
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Faith Chepchirchir Kiprotich

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 Faith Chepchirchir Kiprotich ("the **Athlete**") is a 23-year-old road runner from Kenya¹.
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 Athlete's 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

[...]

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/faith-chepchirchir-15179765>

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

5. On 29 September 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the CZ Tilburg Ten Miles held in Tilburg, Netherlands, which was given code 8068282 (the “**First Sample**”) pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of Doping Authority Netherlands (“**DAN**”).
6. On 6 October 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the Hyundai Half Marathon held in Lisbon, Portugal², which was given code 7188792 (the “**Second Sample**”) pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics.
7. On 18 October 2024, the WADA-accredited laboratory in Ghent, Belgium (the “**Ghent Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the First Sample based on the presence of 19-Norandrosterone (“**Norandrosterone**”) ³ at a concentration above 15 ng/mL⁴ (the “**First Adverse Analytical Finding**”).
8. On 20 December 2024, the World Anti-Doping Agency (“**WADA**”) accredited laboratory in Lisbon, Portugal (the “**Lisbon Laboratory**”) ⁵ reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Second Sample based on the presence of exogenous Norandrosterone⁶ (the “**Second Adverse Analytical Finding**”; together the “**Adverse Analytical Findings**”).
9. In circumstances where the Second Sample had been collected from the Athlete, on 11 December 2024, the AIU accepted a request from DAN to conduct Results Management of the First Adverse Analytical Finding.
10. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Findings in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management (“**ISRM**”) and determined that:
 - 10.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption (“**TUE**”) that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the Norandrosterone found in the Samples; and
 - 10.2. 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 Findings.
11. Therefore, on 23 December 2024, the AIU notified the Athlete of the Adverse Analytical Findings in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, including that the Adverse Analytical

² A World Athletics Elite Label Road Race. The Athlete finished in 1st place.

³ Norandrosterone is a metabolite of nandrolone or nandrolone precursors.

⁴ In accordance with WADA Technical Document [TD2021NA](#), the presence of Norandrosterone at a concentration above 15 ng/mL constitutes an Adverse Analytical Finding.

⁵ The GC/C/IRMS analysis was performed at the WADA-accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland (the “**Lausanne Laboratory**”).

⁶ Results of the GC/C/IRMS analysis performed on the Second Sample are consistent with the exogenous origin of Norandrosterone (which was detected at a concentration ≤ 10 ng/mL).

Findings 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.

12. The Athlete was also informed of her rights, inter alia, to request the B Sample(s) analysis, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting the Adverse Analytical Findings 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 by 6 January 2025.
13. On 5 January 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU and stated that she did not use the prohibited substance (i.e., Nandrolone or a Nandrolone precursor).
14. On 7 January 2025, the AIU gave the Athlete until no later than 9 January 2025 to provide any explanation for the Adverse Analytical Findings. On the same day, the Athlete requested an extension of the deadline, which was granted by the AIU until 15 January 2025.
15. On 8 January 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU stating that she accepted that the prohibited substance was found in her Samples, but that she could not remember how the substance entered her body.
16. On 9 January 2025, the Athlete informed the AIU that she accepted the Consequences and on 11 January 2025, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete (dated 9 January 2025).

Consequences

17. In accordance with Rule 10.9.3(a), the First Adverse Analytical Finding and Second Adverse Analytical Finding shall be considered together as one single Anti-Doping Rule Violation. This is therefore the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
18. 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."*

19. Norandrosterone (resulting from an exogenous administration) is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
20. 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.

21. The Athlete has not demonstrated that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional. Therefore, the mandatory period of Ineligibility is a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years.

22. 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.”

23. The Notice of Allegation was issued to the Athlete on 23 December 2024, and, on 11 January 2025, 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 Ineligibility⁷.

24. The Athlete shall therefore receive a one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction.

25. 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:

25.1. a period of Ineligibility of three (3) years commencing on 23 December 2024 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and

25.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 29 September 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

⁷ The 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 signed admission and acceptance of Consequences on 11 January 2025, no Notice of Charge was ever issued.

26. 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.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

28. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
29. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, WADA and the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya (“**ADAK**”) 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.
30. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or ADAK, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 14 January 2025