

In the matter of the Canadian Anti-Doping Program;

**And in the matter of an anti-doping rule violation by Wade Cyr asserted by the
Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport;**

File Outcome Summary

Summary

1. The Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES) conducted an in-competition sample collection on August 31, 2017 in Sherbrooke, QC.
2. Mr. Wade Cyr (“the athlete”) was selected for doping control. The sample provided by the athlete returned an adverse finding for SARM S-22, SARM LGD-4033 and Drostanolone (S1. Anabolic Agents) and GW501516 and Letrozole (S.4 Hormone and Metabolic Modulators), all prohibited substances.
3. The athlete failed to dispute the asserted violation within the timelines outlined within the Canadian Anti-Doping Program (CADP) and as a result was deemed to have admitted that he committed the asserted violation, waived his right to a hearing and accepted the proposed consequences.

Jurisdiction

4. The CCES is an independent not-for-profit organization incorporated under the federal laws of Canada that promotes ethical conduct in all aspects of sport in Canada. The CCES also maintains and carries out the CADP, including providing anti-doping services to national sport organizations and their members.
5. As Canada’s national anti-doping organization, the CCES is in compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code (Code) and its mandatory International Standards. The CCES has implemented the Code and its mandatory International Standards through the CADP, the domestic rules which govern this proceeding. The purpose of the Code and of the CADP is to protect the rights of athletes to fair competition.
6. The athlete is a member of U SPORTS, and participates in the sport of American Football. According to Part C, Rule 1.3 of the CADP, the CADP provisions apply to all members of, and participants in the activities of, sport organizations adopting it. The CADP was issued for adoption by Canadian sport organizations on October 1, 2014, to be operational on January 1, 2015. U SPORTS adopted the CADP on

December 19, 2014. Therefore, as a member of U SPORTS and/or as a participant in U SPORTS sport activities, the athlete is subject to the Rules of the CADP.

Doping Control

7. On August 31, 2017 the CCES conducted an in-competition doping control session in Sherbrooke, QC. Testing at this competition was conducted on U SPORTS athletes as part of the CCES' domestic test distribution plan, all pursuant to the CADP.
8. The athlete was notified for doping control and, together with the Doping Control Officer (DCO) from the CCES, completed the sample collection process. The athlete's sample code number was 4038338.
9. On September 5, 2017 the athlete's sample was received by World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) accredited laboratory, the INRS-Institut Armand-Frappier (INRS), in Laval, QC.

Results Management

10. The adverse analytical findings were received from the WADA accredited laboratory on September 29, 2017. The Certificate of Analysis indicated the presence of SARM S-22, SARM LGD-4033, Drostanolone, GW501516 and Letrozole.
11. On October 12, 2017, the CCES formally asserted a violation against the athlete for the presence of five prohibited substances. As a result of the CCES' assertion the athlete was also subject to a mandatory provisional suspension.
12. In accordance with CADP Rule 10.2.1, the standard sanction for an intentional doping violation involving the presence of a prohibited substance (non-specified substance), regardless of the number of substances detected, is a four (4) year period of ineligibility. The CCES proposed the standard four (4) year sanction within its assertion of October 12, 2017.

Confirmation of Violation and Sanction

13. Rule 7.10.2 of the CADP states:

7.10.2 Alternatively, if the Athlete or other Person against whom an anti-doping rule violation is asserted fails to dispute that assertion within the deadline specified in the notice sent by the CCES asserting the violation, then he/she shall be deemed to have admitted the violation, to have waived a hearing, and to have accepted the Consequences that are mandated by the Rules or (where some discretion as to Consequences exists under the Rules) that have been offered by CCES.

14. In accordance with CADP Rule 7.10.2, which was specifically referenced within the assertion letter, the CCES informed the athlete on October 12, 2017 that, should the athlete take no further action to dispute the asserted violation within 30 days (November 27, 2017) of his last participation in the results management process (October 25, 2017) he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing in accordance and thereby accepts the four (4) year sanction proposed by the CCES.
15. As no further action was taken by the athlete to dispute the asserted violation by October 25, 2017, the CCES relies on the provisions contained in CADP Rule 7.10.2. Accordingly, effective November 28, 2017 by reason of the deemed Waiver, an anti-doping rule violation has been confirmed against the athlete for the presence of the identified prohibited substances. In accordance with CADP Rule 10.2.1 the sanction for this violation is a four (4) year period of ineligibility, which commenced on October 12, 2017 and concludes on October 11, 2021.
16. The CCES now considers this case closed.

Dated at Ottawa, Ontario this 13th day of December, 2017.



Jeremy Luke
Senior Director, Sport Integrity, CCES