2.1. Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s Sample

2.1.5. In the event an Athlete entering the Program voluntarily and promptly discloses to USADA, prior to testing by USADA, the Use or Attempted Use of any Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method included on the UFC Prohibited List, then the presence or evidence of Use of such disclosed substance or method in an Athlete’s Sample, shall not be considered an Anti-Doping Policy Violation if it is determined by USADA to have resulted from Use of the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method which occurred prior to the Athlete entering the Program.

2.5. Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control

2.5.2. Absent a compelling justification, the failure to disclose to USADA, prior to entering the Program, the Use, Attempted Use or Possession within the previous one year of clomiphene, a Non-Specified Method, or a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times by the UFC Prohibited List. The past Use, Attempted Use or Possession of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method shall not constitute a violation of these Policies if disclosed prior to entering the Program; however, the admission of such conduct shall subject the Athlete to the notice period requirements outlined in Article 5.7.4. Furthermore, unless the Athlete’s Use of the substance or method in question was pursuant to a valid medical prescription or recommendation, such conduct may also be considered in sanctioning or counted as a violation for purposes of Article 10.7 if the Athlete subsequently commits an Anti-Doping Policy Violation.

3.2. Methods of Establishing Facts and Presumptions

3.2.1. Analytical methods or decision limits approved by WADA after consultation within the relevant scientific community and which have been the subject of peer review are presumed to be scientifically valid. Decision Concentration Levels set forth in the UFC Prohibited List shall not be subject to challenge.

4.1. Incorporation of the UFC Prohibited List

This Anti-Doping Policy hereby incorporates the UFC Prohibited List. Unless provided otherwise in the UFC Prohibited List and/or a revision thereof, the UFC Prohibited List and revisions shall go into effect under this Anti-Doping Policy three months after publication by UFC (or, to the extent applicable, WADA), without requiring any further action by UFC. All Athletes and other Persons shall be bound by the UFC Prohibited List and any revisions thereto, from the date they go into effect, without further formality. It is the responsibility of all Athletes and other Persons to familiarize themselves with the most up-to-date version of the UFC Prohibited List and all revisions thereto.

4.2. Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods Identified on the UFC Prohibited List

4.2.1. Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods

The UFC Prohibited List (which incorporates the WADA Prohibited List as further described therein) shall identify those Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods which are prohibited as doping at all times (both In-Competition and Out-of-Competition) because of their potential to enhance performance in future Bouts or their masking potential, and those substances and methods which are prohibited In-Competition only.

5.7. Notice Requirements for New UFC Athletes and Former UFC Athletes Returning to UFC Competition

5.7.4. A new or returning Athlete who admits or has an established and verifiable history of the Use, Attempted Use or Possession of clomiphene, a Non-Specified Method, or a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times by the UFC Prohibited List while the Athlete was not subject to an Anti-Doping Policy, shall not be permitted to compete in UFC Bouts until he/she has made him/herself available for Testing for a minimum period of six months before competing or one year after the Athlete’s last established Use, whichever is shorter. At USADA’s discretion, such Athletes may also be required to provide a minimum of two negative Samples during the minimum six-month notice period before being cleared for competition. This provision shall not apply in situations in which (i) the Athlete’s Use of the Prohibited Substance or Method was pursuant to a valid TUE or (ii) USADA subsequently grants the Athlete a TUE for the substance or method in question.

6.1. Use of Accredited and Approved Laboratories

For purposes of Article 2.1, Samples shall be analyzed only in laboratories accredited or otherwise approved by WADA. The choice of the WADA-accredited or WADA-approved laboratory used for the Sample analysis shall be determined exclusively by USADA. For purposes other than Article 2.1, USADA may rely upon Sample analysis conducted elsewhere than at a WADA accredited or approved laboratory. Nothing in this Article shall prevent USADA from using other laboratories to conduct other types of forensic analysis (e.g. DNA testing or fingerprinting) or seeking the advice of outside experts.

7.1. Results Management for Tests Initiated by USADA

7.1.3. If the initial review of an Adverse Analytical Finding under Article 7.1.2 does not reveal an applicable TUE or entitlement to a TUE, as provided in the UFC TUE Policy, or departure that caused the Adverse Analytical Finding, or is below the Decision Concentration Level and will therefore be administered by USADA as an Atypical Finding, USADA shall, except in the case of Atypical Findings, promptly and simultaneously give written notice to the Athlete and UFC, and may also give notice to an Athletic Commission, if applicable. Written notice shall include the information described
in Article 14.1.1.1, as well as: (a) the Adverse Analytical Finding; (b) the Anti-Doping Policy violated; (c) the Athlete’s right to promptly request the analysis of the B Sample or, failing such request, that the B Sample analysis may be deemed waived; (d) the scheduled date, time, and place for the B Sample analysis (which shall be scheduled within the time period specified in the International Standard for Laboratories) if the Athlete or USADA chooses to request an analysis of the B Sample; (e) the opportunity for the Athlete and/or the Athlete’s representative to attend the B Sample opening and analysis within the time period specified in the International Standard for Laboratories if such analysis is requested; and (f) any Provisional Suspension imposed if USADA decides not to bring forward the Adverse Analytical Finding as an Anti-Doping Policy Violation, it shall so notify the Athlete. USADA shall promptly provide the Athlete with an abbreviated A Sample documentation package. Upon receipt of the complete A Sample documentation package from the laboratory, USADA shall provide the complete A Sample documentation package to the Athlete containing all information required by the International Standard for Laboratories, unless the Athlete’s case has been resolved by agreement between USADA and the Athlete.

7.1.7. If a Prohibited Substance or the Use of a Prohibited Method is identified (i.e., if the B Sample analysis confirms the presence of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method in the Sample (except as contemplated by Article 2.1.3.1)), or the B Sample analysis is not requested or is waived (in accordance with this Anti-Doping Policy), the Athlete shall be given written notice of: (a) the Anti-Doping Policy Violation asserted; (b) the basis of that assertion, (c) the additional information set forth in Article 14.1.1.1; (d) the Consequences that USADA will seek to impose; (e) the Athlete’s right within ten days of the notice, to request a hearing, and (f) that, if the Athlete does not request a hearing within the time limit indicated in subsection (e) of this Article, the Consequences will be imposed immediately. If not already provided to Athlete, once received by USADA, USADA shall promptly provide the Athlete with copies of the complete A and B Sample laboratory documentation packages that include all information required by the International Standard for Laboratories. USADA shall not be required to provide B Sample documentation if the Athlete waives analysis of its B Sample.

7.1.9. When a reported Adverse Analytical Finding is at a concentration below the Decision Concentration Level set forth in the UFC Prohibited List, the Sample shall be reviewed by USADA as an Atypical Finding. USADA may establish that such Atypical Finding is an Anti-Doping Policy Violation if, and only if, USADA establishes that the Athlete intentionally used or actually knew it used such Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method, or recklessly disregarded an obvious risk that such Athlete was using a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.

7.2. Review of Atypical Findings

7.2.5.2. If UFC or USADA is asked by an Athletic Commission that has jurisdiction over an Athlete at the time of sample collection or jurisdiction over such Athlete with respect to a disciplinary or licensing hearing scheduled with the Athlete for which pending Atypical Findings are relevant or such a hearing is contemplated or disciplinary action by the Athletic Commission is being investigated, to disclose whether an Athlete licensed by the Athletic Commission has a pending Atypical Finding, UFC or USADA may so advise the Athletic Commission upon confirmation that such Atypical Finding has been disclosed to the applicable Athlete. USADA shall provide prior notice to UFC and USADA shall consult with UFC regarding whether the Athletic Commission has the requisite jurisdiction. If, following consultation, USADA disagrees with UFC’s determination regarding jurisdiction of the Athletic Commission, and USADA desires to proceed with disclosure to the Athletic Commission, then, prior to such disclosure, and unless otherwise mutually agreed by USADA and UFC, USADA and UFC shall jointly submit the dispute on jurisdiction to the Arbitrator (which, as of the date of this Anti-Doping Policy, is McLaren Global Sport Solutions Inc.) for final determination by a single arbitrator in an expedited telephonic arbitration, and USADA and UFC will use their respective reasonable efforts to complete the arbitration, and instruct the Arbitrator to render a decision, within 48 hours of the dispute having been referred to the Arbitrator (the costs of such arbitration shall be borne by the non-prevailing party in such arbitration).

7.2.5.3. If an Athletic Commission that has requested test results and has jurisdiction over an Athlete at the time of sample collection or jurisdiction over such Athlete with respect to a disciplinary or licensing hearing scheduled with the Athlete for which the test results are relevant or such a hearing is contemplated or disciplinary action by the Athletic Commission is being investigated, and USADA is aware that a laboratory report of an Adverse Analytical Finding below a
8.1 Hearing

Any Athlete or other Person who is asserted to have committed an Anti-Doping Policy Violation shall have a right to a fair hearing before an impartial and independent hearing Panel as provided in the UFC Arbitration Rules. Decisions rendered pursuant to the UFC Arbitration Rules shall be final and binding and shall not be subject to appeal.

8.2 Waiver of Hearing

The right to a hearing may be waived either by the Athlete or Person’s express written consent or by the Athlete or other Person’s failure to challenge USADA’s assertion that an Anti-Doping Policy Violation has occurred as provided in UFC’s policies (provided that USADA has complied with all applicable notice provisions).

10.2 Ineligibility, Use or Attempted Use, or Possession of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method

10.2.1 The period of Ineligibility shall be two years where the Anti-Doping Policy Violation involves a Non-Specified Substance or Non-Specified Method.

10.2.2 The period of Ineligibility shall be one year where the Anti-Doping Policy Violation involves a Specified Substance or Specified Method.

10.4 No Violation where there is No Fault or Negligence

10.4.1 If an Athlete or other Person establishes in an individual case that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence, then there shall be no violation of this Anti-Doping Policy, subject to the right of UFC or an Athletic Commission to disqualify the Athlete or other Person for Reasons Other than Fault.

10.6 Elimination, Reduction, or Suspension of Period of Ineligibility or other Consequences for Reasons Other than Fault

10.6.2 Full and Complete Cooperation

10.6.2.1 USADA in its sole discretion may suspend all or any part of the period of Ineligibility and other Consequences imposed in an individual case in which it has results management authority where the Athlete or other Person has provided Full and Complete Cooperation. The extent to which the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility may be suspended or eliminated shall be based on the seriousness of the Anti-Doping Policy Violation and the significance of the Full and Complete Cooperation provided by the Athlete or other Person.

10.6.3 [INTENTIONALLY OMITTED]

10.6.4 Substances of Abuse: Rehabilitation in Lieu of, or to Reduce, Ineligibility

10.6.4.1 Notwithstanding any other provision in this Article 10, (i) when a violation of Articles 2.1 or 2.2 involves a Substance of Abuse and (ii) the Athlete can establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation did not enhance, and was not intended to enhance, the Athlete’s performance in a Bout, then, provided that the foregoing clauses (i) and (ii) are satisfied, the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility may be reduced.
For purposes of Article 10.7, each Anti-Doping Policy Violation must take place within the same ten-year period in order to be considered multiple violations.

10.6.5 USADA’s discretionary decisions to eliminate or reduce, or not to eliminate or reduce, the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility under Articles 10.6.1, 10.6.2 or 10.6.4 may be reviewed in a hearing or subject to appeal solely to the extent that the Athlete establishes in such hearing or appeal that such discretionary decision was retaliatory or otherwise biased against the Athlete due to the Athlete's views on the Program.

10.7 Multiple Violations

10.7.1 Subject to Article 10.7.3, for an Athlete or other Person’s second Anti-Doping Policy Violation, the period of Ineligibility shall be the lesser of:

(a) the period of Ineligibility applicable to the first violation plus the period of Ineligibility for the second violation, not taking into account any reduction under Article 10.6 for either violation; or
(b) twice the period of Ineligibility for the second violation, not taking into account any reduction under Article 10.6.

10.7.3 USADA may, in its sole discretion, elect not to impose an enhanced sanction for a multiple violation in the event USADA has determined in USADA’s sole and unreviewable discretion, it was unlikely that one or more of the Athlete’s violations was intentional and/or based upon the Athlete’s provision of significant Substantial Assistance or Full and Complete Cooperation as determined by USADA. Notwithstanding the prior sentence, the Athlete may challenge the imposition of an escalation of the period of Ineligibility under this Article 10.7, provided that the Athlete must demonstrate, by Clear and Convincing Evidence, that such second or third (or other applicable additional violation) was not intentional.

10.7.4 If the Athlete or other Person establishes by Clear and Convincing Evidence that its most recent Anti-Doping Policy violation was not intentional, then the Athlete or other Person shall not be subject to an enhancement under Article 10.7.

10.7.5 Additional Policies for Certain Potential Multiple Violations.

10.7.6 Multiple Anti-Doping Policy Violations during Ten-Year Period

For purposes of Article 10.7, each Anti-Doping Policy Violation must take place within the same ten-year period in order to be considered multiple violations.

10.10 [INTENTIONALLY OMITTED]
the dispute on jurisdiction to the Arbitrator (which, as of the date of this Anti-Doping Policy, is McLaren Global Sport Solutions Inc.) for final determination by a single arbitrator in an expedited telephonic arbitration, and USADA and UFC will use their respective reasonable efforts to complete the arbitration, and instruct the Arbitrator to render a decision, within 48 hours of the dispute having been referred to the Arbitrator (the costs of such arbitration shall be borne by the non-prevailing party in such arbitration). USADA shall not have any responsibility for what the Athletic Commission does with that information.

14.6. Sharing of Information in Connection with an Investigation

UFC or USADA may share confidential information with an Athletic Commission, any Code Signatory Anti-Doping Organization or law enforcement in connection with an investigation being conducted by UFC, USADA, an Athletic Commission, law enforcement or Anti-Doping Organization, in each case, provided that such entity or authority or body has requisite jurisdiction over the Athlete. For purposes of the foregoing, it is not necessary that the scope of jurisdiction among the various entities or bodies be identical or substantially similar. With respect to Athletic Commissions, USADA shall provide prior notice to UFC and USADA shall consult with UFC regarding whether the Athletic Commission has the requisite jurisdiction. If, following consultation, USADA disagrees with UFC’s determination regarding jurisdiction of the Athletic Commission, and USADA desires to proceed with disclosure to the Athletic Commission, then, prior to such disclosure, and unless otherwise mutually agreed by USADA and UFC, USADA and UFC shall jointly submit the dispute on jurisdiction to the Arbitrator (which, as of the date of this Anti-Doping Policy, is McLaren Global Sport Solutions Inc.) for final determination by a single arbitrator in an expedited telephonic arbitration, and USADA and UFC will use their respective reasonable efforts to complete the arbitration, and instruct the Arbitrator to render a decision, within 48 hours of the dispute having been referred to the Arbitrator (the costs of such arbitration shall be borne by the non-prevailing party in such arbitration). Results may also be provided with the written consent of the UFC and pursuant to Articles 7.2.5.2, 7.2.5.3, and 14.1.2.2.

ARTICLE 19: [INTENTIONALLY OMITTED]

21.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Athletes

21.1.7 To use reasonable efforts to examine products to determine whether such products are Contaminated Products or Certified Supplements.
APPENDIX 1 DEFINITIONS

**Adverse Analytical Finding:** A report from a WADA-accredited laboratory or other WADA-approved laboratory that, consistent with the International Standard for Laboratories and related Technical Documents, identifies in a Sample the presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers (including elevated quantities of endogenous substances) or evidence of the Use of a Prohibited Method.

**Contaminated Product:** A product (other than a supplement) that either (i) contains a Prohibited Substance due to environmental or other innocent contamination, such as the contamination of water, food (including food that may have crossed applicable country borders notwithstanding laws or regulations in the country of origin or country of ingestion) or prescription medication or (ii) contains a Prohibited Substance that is not disclosed on the product label and all circumstances considered, a reasonable person using due care would not have suspected that there is a material risk that the product contains a Prohibited Substance.

**Decision Concentration Level:** See Adverse Analytical Finding Results Management Decision Concentration Level.

**Full and Complete Cooperation:** Where an Athlete demonstrates, as determined by USADA in its discretion, that he or she did not intend to commit the Anti-Doping Policy Violation to enhance its performance and has provided full, prompt and truthful responses and information (in each case, in all material respects) to all reasonable inquiries and requests for information regarding the applicable subject matter, which shall take into account as a mitigating factor admissions of an Anti-Doping Policy Violation, whether before notice of Sample collection or after. Full and Complete Cooperation shall in no case require an Athlete to, or consider whether an Athlete did, provide Substantial Assistance. Full and Complete Cooperation shall eliminate the possibility of sanction on account of Aggravating Circumstances.

**Program:** The UFC anti-doping program described in this Anti-Doping Policy.

**UFC Prohibited List:** The UFC list incorporated into this Anti-Doping Policy identifying the Prohibited Substances and Prohibited Methods.