
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Daniel Do Nascimento

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. Mr Daniel Do Nascimento ("the **Athlete**") is a 26-year-old road runner from Brazil.¹
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/brazil/daniel-do-nascimento-14646503>

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

5. On 4 July 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, which was given code 6558200 (the “**First Sample**”) pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of the Autoridade Brasileira de Controle de Dopagem (“**ABCD**”).
6. On 7 July 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, which was given code 7220228 (the “**Second Sample**”) pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics - AIU.
7. On 12 July 2024, the World Anti-Doping Agency (“**WADA**”)-accredited laboratory in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (the “**Rio Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the First Sample based on the presence of (i) Drostanolone and its Metabolite, 3 α -Hydroxy-2 α -methyl-5 α -androst-17-one, (ii) Metenolone and its Metabolite, 3 α -Hydroxy-1-methylene-5 α -androst-17-one and (iii) Nandrolone and its Metabolites 19-norandrosterone (at a concentration above 15 ng/mL) and 19-noretiocholanolone. (the “**First Adverse Analytical Finding**”)².
8. On 15 July 2024, ABCD issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations, which informed him of the First Adverse Analytical Finding, imposed a Provisional Suspension (effective immediately) and invited him to provide *inter alia* his position in relation to the B Sample analysis of the First Sample and a detailed written explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding within seven (7) days of receipt of that Notice.
9. On 20 July 2025, the Athlete’s representative, Mr Flavio Schuler, wrote to ABCD stating that the Athlete was experiencing issues with his mental health and requested a 30-day extension to provide a reply.
10. On 23 July 2024, the WADA-accredited laboratory in Montreal, Canada (the “**Montreal Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Second Sample based on the presence of (i) Drostanolone and its Metabolites, including 3 α -Hydroxy-2 α -methyl-5 α -androst-17-one and (ii) Metenolone and its Metabolite, 16 α -Hydroxy-1-methyl-5 α -androst-1-en-3,17-dione (the “**Second Adverse Analytical Finding**”).
11. The AIU reviewed the Second Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the ISRM and determined that:
 - 11.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption (“**TUE**”) that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the Drostanolone (and its Metabolites) and/or for the Metenolone (and its Metabolite) found in the Second Sample; and

² The First Sample was also reported as an Atypical Finding on the basis that the GC/C/IRMS results were inconclusive for the target compounds (i.e., testosterone and Metabolites).

- 11.2. 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 Second Adverse Analytical Finding.
12. Therefore, in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 ISRM, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations on 26 July 2024, which informed him of the Second Adverse Analytical Finding, imposed a Provisional Suspension (effective immediately) and invited him to provide *inter alia* his position in relation to the B Sample analysis of the Second Sample and a detailed written explanation for the Second Adverse Analytical Finding by no later than 2 August 2024.
13. On 2 August 2024, Mr Schuler wrote to the AIU on behalf of the Athlete to request a 90-day extension to provide an explanation due to issues with his mental health.
14. On 10 August 2024, the AIU asked Mr Schuler to clarify his relationship to the Athlete and provide written evidence of his authority to represent the Athlete in this matter.
15. On 12 August 2024, ABCD transferred Results Management of the First Adverse Analytical Finding to the AIU, so that it could be treated together with the Second Adverse Analytical Finding (together the “**Adverse Analytical Findings**”).
16. On 14 August 2024, Mr Schuler explained that he was the Athlete’s career manager and submitted a handwritten medical document in support of the claims as to the state of the Athlete’s mental health.
17. On 16 August 2024, the AIU noted that the handwritten medical document was largely illegible and indecipherable and therefore asked Mr Schuler to provide a legible copy translated into English as soon as possible.
18. On 24 September 2024, following several exchanges, Mr Schuler wrote to the AIU stating that he was unable to obtain further medical documents and that the Athlete was unreachable.
19. Between 25 November and 2 December 2024, AIU representatives communicated directly with the Athlete via his wife using WhatsApp.
20. On 10 January 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and noted that he had failed to respond to the Notice of Allegation (issued almost 6 months prior) to confirm how he would like to proceed and gave him until no later than 20 January 2025 to provide his explanation for the Adverse Analytical Findings.
21. On 21 January 2025, Mr Schuler wrote to the AIU noting that the Athlete had recently attended a medical appointment and begun treatment for his mental health. Mr Schuler asked that the AIU exercise caution with any direct communication with the Athlete.
22. On 10 February 2025, the AIU noted Mr Schuler’s request and stressed that it had proceeded sensitively throughout its direct communications with the Athlete. However, the AIU recalled that, despite several attempts (through multiple avenues) in the preceding 6 months, the Athlete had still failed to provide his explanation for the Adverse Analytical Findings or a substantive response to any of the matters that were set out in the Notice of Allegation and

therefore that the proceedings could not be further delayed. The AIU confirmed that it would proceed by issuing the Athlete with a Notice of Charge and asked Mr Schuler to ensure that the Athlete had appropriate support in place to assist him.

23. Therefore, on 10 March 2025, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 ADR and Article 7.1 ISRM confirming that he was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR (“the **Charge**”) and invited him to confirm how he would like to proceed with the Charge.
24. Following a response to the Charge filed on behalf of the Athlete by Mr Schuler on 30 March 2025³, on 23 April 2025 the Athlete attended a recorded interview with AIU representatives.
25. On 30 April 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and confirmed, inter alia, that it understood that he had accepted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations based on the Adverse Analytical Findings and the Consequences set out in the Notice of Charge and that the AIU would shortly issue a decision confirming the outcome in his case.

Consequences

26. This is the Athlete’s first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
27. Rule 10.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 ADR or Rule 2.2 ADR 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.”*

28. Nandrolone, Metenolone and Drostanolone (and their respective Metabolites) are Prohibited Substances under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. They are Non-Specified Substances prohibited at all times.
29. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.

³ The Athlete did not request a hearing within the given deadline (i.e., 24 March 2025) and was therefore deemed to have waived his right to a hearing, admitted the asserted Anti-Doping Rule Violation and accepted the Consequences set out in the Notice of Charge.

30. 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.

31. However, Rule 10.4 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation may be greater than the standard sanction when it is established that Aggravating Circumstances are present:

“10.4 Aggravating Circumstances that may increase the period of Ineligibility

If the Integrity Unit or other prosecuting authority establishes in an individual case involving an anti-doping rule violation [...] that Aggravating Circumstances are present which justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction, then the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable will be increased by an additional period of Ineligibility of up to two (2) years depending on the seriousness of the violation and the nature of the Aggravating Circumstances, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that they did not knowingly commit the anti-doping rule violation.”

32. Aggravating Circumstances are defined in the ADR as follows:

“Aggravating Circumstances: Circumstances involving, or actions by, an Athlete or other Person which may justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction. Such circumstances and actions shall include, but are not limited to: the Athlete or other Person Used or Possessed multiple Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods, Used or Possessed a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method on multiple occasions or committed multiple other anti-doping rule violations; a normal individual would be likely to enjoy the performance-enhancing effects of the anti-doping rule violation(s) beyond the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility; the Athlete or Person engaged in deceptive or obstructive conduct to avoid the detection or adjudication of an anti-doping rule violation; or the Athlete or other Person engaged in Tampering during Results Management. For the avoidance of doubt, the examples of circumstances and conduct described herein are not exclusive and other similar circumstances or conduct may also justify the imposition of a longer period of Ineligibility.”

33. The analysis of the Samples revealed the presence of Nandrolone, Metenolone and Drostanolone. This constitutes clear evidence of the Athlete's Use of multiple Prohibited Substances which is expressly identified in the definition of Aggravating Circumstances and therefore justifies an increase of the period of Ineligibility unless the Athlete can establish that he did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations.

34. The Athlete has failed to establish that he did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations. Therefore, the period of Ineligibility to be imposed is a period of six (6) years.

35. 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.”

36. A Notice of Charge was issued to the Athlete on 10 March 2025. On 30 March 2025, Mr Schuler responded to the Notice of Charge on the Athlete’s behalf and, consequently, on 23 April 2025, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives during which he did not dispute that he had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations. On 30 April 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and confirmed its understanding following the Athlete’s response to the Charge dated 30 March 2025 and subsequent interview, that he had accepted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations based on the Adverse Analytical Findings and the Consequences that were set out in the Notice of Charge and that the AIU would therefore issue a decision confirming the outcome and the specific Consequences in his case (unless the Athlete advised to the contrary by 2 May 2025). On 30 April 2025, Mr Schuler responded to the AIU on behalf of the Athlete and did not challenge the AIU’s understanding of the Athlete’s position apropos the Anti-Doping Rule Violations or the Consequences that he had accepted. The AIU therefore considers that the Athlete admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences within 20 days after receiving the Notice of Charge for the purpose of Rule 10.8.1 ADR.
37. The Athlete shall therefore receive a one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction.
38. 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 Rule 10.4 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:
- 38.1. a period of Ineligibility of five (5) years commencing on 15 July 2024 (the date of the Provisional Suspension imposed by ABCD); and

- 38.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 4 July 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

40. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
41. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, WADA and ABCD 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.
42. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or ABCD, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 6 May 2025