

---

## DECISION OF THE ATHLETICS INTEGRITY UNIT IN THE CASE OF MR BELAL AHMED

---

### Introduction

1. In April 2017, World Athletics (formerly the IAAF) 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. 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. Mr Belal AHMED is a 33-year old Egyptian national (resident in the United Kingdom) and a long-distance runner who is an International-Level Athlete for the purposes of the ADR (the "**Athlete**").
3. This decision is issued by the AIU pursuant to Article 8.4.7 ADR, which provides as follows.

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

### The Athlete's commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation

4. On 27 September 2019, the Athlete was subject to out-of-competition Testing pursuant to the Testing Authority of World Athletics in Berlin, (Germany). The Athlete provided a urine sample numbered 4323001 ("**the Sample**").
5. On 11 November 2019, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Kreischa (Germany) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding for the presence of recombinant EPO ("**EPO**") in the Sample ("**the AAF**").
6. EPO is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2019 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 TUE permitting the use of EPO.
7. On 4 December 2019, the AIU notified the Athlete of the AAF and imposed a Provisional Suspension upon him pending the determination of the matter. The Athlete was requested to provide an explanation for the presence of EPO in the Sample and was afforded the opportunity to request analysis of the B Sample by no later than 11 December 2019.
8. On 11 December 2019, the AU extended the deadline for the Athlete to respond until 24 December 2019.

9. On 24 December 2019, the Athlete (through his legal counsel) admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations set out in the AIU correspondence sent to him on 4 December 2019 and confirmed that (i) he did not require the B Sample analysis; (ii) he did not wish for the matter to proceed to a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal; and (iii) he accepted the applicable period of ineligibility was a period of four (4) years.

### **Consequences**

10. This constitutes the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation under the ADR.
11. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Article 2.1 ADR and Article 2.2 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
  - 11.1. a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years pursuant to Article 10.2.1(a) commencing on 4 December 2019; and
  - 11.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 27 September 2019 with all resulting consequences including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points and prize and appearance money pursuant to Articles 9 and 10.8 ADR.

### **Publication**

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

### **Rights of Appeal**

13. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Article 8.4.7 ADR.
14. Further to Article 13.2.4 ADR, WADA, United Kingdom Anti-Doping ("UKAD") and the Athlete 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 13.7.2 ADR.
15. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or UKAD, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Article 13.9.3 ADR.

**Monaco, 30 December 2019**