

DECISION OF THE ATHLETICS INTEGRITY UNIT IN THE CASE OF MS DANAH HUSSEIN

INTRODUCTION

1. World Athletics has established the Athletics Integrity Unit ("**AIU**") whose role is to protect the integrity of the sport of Athletics, including fulfilling World Athletics' obligations as a Signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code ("the "**Code**"). World Athletics has delegated implementation of the World Athletics Anti-Doping Rules ("**ADR**") to the AIU, including but not limited to the following activities in relation to International-Level Athletes: Testing, Investigations, Results Management, Hearings, Sanctions and Appeals.
2. Ms Danah Hussein ("the **Athlete**") is a 36-year-old International-Level sprinter from Iraq¹.
3. This decision is issued by the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR, which provides as follows:

"8.5.6 In the event that the Athlete or other Person either (i) admits the violation and accepts the proposed Consequences or (ii) is deemed to have admitted the violation and accepted the Consequences as per Rule 8.5.2(f), the Integrity Unit will promptly:

- (a) issue a decision confirming the commission of the violation(s) and the imposition of the specified Consequences (including, if applicable, a justification for why the maximum potential sanction was not imposed);*
- (b) Publicly Report that decision in accordance with Rule 14;*
- (c) send a copy of the decision to the Athlete or other Person and to any other party that has a right, further to Rule 13, to appeal the decision (and any such party may, within 15 days of receipt, request a copy of the full case file pertaining to the decision)."*

THE COMMISSION OF ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS

4. Rule 2 ADR sets out that the following shall constitute an Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

"2.1 Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample

[...]

2.2 Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method"

5. On 17 June 2021, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition following her 1st place finish in the 100m final at the Arab Championships in Rades, Tunisia, which was given code 0013801 (the "**Sample**").

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/iraq/danah-hussein-14283410>

6. Analysis of the Sample revealed the presence of Stanozolol and its Metabolites 16 β -hydroxy-stanozolol, 3'-hydroxy-stanozolol, 4 β -hydroxy-stanozolol and Clenbuterol (the "**Adverse Analytical Finding**").
7. Stanozolol and Clenbuterol are Prohibited Substances under the WADA 2021 Prohibited List. Stanozolol is listed under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids and Clenbuterol is listed under the category S2. Other Anabolic Steroids. They are Non-Specified Substances prohibited at all times.
8. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management ("**ISRM**") and determined that:
 - 8.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the Testosterone and its Metabolites consistent with exogenous origin found in the Sample; and
 - 8.2. there was no apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations ("**ISTI**") or from the International Standard for Laboratories ("**ISL**") that could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding.
9. Therefore, on 16 July 2021, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, including that the Adverse Analytical Finding may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR and/or Rule 2.2 ADR and of the imposition of an immediate Provisional Suspension.
10. The Athlete was also informed of her rights, inter alia, to request the B Sample analysis, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting the Adverse Analytical Finding and to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR.
11. On 23 July 2021, the AIU received, via the Iraqi Athletics Federation, a response and documents sent on behalf of the Athlete in reply to the Notice of Allegation confirming that that the Athlete and her Coach, Mr Karokh Salih Mohammed ("the **Coach**") had been invited to appear before representatives of the Iraqi Athletics Federation on 22 July 2021 to answer questions concerning the circumstances of the Adverse Analytical Finding.²
12. The documents received via the Iraqi Athletics Federation provided that the Athlete gave the following information in answer to questions put to her:

"Q3: We received an email from the (AIU) on July 16, 2021, from Mr. (Tony Jackson) Deputy Head of Case Management it contains a set of documents related to the result of the analysis that appeared positively in the urine sample that was taken from you on June 17, 2021 in Tunisia, which showed the presence of a substance S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids (Stanozolol and its Metabolites 16 β -hydroxy-stanozolol, 3'-hydroxy-stanozolol, 4 β -hydroxy-stanozolol), S2. Other Anabolic Steroids (Clenbuterol). What is your response to this result?"

² The B Sample analysis was also requested in the response received on 23 July 2021

AI I have no knowledge of these substances that appeared in the result of the analysis and that the person responsible for my nutrition and training is Mr (Karokh Salih Mohammed) (My Coach).

[...]

Q5/ Is there someone you suspect gave you these materials?

AI Yes, I have my own coach and he is responsible for providing me with all the supplements, medications and vitamins that I take without knowing their contents.”

13. In addition, the Coach confirmed the following in answering questions from the Iraqi Athletics Federation representatives:

“To sit with the coach (Karokh Salih Mohammed), who is responsible for training the athlete (Danah Hussein Abdulrazzaq Al-Khafaji) after their return from traveling directly on July 22, 2021 for the purpose of asking some questions about the positive test results that appeared in the athlete’s sample and about the answers given by the athlete, in which you indicate that you are You are [sic] response [sic] for training her and giving her food, supplements and vitamins. What is your response?

AI Yes, I was responsible for giving the Athlete daily training doses for more than two years, as well as the person responsible for giving her nutritional supplements, vitamins and mineral salts without the athlete’s knowledge of the contents of these substances. [...] And here I confirm that the player is not aware of the materials that I gave her and she is not responsible. I am responsible, but I do not know that they contain international materials.”

(emphasis added)

14. Following the Athlete’s request for the B Sample analysis received on 23 July 2021, on 24 August 2021, the AIU wrote to the Athlete confirming that the B Sample analysis had confirmed the Adverse Analytical Finding and requested the Athlete’s full written explanation by no later than 27 August 2021.
15. On 1 September 2021, the AIU received a request for an extension to the deadline for the Athlete to submit her explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding from the Athlete’s newly appointed legal representatives.
16. On 7 September 2021, the Athlete wrote to the AIU through her legal representatives and confirmed that she wished to provide Substantial Assistance.
17. On 9 September 2021, the Athlete provided her written explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding (which equally served as the Athlete’s information submitted for the purposes of Substantial Assistance) by way of a signed written statement to the AIU. In summary, the Athlete explained as follows:

- 17.1. she began menstruating on the evening of 15 June 2021 which developed on 16 June 2021 and 17 June 2021 into physical symptoms, including severe cramps, and she informed the Coach;
 - 17.2. on 17 June 2021, approximately 30 to 35 minutes before her race (i.e., the 100m final of the Arab Championships), the Coach approached the Athlete with a vitamin C container/bottle, from which he removed three (3) pills of two different types (two (2) were one colour and one (1) was another colour) and offered them to the Athlete;
 - 17.3. she asked the Coach what the pills were and the Coach informed her that they would help her body relax and make the Athlete “*feel regular*”;
 - 17.4. she took the pills because she trusted the Coach and believed that he was acting in her best interests;
 - 17.5. she did not associate the pills with performance enhancing substances because the Coach had informed her that they would help her relax rather than enhance her performance;
 - 17.6. she did not declare the pills on the Doping Control Form because she did not know the name of them; and
 - 17.7. several days after being interviewed/questioned by the Iraqi Athletics Federation on 22 July 2021, the Coach had called the Athlete and admitted that the pills he had given to her were Stanozolol and Clenbuterol.
18. Following receipt of the Athlete’s explanation and information, the AIU made several requests of the Athlete for further information/evidence to corroborate her explanation and information. The Athlete produced WhatsApp messages between the Athlete and the Coach in which the Coach confirmed (i) the name and location of the store/individual where he purchased Clenbuterol and Stanozolol (ii) details of the purchase, including the amount paid, and (iii) further details concerning the Stanozolol and Clenbuterol purchased (e.g., precise dosages, images of the pills and packaging etc.).
19. On 17 December 2021 and 29 March 2022, the AIU interviewed the Athlete in relation to her explanation and the corroborating information that she had provided. The Athlete confirmed (and further corroborated) her explanation already provided to the AIU in her written statement of 9 September 2021 during those interviews.
20. On 10 May 2022, the AIU wrote to the Coach referring to the answers that he had given to the Iraqi Athletics Federation on 22 July 2021 in relation to the Adverse Analytical Finding and issued a Demand for him to provide a written statement, setting out in full his knowledge of the relevant facts and circumstances relating to the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Rule 5.7.5 ADR by no later than 20 May 2022 (“the **Demand**”).
21. On 14 May 2022, the AIU received a written reply from the Coach in response to the Demand. The Coach stated that he was responsible for the Adverse Analytical Finding and that he had taken the Athlete’s menstrual pain as an opportunity to deliberately give her pills (which he maintained that he did not know were prohibited substances) to ensure that the Athlete obtained a favourable result to enhance his profile as a coach.

22. The Coach confirmed that he had presented the pills to the Athlete in a vitamin C container/bottle shortly before her 100m race on 17 June 2021, having represented them as something that would relax her and assist with her menstrual pain.
23. On 22 June 2022, the Coach attended an interview with AIU representatives. The Coach confirmed the details of his written explanation, but also clarified that he had been specifically advised by a friend of the benefits of using Stanozolol and Clenbuterol in combination to enhance performance/weight loss, and that he had purchased them on that advice.
24. The Coach also confirmed that, contrary to what he had stated in his written explanation, he was fully aware that Stanozolol and Clenbuterol were prohibited substances when he purchased them and when he gave them to the Athlete on 17 June 2021.
25. On 16 November 2022, the AIU issued a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations to the Coach for violations of Rule 2.6 (Possession of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method by an Athlete Support Person), Rule 2.7 (Trafficking in any Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method by an Athlete or other Person), Rule 2.8 Administration by an Athlete or other Person to any Athlete In-Competition of any Prohibited Method or Prohibited Substance) and Rule 2.9 Complicity by an Athlete or other Person).
26. On 4 December 2022, the Coach signed and returned an admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences form to the AIU, confirming that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted a lifetime period of Ineligibility from the sport of Athletics.
27. On 9 February 2023, the Athlete signed and returned an admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences form to the AIU, confirming that she admitted to committing Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 and Rule 2.2 ADR based on the Adverse Analytical Finding.

CONSEQUENCES

28. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
29. Rule 10.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 or Rule 2.2 shall be as follows:
 - “10.2.1 Save where Rule 10.2.4 applies, the period of Ineligibility will be four years where:*
 - (a) The anti-doping rule violation does not involve a Specified Substance or a Specified Method, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional.*
 - (b) The anti-doping rule violation involves a Specified Substance or a Specified Method and the Integrity Unit can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was intentional.”*
30. Stanozolol and Clenbuterol are Prohibited Substances under the WADA 2021 Prohibited List. Stanozolol is listed under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids and Clenbuterol is listed under the category S2. Other Anabolic Steroids. They are Non-Specified Substances prohibited at all times.

31. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.
32. The AIU's position is that the Athlete cannot rely on her (ultimately misplaced) trust in the Coach, or on her asserted belief that he was acting only in her best interests when he gave her the pills on 17 June 2021, to demonstrate that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.
33. The Athlete's fundamental duty under the ADR is a personal one to ensure that she does not use or ingest any Prohibited Substances or Methods at any time. That duty cannot be delegated, and the Athlete's responsibility includes the behaviour of her entourage, including her Coach³.
34. In any event, the AIU considers that the Athlete's Anti-Doping Rule Violations are a prime example of a case of "indirect intent".
35. As held in numerous CAS cases,⁴ indirect intent is present where: "*the Player i) knew that there was a significant risk that his conduct might constitute or result in an anti-doping rule violation; and ii) manifestly disregarded that risk.*"⁵ Put more colourfully: "*If - figuratively speaking - an athlete runs into a "minefield" ignoring all stop signs along his way, he may well have the primary intention of getting through the "minefield" unharmed. However, an athlete acting in such (reckless) manner somehow accepts that a certain result (i.e., adverse analytical finding) may materialize and therefore acts with (indirect) intent.*"⁶
36. The Athlete's conduct in this case was consistent with the analysis of indirect intent quoted above and set out in numerous CAS cases. The Athlete ran into the proverbial '*minefield*', without sufficient caution or care, *inter alia*, and without limitation, based upon the following factors:
- 36.1. 17 June 2021 was only the second time that the Athlete had ever met the Coach in person, and it was the first (and only) time that the Athlete had ever received pills from the Coach directly;
- 36.2. the Athlete accepted in interview with the AIU that she did not know what the pills were when she took them;
- 36.3. the Athlete also accepted that, although she did not know what the pills were, she knew that they were not vitamin C pills (despite being presented to her in a vitamin C box) or painkillers;

³ See for example [CAS 2017/A/5301 Sara Errani v ITF](#), para 198.

⁴ C.f. [CAS 2012/A/2822 Erkand Qerimaj v. IWF](#); [CAS 2016/A/4609 WADA v. Indian NADA & Dane Pereira](#); [CAS 2017/A/5022 FIFA v. CBF & Cristiano Lopes](#).

⁵ [CAS 2016/A/4609 WADA v. Indian NADA & Dane Pereira](#), para. 62.

⁶ [CAS 2012/A/2822 Erkand Qerimaj v. IWF](#), para. 8.14.

- 36.4. the Athlete's inquiry of the Coach as to the nature of the pills was therefore manifestly insufficient and resulted only in an entirely vague (and evasive) description as to their effects; and
- 36.5. although the Athlete had some 30-35 minutes between being presented with the pills and the 100m race on 17 June 2021, she failed to probe further the vague and evasive descriptions as to the nature of the pills offered to her by her Coach, or to take any (independent) steps to verify the nature of the unidentified pills before ingesting them, for example, by consulting a medical professional.
37. In this case, the Athlete accepts that she had no idea what pills were presented to her. She knew, however, that they were not what they were purported to be because she has accepted that she knew the pills were not vitamin C or painkillers and she knew that they were not being presented to her in their original (or related) packaging. She was not told explicitly what they were and was given only vague descriptions as to their effects.
38. Ignoring all of those clear and obvious warning signs, the Athlete nevertheless chose to ingest them. The Athlete's reckless behaviour in this sense means that she is considered to have accepted that a certain result (i.e., the Adverse Analytical Finding) might materialise.
39. This is a paradigm case of indirect intent, and the applicable period of Ineligibility is therefore four (4) years.
40. However, Rule 10.8.1 ADR provides that an athlete potentially subject to an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) years or more may benefit from a one (1)-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction:
- “10.8.1 One year reduction for certain anti-doping rule violations based on early admission and acceptance of sanction.*
- Where the Integrity Unit notifies an Athlete or other Person of an anti-doping rule violation charge that carries an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) or more years (including any period of Ineligibility asserted under Rule 10.4), if the Athlete or other Person admits the violation and accepts the asserted period of Ineligibility no later than 20 days after receiving the Notice of Charge, the Athlete or other Person may receive a one (1) year reduction in the period of Ineligibility asserted by the Integrity Unit. Where the Athlete or other Person receives the one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility under this Rule 10.8.1, no further reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility will be allowed under any other Rule.”*
41. The Athlete was notified of the Adverse Analytical Finding and that this may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 and/or Rule 2.2 and a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years on 16 July 2021⁷.

⁷ This Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations was issued to the Athlete in accordance with Article 5.1.2 of the ISRM, prior to a Notice of Charge issued in accordance with Article 7 of the ISRM. Considering the Athlete's admission and acceptance of Consequences on 9 February 2023, no Notice of Charge was ever issued.

42. On 9 February 2023, the Athlete returned a signed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form confirming that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility.
43. The Athlete shall therefore receive a one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR.
44. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR, in accordance with Rule 10.2.1 ADR and the application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
- 44.1. a period of Ineligibility of three (3) years commencing on 16 July 2021 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
 - 44.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 17 June 2021, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points prizes and appearance money.
45. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for her Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived her right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

SUBSTANTIAL ASSISTANCE

46. Rule 10.7.1(a) of the ADR provides that it is a *sine qua non* condition that Substantial Assistance must result in (i) an Anti-Doping Organisation discovering or bringing forward an Anti-Doping Rule Violation by another Person; or (ii) a criminal or disciplinary body discovering or bringing forward a criminal offence or the breach of professional rules committed by another Person and the information provided by the Person providing Substantial Assistance is made available to the Integrity Unit or other Anti-Doping Organisation with Results Management responsibility; or (iii) WADA initiating a proceeding against a Signatory, WADA-accredited laboratory, or Athlete passport management unit (as defined in the International Standard for Laboratories) for non-compliance with the Code, International Standards or Technical Documents; or (iv) a criminal or disciplinary body bringing forward a criminal offence or the breach of professional or sport rules arising out of a sport integrity violation other than doping (provided that, for this point (iv) to apply, the Integrity Unit must have first obtained WADA's approval).
47. Moreover, Substantial Assistance is defined in the Rules and describes information provided for that purpose in the following terms (emphasis added):

“Substantial Assistance: For purposes of Rule 10.7.1, a Person providing Substantial Assistance must: (1) fully disclose in a signed written statement or recorded interview all information they possess in relation to anti-doping rule violations or other proceeding described in Rule 10.7.1(a), 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 Organisation or hearing panel. Further, the information provided must be credible and must comprise an important part of any case or proceeding that 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.”

48. Rule 10.7.1(a) provides that the extent of any suspension in the period of Ineligibility shall be based on (i) the seriousness of the Athlete's Anti-Doping Rule Violations and (ii) the significance of the Substantial Assistance provided by the Athlete to the effort to eliminate doping in sport, non-compliance with the Code and/or sport integrity violations.
49. The AIU accepts that the information that the Athlete provided in relation to the Coach formed an important part of the case brought against him and therefore falls within the definition of Substantial Assistance.
50. The Coach was charged with (and ultimately admitted) several Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted a lifetime period of Ineligibility. The AIU therefore also accepts, in principle, that the Athlete may receive a suspension in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.7.1(a) ADR.
51. The period of Ineligibility to be suspended shall be based on (i) the seriousness of the Athlete's Anti-Doping Rule Violations and (ii) the significance of the Substantial Assistance provided by the Athlete to the effort to eliminate doping in sport.
52. As to the seriousness of the Athlete's Anti-Doping Rule Violations, as described above, the AIU considers that the Athlete acted recklessly and plainly acted with indirect intent justifying the maximum period of Ineligibility under Rule 10.2.1 ADR. An intentional Anti-Doping Rule Violation (involving two powerful steroids) should be treated as being significantly more serious than one that is not intentional.
53. Based on these factors, the AIU considers the Athlete's Anti-Doping Rule Violations to be serious violations.
54. As to the significance of the Substantial Assistance to the effort to eliminate doping in sport, any assessment has to be based on: (i) the seriousness of the Anti-Doping Rule Violations discovered/brought forward and (ii) the importance of the evidence/information provided in that respect.
55. The AIU considers the following factors relevant in consideration of the seriousness of the discovered Anti-Doping Rule Violations:
 - 55.1. the number of persons whose ADRVs were revealed;
 - 55.2. the importance of such persons (measured by their sporting level or position in sports-related and other organisations); and
 - 55.3. the significance of the sporting event to which any doping may have been linked.
56. The AIU accepts that, in isolation, the Anti-Doping Rule Violations committed by the Coach⁸ are egregious for which he accepted a lifetime period of Ineligibility. However, they concern a sole individual which moderates their overall severity in the context of the significance of the Substantial Assistance.

⁸ Possession, Administration, Trafficking and Complicity.

57. In addition, since the Athlete's sporting-level at the time can, at best, be classified as being of regional standing rather than of truly international standard⁹, the importance of the Coach, based on his sporting level as a coach to a regional-level Athlete, as opposed to an international level Athlete, is particularly limited.
58. Similarly, and consistent with the above, although the Arab Championships is an International Competition for the purposes of the ADR, from a global perspective, it is not a high-profile international competition such as a World Athletics Series competition (e.g., World Athletics Championships) or an event on the international One Day Meeting Circuit (e.g., Diamond League, Continental Tour, Indoor Tour, Cross-Country Tour, Race-Walking Tour, Combined Events Tour). The significance of the sporting event in question is therefore reduced (although not to the extent of a purely National-Level event, e.g., the Iraq Championships).
59. Therefore, although the Coaches' Anti-Doping Rule Violations are serious violations in isolation, when considered in their full context for the purposes of Substantial Assistance, they ultimately relate to a single and (based on her sporting level and position) relatively low-level athlete, and a competition of reduced significance. Consequently, the AIU considers the Anti-Doping Rule Violations brought forward against the Coach based on the Athlete's information to be of limited seriousness in the context of Substantial Assistance.
60. Nevertheless, the AIU accepts that the information that the Athlete provided constituted important information in bringing forward those Anti-Doping Rule Violations against the Coach.
61. Overall, pursuant to the foregoing, and considering the entirety of the information that the Athlete provided, the AIU concludes that her assistance is of rather limited significance to eliminating doping in the sport of Athletics.
62. In these circumstances and considering that the AIU views the Athlete's own Anti-Doping Rule Violations to be serious violations, the AIU concludes that the appropriate suspension to the three (3) year period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.7.1(a) is a period of six (6) months.
63. Consequently, the last six (6) months of the Athlete's three (3) year period of Ineligibility effective from 16 July 2021 (i.e., the period from 16 January 2024 to 15 July 2024) shall be suspended based on the Substantial Assistance provided by the Athlete and the Athlete shall be considered re-eligible as of 16 January 2024.

PUBLICATION

64. In accordance with Rule 8.5.6(b) ADR, the AIU shall publicly report this decision on the AIU's website.

⁹ Although the Athlete is 8 x National Champion in Iraq, the Athlete is ranked globally 323 in the 100m and 54 in the 200m. She has achieved only top 8 finishes in the Asian Games and Asian Championships and last competed on an international level in a World Championships in 2013 and an Olympic Games in 2012.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL

65. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
66. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, WADA and the National Olympic Committee of Iraq (“the **NOC**”) have a right of appeal against this decision to the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland, in accordance with the procedure set out at Rule 13.6.1 ADR.
67. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or the NOC, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 20 February 2023