
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Albert Korir

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 Albert Korir ("the **Athlete**") is a 31-year-old marathon runner from Kenya¹.
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 the Anti-Doping Rule Violations:

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

[...]

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/albert-korir-14645745>

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

5. On 3 October 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition, in Kapkitony, Kenya, which was given code 8390725 (the **“First Sample”**) pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya (**“ADAK”**).
6. On 13 October 2025, the Athlete provided a blood Sample Out-of-Competition, in Kipkabus, Kenya, which was given code 8331463 (the **“Second Sample”**) under the Testing Authority of ADAK.
7. On 21 October 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition, in Kapkitony, Kenya, which was given code 8411620 (the **“Third Sample”**) under the Testing Authority of ADAK.
8. Following analysis of the above Samples by the World Anti-Doping Agency (**“WADA”**) accredited laboratory in Stockholm, Sweden (the **“Laboratory”**) the following Adverse Analytical Findings were reported in the Samples, based on:
 - 8.1.1. the presence of Methoxy polyethylene glycol-epoetin beta (**“CERA”**) in the First Sample (the **“First Adverse Analytical Finding”**);
 - 8.1.2. the presence of CERA in the Second Sample (the **“Second Adverse Analytical Finding”**); and
 - 8.1.3. the presence of CERA in the Third Sample (the **“Third Adverse Analytical Finding”**).
9. In accordance with Rule 1.4.4 ADR, as an Athlete who has Gold Status under the World Athletics Label Road Race Programme as published by the AIU on its website², he is an International-Level Athlete under the ADR and according to the ADAK Anti-Doping Regulations.
10. ADAK therefore formally delegated its authority for Results Management in relation to the Adverse Analytical Findings to the AIU, in accordance with S7(3) of the Kenya Anti-Doping Act³.
11. Therefore, the AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Findings in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management (**“ISRM”**) and determined that:
 - 11.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption (**“TUE”**) that had been granted for the CERA found in the Samples; and

² See <https://www.athleticsintegrity.org/downloads/pdfs/know-the-rules/en/2023-List-of-Athletes-with-Platinum-Gold-status.pdf>

³ See https://new.kenyalaw.org/akn/ke/act/2016/5/eng@2022-12-31#part_II_sec_7

- 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 Adverse Analytical Findings.
12. On 8 January 2026, the AIU notified the Athlete of the Adverse Analytical Findings in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, including that the Adverse Analytical Findings may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR and/or Rule 2.2 ADR, and of the imposition of an immediate Provisional Suspension. The Athlete was also informed of his rights, *inter alia*, to request the analysis of the B Samples, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting, and to give a written explanation for, the Adverse Analytical Findings, and to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction of the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR, by no later than 15 January 2026.
13. On 12 January 2026, the Athlete returned an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed to confirm that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences specified in the Notice of Allegation issued on 8 January 2026.
14. Following completion of further investigation into this matter, the AIU has issued this Decision in accordance with Rule 8.5.6(a) ADR.

Consequences

15. This is the Athlete’s first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
16. 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...”*
17. CERA is an EPO-based construct listed as a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S2.1. Erythropoietins (EPO) and agents affecting erythropoiesis. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
18. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of four (4) years, unless the AIU demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.
19. The AIU has not demonstrated that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional. Therefore, the mandatory period of Ineligibility to be imposed is a period of four (4) years.

20. 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.”

21. 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.”

22. The Adverse Analytical Findings confirm the presence of CERA in Samples that were collected on 3 October, 13 October and 21 October 2025.
23. This constitutes clear evidence of the Athlete’s use of “*a Prohibited Substance on multiple occasions*” which is expressly identified in the definition of Aggravating Circumstances.
24. The above 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.
25. 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.
26. 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.”

27. A Notice of Allegation was issued to the Athlete on 8 January 2026. On 12 January 2026, the Athlete confirmed that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility of six (6) years⁴.
28. 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.
29. 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:
 - 29.1. a period of Ineligibility of five (5) years, starting on 8 January 2026 (the date of Provisional Suspension) and expiring on 7 January 2031; and
 - 29.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 3 October 2025, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.
30. 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.

Publication

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

⁴ The Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations was issued to the Athlete by the AIU in accordance with Article 5.1.2 of the ISRM, prior to a Notice of Charge issued in accordance with Article 7 of the ISRM. Considering the Athlete's admission and acceptance of Consequences on 12 January 2026, no Notice of Charge will be ever issued.

Rights of Appeal

32. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
33. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, 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.
34. 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, 27 March 2026