Athletics Integrity Unit

1st Floor
6 Quai Antoine 1er
MC 98007, Monaco

Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Roncer Kipkorir Konga

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 Roncer Kipkorir Konga ("the **Athlete**") is a 30-year-old road runner from Kenya[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:

[1] https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/roncer-kipkorir-konga-14849466

"2.1 Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample

[…]

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

5. On 29 December 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Iten, Kenya, which was given code 1452324 (the "**Sample**").

6. On 24 January 2025, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland (the "**Laboratory**") reported its initial analysis of the Sample as negative for the presence of any Prohibited Substances.

7. However, following further analysis conducted on request of the AIU, on 11 June 2025, the Laboratory confirmed the presence of Testosterone and its Metabolites Androsterone, 5α-androstane-3α,17 diol ("**5αAdiol"**) and 5β-androstane-3α,17 diol ("**5βAdiol**") consistent with exogenous origin in the Sample (the "**Adverse Analytical Finding**).

8. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management ("**ISRM**") and determined that:

   8.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the exogeneous Testosterone and its Metabolites found in the Sample; and

   8.2. 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 Finding.

9. Therefore, on 16 June 2025, the AIU notified the Athlete of the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, including that the Adverse Analytical Finding may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR and/or Rule 2.2 ADR, The Athlete was also informed of his rights, inter alia, to request the B Sample analysis, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting the Adverse Analytical Finding 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 23 June 2025.

10. The AIU also issued the Athlete with a Demand to attend interview with AIU representatives and provide his explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Rule 5.7.5 ADR.

11. On 25 June 2025, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives (the "**Interview**"), during which he stated, inter alia, that he:

   11.1. denied knowingly or intentionally taking Testosterone;

   11.2. was not prescribed and did not take any medication in the months preceding the collection of the Sample;

11.3. had taken multivitamins and other supplements such as vitamin C and protein;

11.4. believed that the origin of the Adverse Analytical Finding could be;

11.4.1. a traditional herbal medicine made by his mother which he consumed when staying at home in the period from 25 December 2024 to 29 December 2024: or

11.4.2. a supplement called TestoXT Booster which he bought in September in Copenhagen and used before going home in December[2].

12. Following requests made by AIU representatives during and following the Interview, on 26 June 2025, the Athlete provided the AIU with further information, including, inter alia, a full list of the supplements that he was taking between October and December 2024 and photographs of the TestoXT Booster supplement container. The Athlete clarified that although he initially believed that he had paid for the TestoXT Booster supplement by card (as stated during the Interview), he had since remembered that he had paid using cash.[3]

13. On 3 July 2025, the AIU informed the Athlete of its position being that having reviewed his explanation, he had failed to establish that the traditional herbal medicine prepared by his mother and/or the TestoXT Booster supplement could have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding[4]. The AIU afforded the Athlete an opportunity to submit any additional explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding and supporting documents he wished to rely on by no later than 10 July 2025.

14. On 9 July 2025, the Athlete provided an additional explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding, which, is reproduced in material part below:

> "*Thanks you also for allowing me to explain my self, so according to my observation the herbal are trees from forest and they are medicine also that can treat many diseases so I have doubt that might bring the rise of testosterone in my sample A, about testo tx booster it contain testosterone also which might interfere with the sample tested positive, I believe body responded to this supplement until it become to excess of testosterone levels in the test but maybe combination of the two the Herbs and testo supplement might have bring even the rise of testosterone level high*
>
> *So I would request AIU to do farther research on this this two and if it is this which brings positive results I would ask for forgiveness again and I will never use them*

[2] The Athlete also stated during the Interview that he could not afford to pay for additional analysis.

[3] In response to the request for a copy of his bank records for the day that he purchased the TestoXT Booster or a copy of the receipt of purchase.

[4] The AIU also noted that (i) the ingredients label for the TestoXT supplement did not include Testosterone (or Testosterone precursors) and (ii) there was no publicly available information that indicated that the TestoXT supplement could be contaminated with Testosterone (or Testosterone precursors) or could otherwise have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding.

I would really want exploit my talent because I believe in my self and my training I want to declare that I just used those two before Christmas and I didn't use any of injection."

15. The AIU submitted the Athlete's explanation to the Athlete Passport Management Unit ("**APMU**")[5] for review, and the APMU concluded that "*the use of herbal medicine or food supplements containing Tribulus terrestris, as described in the athlete's explanation, does not seem consistent with the analytical findings indicative of exogenous origin of testosterone and its metabolites*."

16. Following a review of the Athlete's explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding, the AIU remained satisfied that he had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations.Therefore, on 22 July 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 thats 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.

17. On 11 August 2025, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

Consequences

18. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.

19. 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.*
>
> *10.2.2 If Rule 10.2.1 does not apply, then (subject to Rule 10.2.4(a)) the period of Ineligibility will be two years."*

20. Testosterone (or Testostrone precursors) 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.

[5] The APMU is independent of the AIU and is hosted by the Laboratory with responsibility for the timely management of your Steroid Passport in ADAMS on behalf of World Athletics/AIU.

1st Floor
6 Quai Antoine 1er
MC 98007, Monaco

21. 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.

22. 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.

23. 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."*

24. A Notice of Charge was issued to the Athlete on 22 July 2025. On 11 August 2025, the Athlete returned a signed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form confirming that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility.

25. 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.

26. 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:

    26.1. a period of Ineligibility of three (3) years commencing on 16 June 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and

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

27. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for his Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived his right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

1st Floor
6 Quai Antoine 1er
MC 98007, Monaco

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

29. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.

30. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, the Athlete, 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.

31. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or ADAK, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 18 August 2025