
DECISION OF THE ATHLETICS INTEGRITY UNIT

IN THE CASE OF MR ALEKSEY SAVIN

Introduction

1. In April 2017, the IAAF established the Athletics Integrity Unit ("**AIU**") whose role is to protect the integrity of the sport of Athletics, including fulfilling the IAAF's obligations as a Signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code. The IAAF has delegated implementation of the IAAF 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. Mr Aleksei Savin is a 37-year old Athlete Support Person who is affiliated to the Russian Athletics Federation (the "**Coach**"). He has coached his wife, an international-level athlete, Ms Ksenya Savina (the "**Athlete**") since 2009.
3. This decision is issued by the AIU pursuant to Article 8.4.5 and Article 8.4.7 of the ADR.
4. Article 8.4.5 ADR provides that:

"8.4.5 In the event that the Athlete or Athlete Support Person does not respond to the Notice of Charge by the specified deadline, the Athlete or Athlete Support Person will be deemed to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) charged and to have acceded to the Consequences specified in the Notice of Charge and the Integrity Unit shall promptly issue a decision in accordance with Article 8.4.7."

5. Article 8.4.7 ADR provides that:

"8.4.7 In the event that [...] the Athlete or Athlete Support Person admits the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) charged and accedes to the Consequences specified by the Integrity Unit (or is deemed to have done so), a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal shall not be required. In such a case, the Integrity Unit:

(a) shall promptly issue a decision confirming [...] the commission of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) and the imposition of the Specified Consequences [...];

(b) shall publicly Report that decision in accordance with Article 14; [...]"

The Coach's commission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations

6. On 15 May 2018, the Athlete underwent an out-of-competition doping control in Ifrane, Morocco. The Athlete provided a urine sample numbered 4085363 (the "**Sample**").
7. On 14 June 2018, the WADA accredited laboratory in Cologne, Germany, reported an Adverse Analytical Finding for the presence of recombinant EPO ("**EPO**") in the Sample (the "**AAF**").

8. EPO is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2018 Prohibited List (S2: Peptide Hormones, Growth Factors, Related Substances and Mimetics). It is a Non-Specified Substance and is prohibited at all times. The Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption permitting the use of EPO.
9. On 15 June 2018, the AIU notified the Athlete of the AAF and imposed a provisional suspension on her pending resolution of her case. The Athlete was requested to provide an explanation for the presence of EPO in the Sample.
10. On 6 July 2018, the Athlete provided an explanation for the AAF. The Athlete's explanation was that the Coach had been prescribed EPO (Recormon) to treat chronic renal failure and their housekeeper must have mixed up his medication with hers (taken for back pain) whilst the housekeeper was laying the table for lunch at their apartment in Ifrane, Morocco.
11. On 7 July 2018, in support of the above explanation, the Athlete provided the AIU with a copy of the Coach's medical records dated 29 June 2018 from the Gemocod+ Clinic in Simferopol, Crimea (the **Clinic**) establishing a diagnosis of renal failure for a patient, Alexei Mikhailovich Savin.
12. The AIU decided to investigate the authenticity of the medical records provided by the Athlete and enlisted the assistance of the Russian Anti-Doping Agency (**RUSADA**) for that purpose.
13. On 15 and 16 August 2018, the investigations department of RUSADA, together with the police of the Republic of Crimea, visited the Clinic and they were informed by Clinic authorities (i) that the Clinic did not issue documents such as the one provided by the Athlete and the Coach to the AIU and (ii) that there was no evidence of the prescribed medical treatment of the Coach in the Clinic's log books.
14. On 16 August 2018, the Chief Doctor of the Clinic confirmed in writing to RUSADA that the medical records provided by the Athlete and the Coach to the AIU were forged.
15. On 3 April 2019, the AIU suspended the Coach provisionally and charged him with committing the following anti-doping rule violations:
 - 15.1. Tampering with any part of Doping Control, pursuant to Article 2.5 ADR, by providing fraudulent information to the AIU via the Athlete (in the form of forged documents) within the context of her disciplinary proceeding; and
 - 15.2. Complicity, pursuant to Article 2.9 ADR, for assisting, aiding and conspiring with the Athlete in her committing a Tampering violation under the ADR.
16. The Notice of Charge offered the Coach the opportunity to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and to accept a four (4) year sanction, or to request a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal, by no later than 13 April 2019.
17. On 11 April 2019, the Coach wrote to the AIU but failed to address the substantive matters raised in the Notice of Charge.
18. On 12 April 2019, the AIU reminded the Coach that he had until 13 April 2019 to confirm how he wished to proceed with his case. The Coach once again failed to respond to the Notice of Charge within the given deadline.
19. On 15 April 2019, the Coach was given a final opportunity to respond to the Notice of Charge and advised that, if he did not do so by 17 April 2019, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal, to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and to have accepted the Consequences for those Anti-Doping Rule Violations specified in the Notice of Charge.

20. The Coach failed to respond as required by the specified deadline of 17 April 2019 and he is therefore deemed, in accordance with Article 8.4.5 ADR, to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and to have acceded to the Consequences specified in the Notice of Charge.

Consequences

21. This constitutes the Coach's first Anti-Doping Rule Violations under the ADR.
22. On the basis that the Coach is deemed to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations as specified above, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences in his case:
- 22.1. a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years commencing on the date of this decision;
- 22.2. the period of provisional suspension imposed on the Coach from 3 April 2019 until the date of this decision shall be credited against the total period of Ineligibility.

Publication

23. In accordance with Article 8.4.7(b) ADR, the AIU shall publicly report this decision on the AIU's website.

Rights of Appeal

24. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Articles 8.4.5 and 8.4.7 ADR.
25. In accordance with Article 13.2.4 ADR, the Athlete, RUSADA and WADA 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 Article 13.7 ADR.

Monaco, 6 May 2019