
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Maryna Bekh-Romanchuk

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 Maryna Bekh-Romanchuk ("the **Athlete**") is a 30-year-old Ukrainian athlete who specializes in long jump and triple jump¹.
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/ukraine/maryna-bekh-romanchuk-14434131>

[...]

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

5. On 7 December 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, which was given code 8160007 (the "**Sample**") pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics – AIU.
6. On 28 March 2025, the WADA-accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland (the "**Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of 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 "**Adverse Analytical Finding**") following analysis by GC/C/IRMS.
7. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management ("**ISRM**") and determined that:
 - 7.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin found in the Sample; and
 - 7.2. 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.
8. Therefore, on 13 May 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, and of the imposition of an immediate Provisional Suspension. The Athlete was also informed of her 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 20 May 2025.
9. The AIU also issued the Athlete with a Demand to attend interview with AIU representatives to provide her explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Rule 5.7.5 ADR.
10. On 15 May 2025, the Athlete confirmed her availability to attend an interview with AIU representatives on 21 May 2025 in accordance with the Demand. On 17 May 2025, the Athlete informed the AIU that she would be accompanied at the interview by her appointed legal representatives.
11. On 20 May 2025, the Athlete requested the analysis of her B Sample and copies of the A Sample and B Sample laboratory documentation packages ("**LDPs**").

12. Shortly before the interview with AIU representatives on 21 May 2025, the Athlete provided a “*factual description of the events leading up to the doping test in December 2024*”², which included details of her medical history, diagnosis and prescribed treatments (medicines and supplements)³.
13. On 21 May 2025, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives (the “**First Interview**”) in which she:
 - 13.1.1. denied taking Testosterone but could not explain the Adverse Analytical Finding;
 - 13.1.2. confirmed her medical history in the lead up to the positive test (as set out in the factual description provided in writing shortly before the interview);
 - 13.1.3. stated that she had stopped training following the Paris 2024 Olympic Games from August 2024 to February 2025 for personal reasons;
 - 13.1.4. specified that she had checked all the medications she had taken against the WADA Prohibited List before taking them.
14. Following requests made by AIU representatives during and following the interview, on 28 May 2025, the Athlete provided the AIU with (i) the name and contact details of doctors who had prescribed her medications identified in the factual description document and during the interview, and (ii) English translations of the medical documents that she had enclosed with the factual description.
15. On the same day, 28 May 2025, the Athlete confirmed that she would not attend nor be represented at the B Sample analysis.
16. On 2 June 2025, the B Sample opening took place at the Laboratory and was witnessed by an independent observer in accordance with Article 5.3.6.2.3 of the ISL.
17. On the same day, 2 June 2025, the Athlete asked for her request for the A and B Sample LDPs to be suspended until after the B Sample analysis had been completed.
18. On 11 June 2025, the AIU informed the Athlete that the analysis of the B Sample had confirmed the Adverse Analytical Finding in the A Sample and asked her to confirm by 16 June 2025 whether she maintained her request for the A and/or B Sample LDPs.
19. On 16 June 2025, the Athlete waived her request for copies of the A and/or B Sample LDPs.
20. On 26 June 2025, the AIU conducted a follow-up interview with the Athlete (the “**Second Interview**”) during which she maintained that she did not know how the Adverse Analytical Finding had occurred.

² The Athlete also enclosed copies of medical documents in Ukrainian.

³ The AIU reviewed the prescribed medications and supplements specified and, according to their labels, none of them contained Testosterone.

21. On 27 June 2025, the Athlete was provided with opportunity to provide any additional explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding and and further supporting documents that she wished to rely upon by 10 July 2025.
22. On 9 July 2025, the Athlete provided an additional explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding which relied upon an Expert Opinion provided by a doctor, which alleged that the Athlete's medical condition and treatment could explain an elevated level of (endogenous) Testosterone⁴.
23. Upon review of the Athlete's explanations and supporting documents, the AIU concluded that the Athlete had failed to explain the Adverse Analytical Finding for the Metabolites of Testosterone (or a Testosterone precursor) 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin.
24. Therefore, on 21 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 that she was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR ("the **Charge**") and invited her to confirm how she would like to proceed with the Charge by no later than 4 August 2025.
25. The Athlete failed to respond to the Charge by the given deadline.
26. Therefore, on 5 August 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete noting that:
 - 26.1. she had failed to respond to the Charge within the given deadline and, by operation of Rule 8.5.2(f) ADR, was therefore deemed to have (i) waived her right to a hearing, (ii) admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and (iii) accepted the Consequences set out in the Notice of Charge; and
 - 26.2. she had until no later than 10 August 2025 to return a completed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form (enclosed with the Charge) to benefit from a one (1)-year reduction under Rule 10.8.1 ADR, and that, if she failed to do so, then the AIU would proceed by issuing a final decision in her case, including imposing a four (4)-year period of Ineligibility.
27. On the same day, 5 August 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU stating that her medical condition had delayed her response and noted her disappointment about the way that her case had been handled (including that her explanation had been rejected).
28. The AIU responded to the Athlete on the same day, 5 August 2025, noting the following:
 - 28.1. the matter had been dealt with fully in accordance with the procedures and provisions of the ISRM;

⁴ The Adverse Analytical Finding is not based on the level of the Athlete's endogenous Testosterone (or Testosterone Metabolites). It is based on the detection of 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin following GC/C/IRMS analysis (see [WADA Technical Document TD2022IRMS on the Detection of Synthetic Forms of Prohibited Substances by GC/C/IRMS](#)).

- 28.2.in accordance with Rule 10.2.1(a) ADR, as a case involving a Non-Specified Prohibited Substance, it is the Athlete's burden to establish that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional (including the origin of the Prohibited Substances which form the basis of the Adverse Analytical Finding);
- 28.3.the Athlete's explanation failed to explain the Adverse Analytical Finding since it only addressed potential causes of elevated endogenous Testosterone in her body, and, as previously explained in the Charge, the Adverse Analytical Finding is not based on the Athlete's level of endogenous Testosterone (or endogenous Testosterone Metabolites) but on the detection of 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol consistent with exogenous origin following analysis by GC/C/IRMS;
- 28.4.the AIU had decided to exceptionally grant the Athlete an extension to her deadline to request a hearing until no later than 10 August 2025 based on her claims that her medical condition had delayed her response; and
- 28.5.if the Athlete decided not to request a hearing or to return the completed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences form by 10 August 2025, then the AIU would issue a decision imposing a 4-year period of ineligibility (as set out in the Charge).
29. On 9 August 2025, the Athlete reiterated her explanation and her disappointment and confirmed that she would not admit to the Anti-Doping Rule Violations or accept the Consequences set out in the Charge.
30. The Athlete failed to request a hearing (or to return the Admission and Acceptance of Consequences form signed) by 10 August 2025 or at all.
31. On 18 August 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete to confirm that it would proceed to issue a decision shortly confirming the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and imposing a 4-year period of Ineligibility.

Consequences

32. Rule 10.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 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."

33. 5 α Adiol and 5 β Adiol are metabolites of Testosterone (or Testosterone precursors) which is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. Testosterone is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
34. 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.
35. 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.
36. 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 and accepted the Consequences specified by the AIU, in accordance with Rule 10.2.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
- 36.1. a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years commencing on 13 May 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
- 36.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 7 December 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

38. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
39. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, the Athlete, WADA and the National Anti-Doping Center of Ukraine ("**NADC**") 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.
40. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or the NADC, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 18 August 2025