
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Jackline Sakilu

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 Jackline Sakilu ("the **Athlete**") is a 39-year-old long-distance runner from Tanzania¹.
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/tanzania/jackline-sakilu-14302631>

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

5. On 16 March 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the Seoul Marathon held in South Korea, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics-AIU, which was given code 8181478 (the "**First Sample**").
6. Following a request for reanalysis of the First Sample, on 12 September 2025, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Seoul, South Korea (the "**Seoul Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the First Sample based on the presence of Androsterone, Etiocholanolone, 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin (the "**First Adverse Analytical Finding**").
7. In the meantime, on 5 August 2025, the Athlete had provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Arusha, Tanzania, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics-AIU, which was given code 1597537 (the "**Second Sample**").
8. On 13 August 2025, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Paris, France (the "**Paris Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Second Sample based on the presence of Androsterone, Etiocholanolone, 5 α -androstane-3 α ,17 diol ("**5 α Adiol**") and 5 β -androstane-3 α ,17 diol ("**5 β Adiol**") consistent with exogenous origin (the "**Second Adverse Analytical Finding**").
9. The AIU reviewed the First and the Second Adverse Analytical Findings in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management ("**ISRM**") and determined that:
 - 9.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") that had been granted for the Androsterone, Etiocholanolone, 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin found in the First or Second Samples;
 - 9.2. 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 respective Adverse Analytical Findings.
10. Therefore, on 17 September 2025, the AIU notified the Athlete of the Adverse Analytical Findings in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, imposed a Provisional Suspension (effective immediately) and indicated that the Adverse Analytical Findings may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR and/or Rule 2.2 ADR. The Athlete was informed of her rights, inter alia, to request the B Sample 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 24 September 2025.
11. On 22 September 2025, the Athlete's Authorised Athlete Representative, Mr Derek Froude, requested on the Athlete's behalf a one-week extension to submit her explanation, which the AIU granted.
12. On 27 September 2025, the AIU received the Athlete's explanation for the First and Second Adverse Analytical Findings, which, in summary, set out that:

- 12.1. they were caused by a medication (unspecified) administered to the Athlete for therapeutic reasons to treat legitimate health conditions within approved therapeutic doses, and not to enhance her performance;
 - 12.2. the Athlete retained the related medical documentation, which she could submit if requested; and
 - 12.3. no TUE was required, given the permitted status and dosage of the medication.
13. On 30 September 2025, the AIU asked the Athlete to provide the details of her treatment, including the name of the unspecified medication referred to in her explanation and copies of the relevant medical documents by no later than 3 October 2025.
 14. On the same day, the AIU received a medical report dated 19 September 2025, which indicated that the Athlete had attended the Regional Referral Hospital in Arusha (Tanzania) on several occasions beginning on 6 February 2025 and, following examinations, she was treated with Ibuprofen 400mg thrice a day and pre re nata (PRN), and Prednisolone tablets 10mg once a day.
 15. On 6 October 2025, the AIU informed the Athlete that none of the medicines was or contained Testosterone (or testosterone precursors) and therefore the documents that she had provided did not explain the First and Second Adverse Analytical Findings.
 16. The AIU therefore invited the Athlete to provide any additional explanation and/or supporting documents by no later than 13 October 2025.
 17. On 7 October 2025, the Athlete informed the AIU that she did not have any additional explanation or documents to provide.
 18. The AIU also conducted further analysis on other Samples that the Athlete had provided, including the following:
 - 18.1. on 29 June 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Arusha, Tanzania, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics-AIU, which was given code 1348377 (the "**Third Sample**");
 - 18.2. on 19 August 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Arusha, Tanzania, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics-AIU, which was given code 8411402 (the "**Fourth Sample**").
 19. Further analysis of the Third Sample by the WADA accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland (the "**Lausanne Laboratory**"), revealed the presence of Androsterone, 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin (the "**Third Adverse Analytical Finding**").
 20. Further analysis of the Fourth Sample by the WADA accredited laboratory in Paris, France (the "**Paris Laboratory**") also revealed the presence of Androsterone, Etiocholanolone, 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin (the "**Fourth Adverse Analytical Finding**").
 21. The AIU reviewed the Third and Fourth Adverse Analytical Findings in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management ("**ISRM**") and determined that:

- 21.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption (“**TUE**”) that had been granted for the Androsterone, Etiocholanolone, 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin found in the Third or Fourth Samples;
 - 21.2. 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 respective Adverse Analytical Findings.
22. Therefore, in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 ISRM, the AIU issued the Athlete with a further Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations on 12 November 2025 (in addition to the Notice of Allegation dated 17 September 2025), and, inter alia, invited the Athlete to confirm her availability to attend an online interview with AIU representatives to provide her explanation for the Third and Fourth Adverse Analytical Findings by no later than 14 November 2025.
 23. On 17 November 2025, the AIU contacted the Athlete concerning her availability for the interview on either 18 November 2025 or 19 November 2025.
 24. On 19 November 2025, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives and, in summary and inter alia, stated that:
 - 24.1. she had been ill and treated by a doctor in Tanzania who prescribed Ibuprofen and Prednisolone;
 - 24.2. she had no knowledge of using any Prohibited Substances and she did not understand how any of the Adverse Analytical Findings had occurred; and
 - 24.3. she had no knowledge of the WADA Prohibited List and she had not received any training/education about anti-doping.
 25. Based on the Athlete’s interview, the AIU remained satisfied that the Athlete had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR.
 26. Therefore, on 10 February 2026, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 ADR and Article 7.1 ISRM notifying her that (i) she was being charged with the First, Second, Third and Fourth Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR (“the **Charge**”) and that (ii) the Consequences that the AIU would seek included a period of Ineligibility of ten (10) years (as further explained below) and disqualification of her results since 29 June 2024.
 27. The AIU invited the Athlete to confirm how she would like to proceed with the Charge by no later than 24 February 2026.
 28. The Athlete was informed inter alia that if she failed to respond by that deadline she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing, admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge.
 29. On 23 and 24 February 2026, the AIU reminded the Athlete of her deadline to respond to the Charge; however, the Athlete failed to respond to the Charge within the given deadline.

30. Therefore, on 19 March 2026, the AIU wrote to the Athlete noting that she had failed to respond to the Charge within the given deadline and that she was therefore deemed to have waived her right to a hearing, admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Notice of Charge. The AIU confirmed that it would issue a final decision in her case accordingly.

Consequences

31. 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.”

32. Androsterone, Etiocholanolone, 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol are metabolites of Testosterone (or Testosterone precursors) which is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 and 2025 Prohibited Lists under the category S2, Peptide Hormones, Growth Factors, Related Substances, and Mimetics. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.

33. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed for a Non-Specified Substance is a period of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional. The Athlete has not demonstrated that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional in this instance and, therefore, the mandatory period of Ineligibility is a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years.

34. There are multiple Anti-Doping Rule Violations in this case arising from Samples that were collected on 29 June 2024, 16 March 2025, 5 August 2025 and 19 August 2025, but the Athlete did not receive notice of any of the violations before another occurred, and, therefore, in accordance with Rule 10.9.3(a), the Athlete's Anti-Doping Rule Violations are to be considered together as one single violation.

35. However, the AIU notes the exception to Rule 10.9.3(a) set out in Rule 10.9.3(b) as follows:

“10.9.3(b) If the Integrity Unit establishes that an Athlete or other Person committed an additional anti-doping rule violation prior to notification, and that the additional violation occurred 12 months or more before or after the first-noticed violation, then the period of Ineligibility for the additional violation will be calculated as if the additional violation were a stand-alone first

violation and this period of Ineligibility must be served consecutively (rather than concurrently) with the period of Ineligibility imposed for the first-noticed violation. Where this Rule 10.9.3(b) applies, the violations taken together will constitute a single violation for purposes of Rule 10.9.1.”

36. Applying Rule 10.9.3(b) to the Athlete's case, the first-noticed violations were those arising from the Samples collected on 16 March 2025 and 5 August 2025 and notified to the Athlete on 17 September 2025 (the "First-Noticed Violations"). The Athlete committed an additional violation before 17 September 2025, viz. arising from the Sample collected on 29 June 2024, which is more than twelve (12) months before the second of the First-Noticed Violations, viz. arising from the Sample collected on 5 August 2025.
37. Therefore, whereas the violations are to be treated together as single first violation, a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years for the violation arising from the Sample collected on 29 June 2024 is to be served consecutively to a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years for the First-Noticed Violations, adding up to a total of (8) eight years in accordance with Rule 10.9.3(b).
38. Moreover, 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 If the Integrity Unit or other prosecuting authority establishes in an individual case involving an anti-doping rule violation other than violations under Rule 2.7 (Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking), Rule 2.8 (Administration or Attempted Administration), Rule 2.9 (Complicity or Attempted Complicity) or Rule 2.11 (Acts by an Athlete or other Person to discourage or retaliate against reporting) 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”.

39. 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.”

40. The AIU considers that the four Adverse Analytical Findings constitute incontrovertible evidence of the Athlete’s Use of a Prohibited Substance on multiple occasions’ 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 she did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations.
41. The Athlete has failed to establish that she did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations. Therefore, the period of Ineligibility shall be increased by an additional period of Ineligibility of two (2) years based on the seriousness and the nature of the Aggravating Circumstances in the Athlete’s case to a total of ten (10) years.
42. On the basis that the Athlete is deemed to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR, in accordance with Rule 10.2.1 ADR, Rule 10.9.3(b) ADR and Rule 10.4 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences:
 - 42.1. a period of Ineligibility of ten (10) years commencing on 17 September 2025 (the date of the Provisional Suspension); and
 - 42.2. disqualification of the Athlete’s results on and since 29 June 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

44. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
45. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, WADA and Africa Zone V RADO 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.
46. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or Africa Zone V RADO, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 23 March 2026