
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Tadu Teshome Nare

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 Tadu Teshome Nare ("the **Athlete**") is a 23-year-old long-distance Athlete from Ethiopia.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)."*

Whereabouts Failures

4. Rule 2.4 ADR sets out that the following shall constitute an Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

"2.4 Whereabouts Failures by an Athlete in a Registered Testing Pool

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/ethiopia/tadu-teshome-14817199>

Any combination of three missed tests and/or filing failures, as defined in the International Standard for Results Management, within a 12-month period by an Athlete in a Registered Testing Pool.”

5. A Missed Test and a Filing Failure are defined in the International Standard for Results Management (“**ISRM**”) respectively as follows:

*“**Missed Test:** A failure by the Athlete to be available for Testing at the location and time specified in the 60-minute time slot identified in their Whereabouts Filing for the day in question, in accordance with Article 4.8 of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations and Annex B.2 of the International Standard for Results Management.*

***Filing Failure:** A failure by the Athlete (or by a third party to whom the Athlete has delegated the task) to make an accurate and complete Whereabouts Filing that enables the Athlete to be located for Testing at the times and locations set out in the Whereabouts Filing or to update that Whereabouts Filing where necessary to ensure that it remains accurate and complete, all in accordance with Article 4.8 of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations and Annex B.2 of the International Standard for Results Management.”*

6. In short, an athlete violates Rule 2.4 of the ADR where he or she has any combination of three Missed Tests and/or Filing Failures within any twelve-month period, that period beginning on the day of the first relevant Missed Test/Filing Failure.

The Athlete’s Commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation

7. In this instance, the Athlete has had three Whereabouts Failures in the twelve-month period beginning on 7 November 2023, specifically:

7.1.1. a Missed Test and/or a Filing Failure on 7 November 2023;

7.1.2. a Missed Test and/or a Filing Failure on 24 June 2024; and

7.1.3. a Missed Test and/or a Filing Failure on 13 October 2024.

8. The circumstances of each of these Whereabouts Failures are set out in detail below.

I. **First Whereabouts Failure – Missed Test/Filing Failure on 7 November 2023**

9. The Athlete’s whereabouts information stated that she would be at an address in Addis Ababa (“the **Addis Ababa Address**”) on 7 November 2023 during her 60-minute timeslot between 12:00-13:00.
10. A Doping Control Officer (“**DCO**”) was unable to locate the Athlete for Testing on 7 November 2023 during the 60-minute timeslot at the location specified in her whereabouts information.

11. Therefore, on 13 November 2023, the AIU wrote to the Athlete requesting her explanation for an apparent Missed Test/Filing Failure which occurred on 7 November 2023 by no later than 27 November 2023.
12. On 13 November 2023, the Athlete responded to the AIU noting that she had been in South Africa and that she had informed her Authorised Athlete Representative to update her whereabouts information accordingly.
13. On 24 November 2023, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 7 November 2023 against her. The Athlete was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 8 December 2023 and advised that, if she failed to do so, the Whereabouts Failure would be considered as a Whereabouts Failure for the purposes of Rule 2.4 ADR.
14. On 25 November 2023, the AIU received an e-mail from the Athlete in which she reiterated that she had sent all documents and information to her Authorised Athlete Representative to update her whereabouts information, and that following the notification of the apparent Whereabouts Failure, she had contacted him to ask what had happened and he admitted that he had been in Kenya with no reception and had failed to update the Athlete's whereabouts information.
15. On 27 November 2023, the AIU acknowledged receipt of the Athlete's e-mail from 25 November 2023 and confirmed that a Whereabouts Failure had been confirmed against her. The AIU reminded the Athlete that she had until 8 December 2023 to request an administrative review.
16. No request for an administrative review was filed by 8 December 2023 (or at all).
17. Therefore, the AIU recorded a Whereabouts Failure² against the Athlete effective 7 November 2023.

II. Second Whereabouts Failure – Missed Test/Filing Failure on 24 June 2024

18. The Athlete's whereabouts information stated that she would be at the Addis Ababa Address on 24 June 2024 during her 60-minute timeslot between 12:00-13:00.
19. A DCO was unable to locate the Athlete for Testing on 24 June 2024 during the 60-minute timeslot at the location specified in her whereabouts information.
20. Therefore, on 27 June 2024, the AIU wrote to the Athlete requesting her explanation for an apparent Missed Test/Filing Failure which occurred on 24 June 2024 by no later than 11 July 2024.
21. On 8 July the AIU received an e-mail from the Athlete in which she explained that she had informed her Authorised Athlete Representative (through her coach, who is also her husband) that she had a race in Durban, South Africa, on 23 June 2024 and noted that this was included

² The Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as both a Missed Test and a Filing Failure.

in her whereabouts information. The Athlete also claimed that the details of her travel had not been properly included in ADAMS and asserted, *inter alia*, that it was obvious that if she was competing in Durban on 23 June 2024, then she could not be back in Ethiopia for the morning of 24 June 2024.

22. On 12 August 2024, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 24 June 2024 against her. The Athlete was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 26 August 2024 and advised that, if she failed to do so, the Whereabouts Failure would be considered as a Whereabouts Failure for the purposes of Rule 2.4 ADR.
23. No request for an administrative review was filed by 26 August 2024 (or at all).
24. Therefore, the AIU recorded a Whereabouts Failure³ against the Athlete effective 24 June 2024 as her second Whereabouts Failure in the twelve-month period beginning on 7 November 2023.

III. Third Whereabouts Failure – Missed Test/Filing Failure on 13 October 2024

25. The Athlete's Whereabouts information stated that she would be at the Addis Ababa Address on 13 October 2024 during her 60-minute timeslot between 21:00-22:00.
26. A DCO was unable to locate the Athlete for Testing on 13 October 2024 during the 60-minute timeslot at the location specified in her whereabouts information.
27. Therefore, on 16 October 2024, the AIU wrote to the Athlete requesting her explanation for an apparent Missed Test/Filing Failure which occurred on 13 October 2024 by no later than 30 October 2024.
28. On 24 October 2024, the AIU received a request for an extension to the deadline for the Athlete's explanation from her appointed attorneys.
29. On 25 October 2024, the AIU agreed to an extension for the Athlete to submit her explanation until no later than 13 November 2024.
30. On 13 November 2024, the Athlete's appointed attorneys confirmed that the Athlete would not file an explanation for the alleged Whereabouts Failure on 13 October 2024.
31. Therefore, on 18 November 2024, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 13 October 2024 against her. The Athlete was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 2 December 2024 and advised that, if she failed to do so, the Whereabouts Failure would be considered as a Whereabouts Failure for the purposes of Rule 2.4 ADR.
32. On 23 November 2024, the AIU received a request for an extension to the deadline to request an administrative review from the Athlete's appointed attorneys.

³ The Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as both a Missed Test and a Filing Failure.

33. On 27 November 2024, the AIU agreed to an extension for the Athlete to submit a request for an administrative review until no later than 9 December 2024.
34. On 8 December 2024, the Athlete's appointed attorneys confirmed that the Athlete had decided not to submit a request for an administrative review of the AIU's decision to confirm a Whereabouts Failure on 13 October 2024 against her.
35. Therefore, the AIU recorded a Whereabouts Failure⁴ against the Athlete effective 13 October 2024 as her third Whereabouts Failure in the twelve-month period beginning on 7 November 2023.

Disciplinary proceedings

36. On 5 February 2025, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violation in relation to a potential violation of Rule 2.4 and imposed a Provisional Suspension pending the determination of the matter in accordance with Rule 7.4.2.
37. On 13 February 2025, the AIU received a without prejudice response to the Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations submitted on the Athlete's behalf by her appointed attorneys.
38. Following without prejudice discussions during which the AIU proposed terms for the potential settlement of the matter, on 22 May 2025 the Athlete's appointed attorneys informed the AIU that the Athlete did not accept the terms proposed and that the Athlete would therefore seek a hearing on all issues, including the issue of whether she had committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation.⁵
39. Therefore, on 27 May 2025, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge which charged the Athlete with committing an Anti-Doping Rule Violation pursuant to Rule 2.4 and gave the Athlete the opportunity to formalise her request for a hearing (as had been indicated by her attorneys). The AIU also outlined the Athlete's options for determination of the matter, including (and notwithstanding prior without prejudice discussions) the option to seek to enter into a case resolution agreement by admitting the Anti-Doping Rule Violation in accordance with Rule 10.8.2 (per Article 7.1 g) ISRM)
40. On 31 May 2025, the AIU received an e-mail from the Athlete's coach (and husband) stating that the Athlete agreed to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and to accept the Consequences previously proposed by the AU on a without prejudice basis.
41. The Athlete has therefore admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and has agreed to resolve the matter on terms specified by the AIU as set out in further detail below.

⁴ The Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as both a Missed Test and a Filing Failure.

⁵ The Athlete's appointed attorney also confirmed that they were withdrawing from representing the Athlete at that point and informed the AIU to correspond with the Athlete directly in future.

Consequences

42. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
43. Rule 10.3.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.4 ADR shall be as follows:

"10.3.2 For violations of Rule 2.4, the period of Ineligibility will be two (2) years, subject to reduction down to a minimum of one (1) year, depending on the Athlete's degree of Fault. The flexibility between two (2) years and one (1) year of Ineligibility in this Rule is not available to Athlete where a pattern of last-minute whereabouts changes or other conduct raises a serious suspicion that the Athlete was trying to avoid being available for Testing."

44. The period of Ineligibility is therefore two years, subject to a reduction down to a minimum of one year based on the Athlete's degree of Fault.
45. Before addressing the Athlete's level of Fault in this case, it is necessary to recall the following key principles that have been upheld by the Court of Arbitration for Sport ("**CAS**") in relation to the whereabouts system⁶.
46. First, the whereabouts regime constitutes the single most important system through which doping can be effectively detected through no advance notice out of competition testing and it is therefore critical to the fight against doping.
47. Second, whilst that system places substantial demands upon Athletes in terms of sacrifice of freedom or privacy, that is the necessary quid pro quo for Athletes to ensure their participation in doping-free sport.
48. Finally, therefore, all Athletes must be held strictly accountable for their failure (for whatever reason) to comply with their duties under the whereabouts regime to maintain the credibility and integrity of the system and to protect clean Athletes.
49. In that context, an assessment of Fault for a Rule 2.4 Anti-Doping Rule Violation also requires consideration of Fault in relation to all three Whereabouts Failures. As set out in CAS 2020/A/7526 World Athletics v. Salwa Eid Naser & CAS 2020/A/7559 WADA v. World Athletics & Salwa Eid Naser (para. 206) *"given that the ADRV is composed of three different Whereabouts Failures that form part of the First Charge, the Panel will have to assess the Athlete's degree of Fault taking into account the circumstances pertaining to all of them."*
50. In addition, in CAS 2020/A/7528 Christian Coleman v. World Athletics the CAS Panel calibrated the potential reduction of the period of Ineligibility from two years down to one year in relation to a Rule 2.4 Anti-Doping Rule Violation based on levels of Fault ranging from

⁶ See CAS 2020/A/7526 World Athletics v. Salwa Eid Naser & CAS 2020/A/7559 WADA v. World Athletics & Salwa Eid Naser.

“high” (24-20 months with a midpoint of 22 months), “medium” (16-20 months with a midpoint of 18 months) and “low” (12-16 months with a midpoint of 14 months).

51. Fault is defined as follows in the ADR (emphasis added):

*“**Fault:** Fault is any breach of duty or any lack of care appropriate to a particular situation. **Factors to be taken into consideration in assessing an Athlete’s or other Person’s degree of Fault include, for example, the Athlete’s or other Person’s experience, whether the Athlete or other Person is a Protected Person, special considerations such as impairment, the degree of risk that should have been perceived by the Athlete and the level of care and investigation exercised by the Athlete in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk.** In assessing the Athlete’s or other Person’s degree of Fault, the circumstances considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Athlete’s or other Person’s departure from the expected standard of behaviour. Thus, for example, the fact that an Athlete would lose the opportunity to earn large sums of money during a period of Ineligibility, or the fact that the Athlete only has a short time left in a career, or the timing of the sporting calendar, would not be relevant factors to be considered in reducing the period of Ineligibility under Rule 10.6.1 or 10.6.2.”*

52. As to the Athlete’s degree of Fault in the specific circumstances of her case, the AIU considers the following factors to be relevant:

52.1. the Athlete does not speak English and was therefore unable to communicate directly with her Authorised Athlete Representative. Although the Athlete sought to overcome this obstacle by using her coach/husband (who was able to communicate on her behalf in English) to communicate details about her whereabouts, the Athlete’s language barrier nevertheless represents an impairment which is a relevant consideration in her case;

52.2. two of the Athlete’s three Whereabouts Failures are due to the omissions of her Authorised Athlete Representative. For the first Whereabouts Failure on 7 November 2023, the Athlete’s coach/husband sent WhatsApp messages to her Authorised Athlete Representative beginning on 26 October 2023 and had provided all the information for updates for the period 30 October 2023 to 8 November 2023 to them by 28 October 2023 for the update to be made. The Authorised Athlete Representative then failed to make the updates in ADAMS (allegedly he was in Kenya with little to no internet access to be able to file the update). For the second Whereabouts Failure on 24 June 2024, again, the Athlete, through her coach/husband, communicated the details of updates to her whereabouts information to her Authorised Athlete Representative but he failed to make the required updates. This is not disputed by the Authorised Athlete Representative. Whilst that is no defence against the Athlete’s liability⁷, it is nonetheless a relevant consideration for the Athlete’s level of Fault in this case that for two of the three Whereabouts Failures, she communicated updates to her Authorised Athlete Representative who failed to include those updates in the ADAMS system.

⁷ See Article 4.8.14.4 b) of the WADA International Standard for Testing and Investigations (“ISTI”).

53. In consideration of the foregoing, the AIU considers that the Athlete's level of Fault for the Rule 2.4 Anti-Doping Rule Violation to be at the midpoint of the "high" range of Fault (per the calibration of the one-year range as adopted by the CAS Panel in *Coleman*), i.e., a period of twenty-two (22) months. The Athlete has accepted that period of Ineligibility.
54. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.4 ADR and accepted Consequences specified by the AIU, in accordance with Rule 10.3.2 ADR and the application of Rule 8.5.6 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
- 54.1. a period of Ineligibility of twenty-two (22) months commencing on 5 February 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
- 54.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 13 October 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.
55. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for her Anti-Doping Rule Violation and has waived her right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

57. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
58. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, WADA and the Ethiopian Anti-Doping Authority 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.
59. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or the Ethiopian Anti-Doping Authority, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 2 June 2025