/or she would submit a defence in writing.
36. On the same day, the NOC and the IF were invited once again to provide the IOC with the full contact information of the Athlete.
37. On 26 September 2016, the IOC granted the Athlete an additional deadline until 5 October 2016 to complete and return the Disciplinary Commission Form. The Athlete was advised that in the event no reply was given to this correspondence, the Disciplinary Commission would issue a decision on the basis of the file.
38. On 6 October 2016, the Athlete sent to the IOC through her NOC her completed Disciplinary Commission Form in which she indicated that she would not attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission, neither personally nor through a representative, and that she would not submit a written defence.
39. On 10 October 2016, the IOC acknowledged receipt of the Disciplinary Commission Form and advised the Athlete that a decision would be issued on the basis of the file.
40. On the same day, the NOC and the IF were invited to file written observations by 17 October 2016.
41. The NOC and the IF did not file any written observations.
42. As a final observation, it is to be noted that samples provided by the same Athlete on the occasion of the Games of the XXX Olympiad in London in 2012 (the “**2012 Olympic Games**”) were also subject to further analysis.
43. In this case, the analytical results showed the presence of the same Prohibited Substance, namely stanozolol.
44. The corresponding proceedings addressing this further matter have been conducted in parallel to the present proceedings. The Disciplinary Commission issued its decision in this matter on 24 October 2016 (LRT II – 013).

## **II. APPLICABLE RULES**

45. These proceedings are conducted in application of the Rules.
46. 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.”*

47. 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.”*

48. 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.”*

49. 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."*

50. 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."*

51. 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."*

52. 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."*

53. 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."*

54. 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."*

55. Art. 16.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

*"These Rules are governed by the Olympic Charter, by the Code and by Swiss law".*

56. Art. 16.5 of the Rules provides as follows:

*"These Rules have been adopted pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Code and shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with applicable provisions of the Code."*

57. The Introduction of the World Anti-Doping Code (version 2003, p2) provides as follows:

*“International Standards and all revisions shall become effective on the date specified in the International Standard or revision.”*

58. The Introduction of the International Standard (2016 ISL - Version 9, “ISL”), provides as follows:

*“The International Standard for Laboratories first came into effect in November 2002. Further revisions were made after that date. The enclosed International Standard for Laboratories was approved by the WADA Executive Committee on 11 May 2016. The effective date of ISL version 9.0 is 02 June 2016.”*

59. Art. 5.2.2.12.6 ISL provides as follows:

*“During transport and long-term storage, Samples shall be maintained at a temperature sufficient to maintain the analytical integrity of the Sample. In any anti-doping rule violation case based on the Further Analysis of a stored Sample, the issue of the temperature at which the Sample was transported or stored shall only be considered where failure to maintain an appropriate temperature could have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding or other result upon which the anti-doping rule violation is based.”*

60. Art. 5.2.2.12.8 ISL provides as follows:

*“Samples held in long-term storage may be selected for Further Analysis at the discretion of the Testing Authority.”*

61. Art. 5.2.2.12.9 ISL provides as follows:

*“Further Analysis of Samples shall be performed under the ISL and Technical Documents in effect at the time the Further Analysis is performed.”*

62. Art. 5.2.2.12.10 ISL provides as follows:

*“Further Analysis on long-term stored Samples shall proceed as follows:*

- At the discretion of the Testing Authority, the “A” Sample may not be used or it may be used for initial testing (as described in Article 5.2.4.2) only, or for both initial testing and confirmation (as described in Article 5.2.4.3.1). Where confirmation is not completed in the A Sample the Laboratory, at the direction of the Testing Authority shall appoint an independent witness to verify the opening and splitting of the sealed “B” Sample (which shall occur without requirement that the Athlete be notified or present) and then proceed to analysis based on the “B” Sample which has been split into 2 bottles.*
- At the opening of the “B” Sample, the Laboratory shall ensure that the Sample is adequately homogenized (e.g. invert bottle several times) before splitting the “B” Sample. The Laboratory shall divide the volume of the “B” Sample into two bottles (using Sample collection equipment compliant to ISTI provision 6.3.4) in the presence of the independent witness. The splitting of the “B” Sample shall be documented in the chain of custody. The independent witness will be invited to seal one of the bottles using a tamper evident method.”*

### **III. DISCUSSION**

63. The presence of metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, i.e. stanozolol, has been established in 2016 in the sample 1845035 that the Athlete provided on 6 August 2008, upon the occasion of the 2008 Olympic Games.

64. The substance detected in the Athlete's sample is an anabolic steroid. It is listed in the WADA 2008 Prohibited List and in all subsequent lists.
65. The Disciplinary Commission is satisfied that the sample which has been re-analysed by the Laboratory is unequivocally linked to the Athlete and that no relevant departure from the WADA International Standards occurred.
66. The process applied to analyse the Athlete's samples was conducted in application of the ISL in force at the time of the analysis (ISL 2016 – version 9).
67. The Athlete contends that the ISL in force at the time of the sample collection in 2008 should have been applied and that such did not allow to conduct the analysis on a split B-Sample.
68. The Disciplinary Commission observes that the Rules themselves do not specify the version of the ISL, which is to be applied to the analytical process.
69. However the Rules refer to the World Anti-Doping Code (in this case the 2003 version, p.2) which expressly sets forth that *International Standards and all revisions shall become effective on the date specified in the International Standard or revision.*
70. The ISL 2016 – Version 9 came into effect on 2 June 2016 and is therefore the ISL applicable to the analysis of the Athlete's samples conducted in July and August 2016.
71. The applicable ISL expressly provide for the possibility to conduct the analysis on a split B-Sample.
72. For the sake of completeness and although this is actually not relevant in regard of an analysis conducted in 2016, the Disciplinary Commission observes that the possibility to perform the analysis on a split B-Sample was already provided for in the ISL in force at the time of sample collection, i.e. the ISL 2008 – Version 5, in force since January 2008 (see art. 5.2.2.12.1.2).
73. The Disciplinary Commission thus finds that the process which led to the analytical finding was correctly conducted in application of the ISL in force at the time of the analysis.
74. Such results establish that the Athlete has in any event committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 2.1 of the Rules consisting in the presence of a Prohibited Substance in her body.
75. In addition, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping rule violation would also be established if the circumstances are considered in the perspective of art. 2.2 of the Rules.
76. The Disciplinary Commission observes that the nature of the substance which was found in the Athlete's sample is consistent with intentional use of Prohibited Substances specifically ingested to deliberately improve performance. The fact that metabolite of a doping substance, which is a "classical" doping substance was found, supports this consideration.
77. The consequences of an anti-doping rule violation under the Rules are limited to consequences in connection with the 2008 Olympic Games. They are set forth in Art. 8 and 9 of the Rules and are the following.

78. In application of Art. 8.1 and/or Art. 9 of the Rules, the results achieved by the Athlete during the 2008 Olympic Games shall be annulled. This includes the result that the Athlete did not start.
79. 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 Olympic Games 2008 shall be conducted by the International Weightlifting Federation (“**IWF**”).

\* \* \* \* \*

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, Maya MANEZA:
  - (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 63 kg weightlifting event in which she was registered upon the occasion of the Olympic Games Beijing 2008,
- II. The IWF is requested to modify the results of the above-mentioned event accordingly and to consider any further action within its own competence.
- III. This decision enters into force immediately.

Lausanne, 17 November 2016

In the name of the IOC Disciplinary Commission



Ugur Erdener



Denis Oswald, Chairman



Gunilla Lindberg