

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background	1
1.1.1	Motivation for Writing This Book	1
1.1.2	Doping Cases Won or Lost on Evidence	2
1.1.3	Doping Cases Inevitably Involve Scientific Issues	2
1.2	Subject Matter	3
1.2.1	Scope of the Topics Addressed.	3
1.2.2	What This Book Is and What It Is Not.	6

Part I Legal and Scientific Constraints on Evidence in Anti-Doping

2	Focus of the Analysis	11
2.1	Focus on International Doping Cases	11
2.1.1	Reconciling the Universality of Science with the Locality of Law	12
2.1.2	International Doping Cases Before CAS	21
2.1.3	Importance of Swiss Law in International Doping Cases	24
2.2	Focus on Evidence Under the 2015 WADC.	29
2.2.1	Evidentiary Regime of the WADC.	30
2.2.2	Gathering Scientific Evidence through Doping Control.	37
2.3	Focus on the Interplay of Science and Law	46
2.3.1	Reflections on the Logic of Anti-Doping Programs.	46
2.3.2	Analytical Science as the Core Source of Scientific Evidence.	51
2.3.3	Legal Approaches to Anti-Doping Science	56

- 3 Legal Constraints on Evidence in Anti-Doping 63**
 - 3.1 Principles Governing Evidence in International Arbitration 63
 - 3.1.1 Legal Characterisation of Evidentiary Issues. 64
 - 3.1.2 Substantive Aspects of Evidence 68
 - 3.1.3 Procedural Aspects of Evidence. 91
 - 3.1.4 Evaluation of Evidence 97
 - 3.2 Limits of Private Autonomy in Anti-Doping 103
 - 3.2.1 Private Autonomy on Evidentiary Issues
in Anti-Doping 104
 - 3.2.2 The Main Limits on Private Autonomy
Under Swiss Law 108
 - 3.2.3 Integrated Approach to Consent in Anti-Doping 123
 - 3.3 The WADC Evidentiary Regime Demystified 148
 - 3.3.1 Anti-Doping Regulations: Private Agreements
on Evidence 148
 - 3.3.2 Doping Control: Private Gathering
of Scientific Evidence 151

- 4 Scientific Constraints on Evidence in Anti-Doping 161**
 - 4.1 Role(s) of Science in the Fight Against Doping. 161
 - 4.1.1 Anti-Doping Regulations as “Science-Based Law”. 162
 - 4.1.2 Defining “Science” in a Legal Context 167
 - 4.2 Interplay Between Science and Law 172
 - 4.2.1 Challenges of Law in the Face of Science. 173
 - 4.2.2 Evidentiary Mechanisms to Overcome
These Challenges 180
 - 4.3 Mutual Influences Between Science and Law 185
 - 4.3.1 Scientists in the Judicial Process 185
 - 4.3.2 Lawyers in the Realm of Science. 199
 - 4.4 Roadmap to a Combined Scientific and Legal Approach 208
 - 4.4.1 Consent?: Yes, But. 208
 - 4.4.2 Scientific Foundations as the Key Factor. 209

Part II Science in the WADC Evidentiary Regime

- 5 Doping Control—Gathering Scientific Evidence
for Legal Purposes. 213**
 - 5.1 Operational Framework of Doping Control. 213
 - 5.1.1 Scientific Participants in Doping Control 214
 - 5.1.2 Technical Rules Governing Evidence-Gathering
in Doping Control 233
 - 5.2 Procedural Defects in Doping Control. 267
 - 5.2.1 Importance of Procedural Defects Under the WADC . . . 268
 - 5.2.2 General “Presumption” of Adherence
to Applicable Procedures 283

- 5.2.3 Materiality of Procedural Defects 301
- 5.2.4 “False Positives” and the Risk of Hazard. 317
- 5.3 Suggestions for a Sound Gathering of Evidence
in Doping Control 329
 - 5.3.1 Real Stakes: Admissibility of Scientific Evidence
in the Judicial Process 330
 - 5.3.2 Soundness of the Current Distribution
of the Burden of Proof 332
 - 5.3.3 Effects of Procedural Defects on the Outcome
of the Process 337
 - 5.3.4 Fallibility of Analytical Science Over
and Above Procedural Defects 341
- 6 Analytical Science—Approaches in “Traditional”
Doping Control 343**
 - 6.1 Technology Race *versus* Mastery of Existing Technologies 343
 - 6.1.1 “State-of-the-Art” Policy in the WADC Regime 344
 - 6.1.2 Attempts to Reduce Discrepancies
in Analytical Science 349
 - 6.2 Zero Tolerance *versus* Complexity of Analytical Science 356
 - 6.2.1 Scientific Justification for Zero Tolerance
Under the WADC. 356
 - 6.2.2 Formal and Concealed Limits to the Zero
Tolerance Rule 359
 - 6.2.3 Deceptive Absoluteness of Adverse Analytical
Findings 371
 - 6.2.4 Evidentiary Significance of the B Sample
Confirmation 390
 - 6.3 Scientific Innovation *versus* Legal Scrutiny. 409
 - 6.3.1 Approaches to Scientific Innovation
in the WADC Regime. 409
 - 6.3.2 Evolution in CAS Judicial Review
of Analytical Science 412
 - 6.3.3 New Presumption of Scientific Validity
for the 2015 WADC 419
 - 6.3.4 Discussion on the Soundness of the New
Presumption 427
 - 6.4 Evidentiary Strength of Traditional Doping Control
in Question 431
 - 6.4.1 Gap Between Original Pillars of the WADC Regime
and Current Realities 431
 - 6.4.2 Blurring Evidentiary Value of Adverse
Analytical Findings 433
 - 6.4.3 Struggle to Fit Scientific Issues into a Manageable
Legal Framework 435

7	Standardisation in Anti-Doping—Science <i>versus</i> Evidentiary Pragmatism	437
7.1	WADA Prohibited List—Scientific or Political Tool?	437
7.1.1	Scientific Foundations of the Prohibited List	438
7.1.2	Combining Scientific Flexibility with Legal Stability of the Prohibition	459
7.2	Impact on Sports Performance—A Forced Irrelevance?	479
7.2.1	Limited Relevance of Performance Enhancement	480
7.2.2	“Automatic” Disqualification as a Corrective Measure	481
7.2.3	Other Hybrid Types of Disqualification	487
7.2.4	Greater Consistency in the Approach to Performance Enhancement for Disqualification	495
7.3	Role of Fault—A Matter of Evidentiary Convenience?	500
7.3.1	Fault-Related Components of the WADC Regime	500
7.3.2	Strict Liability Rule Under the WADC	503
7.3.3	Presumed Fault for Disciplinary Sanctions	518
7.3.4	Need for Ongoing Monitoring and Re-evaluation	539
8	Scientific Evidence in CAS Arbitration for Doping Disputes	543
8.1	Dealing with Scientific Evidence in Doping Disputes	543
8.1.1	Freedom of Evidence in Doping Disputes	544
8.1.2	Restrictions on the Freedom of Evidence in Doping Disputes	552
8.2	Access to Scientific Documentation for the Athlete	570
8.2.1	Access to Scientific Documentation Based on the WADC Regime	571
8.2.2	Athlete Rights to Further Scientific Documentation	582
8.2.3	Consequences for the Evaluation of the Evidence	596
8.3	Doping Disputes: An Expert’s Business	599
8.3.1	Expert Independence in Doping Disputes	599
8.3.2	Methods for Managing Expert Evidence in Doping Disputes	614
8.3.3	Evaluation of Expert Evidence in Doping Disputes	627
8.4	CAS Panels and Scientific Evidence—Caution Required	640
8.4.1	Restrictions on Athletes’ Access to Scientific Evidence	640
8.4.2	Search for Proficient and Independent Scientific Experts	642
8.4.3	Control and Evaluation of Expert Evidence	644

Part III Rethinking Scientific Evidence in Anti-Doping

9	Mechanisms Used in “Traditional” Doping Control	649
9.1	Mechanisms of Avoidance: Legal Hands-off Approach to Science	649
9.1.1	Approach to Science in Traditional Doping Control	650
9.1.2	Legal Regime That Disregards Causality	653
9.2	Mechanisms of Coordination: Leaving Space to Science	660
9.2.1	Flexibility for Advances in Anti-Doping Science	660
9.2.2	Rebuttable Presumptions to Back-up Anti-Doping Science	661
9.3	Mechanisms of Control: Science to the Scientist, Law to the Lawyer	663
9.3.1	Legal Control Over Science to Compensate for Imbalance in Knowledge	664
9.3.2	Use of Science as a Rubber Stamp for Rationality	666
10	Paths to Improvement Through New Approaches	669
10.1	Reinforced Interactions Between Scientists and Lawyers	669
10.1.1	Tackling Scientific Evidence in Anti-Doping Beyond 2015	670
10.1.2	Judicial Review of Science and Its “Healthy” Limits	673
10.2	Stronger Qualitative Approach in Gathering Evidence	678
10.2.1	Harmonised Testing Conditions to Secure Quality of the Evidence	678
10.2.2	Clarifying the Position of Analytical Science	683
10.3	Higher Refinement in the Evaluation of Scientific Evidence	690
10.3.1	Drawing Legal Inferences from Scientific Evidence	690
10.3.2	Methodology for the Evaluation of Scientific Evidence in Anti-Doping	700
11	Athlete Biological Passport: A Paradigm Shift?	727
11.1	Main Features of the Athlete Biological Passport	727
11.1.1	Basic Principles Underlying the Athlete Biological Passport	728
11.1.2	Current Haematological and Steroidal Modules	730
11.1.3	Procedure for Cases Based on the Athlete Biological Passport	732
11.2	Challenges for Implementing the Athlete Biological Passport	734
11.2.1	System of Legal Rules or Scientific Evidentiary Method?	734
11.2.2	Integrating a New Paradigm into a Pre-Existing Framework	737
11.2.3	Practical and Operational Challenges	738

- 11.3 Evaluation of Evidence for the Athlete Biological Passport 739
 - 11.3.1 Statistics, Probabilities and “Reliable Means”. 740
 - 11.3.2 Determining Relevant Probabilities and Framing Hypotheses 742
 - 11.3.3 Irreducible Qualitative Factors. 746
- 11.4 Role Distribution Between Scientific Experts and Hearing Panels. 749
 - 11.4.1 Independence and Impartiality of the Experts 749
 - 11.4.2 Hearing Panel’s Dependency on Expert Opinions. 753
- 11.5 Demise of Strict Liability and Presumed Fault? 769
 - 11.5.1 The “Doping Scenario” 769
 - 11.5.2 Residual Room for Fault-Related Adjustment of the Sanction 777
- 12 General Conclusions: Interdisciplinary Dialogue and Reflection 779**
 - 12.1 Only Clarify 779
 - 12.2 Only Dialogue 781
 - 12.3 Only Refine 782
 - 12.4 Only Anticipate 783
- References 785**
- Table of Cases 801**
- Index. 809**



<http://www.springer.com/978-94-6265-083-1>

Evidence in Anti-Doping at the Intersection of Science
& Law

Viret, M.

2016, XXVI, 821 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-94-6265-083-1

A product of T.M.C. Asser Press