
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Alysha Newman

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 Alysha Newman ("the **Athlete**") is a 31-year-old pole vaulter from Canada¹.
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

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."

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/canada/alysha-newman-14376225>

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 date of the first relevant Missed Test/Filing Failure.

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

7. In this instance, the Athlete committed three (3) Whereabouts Failures within a twelve-month period beginning on 27 February 2025, specifically:

- (i) a Filing Failure on 27 February 2025;
- (ii) a Missed Test and a Filing Failure on 17 August 2025; and
- (iii) a Filing Failure on 23 August 2025.

8. The circumstances of each of these Whereabouts Failures are set out in detail below.²

I. **First Whereabouts Failure – Filing Failure on 27 February 2025**

9. In summary, a Doping Control Officer (“**DCO**”) arrived at the address specified in the Athlete’s Whereabouts information for her 60-minute time slot (20:00-21:00) on 27 February 2025. The DCO arrived at 19:52 and, starting at 20:00, began knocking on the door. The Athlete did not respond.

² In addition to the three (3) Whereabouts Failures identified above, the Athlete also committed a further Whereabouts Failure (a Filing Failure) within the same twelve-month period, on 14 November 2025, which was confirmed against the Athlete on 27 January 2026. However, this (fourth) Whereabouts Failure does not constitute an element of the Rule 2.4 Anti-Doping Rule Violation that the Athlete has committed.

10. The DCO remained at the location until 21:05 but was unable to locate the Athlete for Testing on 27 February 2025 during her declared 60-minute time slot.
11. Therefore, on 4 March 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete requesting her explanation for an apparent Whereabouts Failure which occurred on 27 February 2025 by no later than 18 March 2025.
12. On 6 March 2025, the AIU received an email from the Athlete in which she explained that she had been prevented from reaching the location in time for her 60-minute time slot on 27 February 2025 due to the unforeseen misplacement of her car key. She stated that, although the vehicle could operate via her phone, this functionality was limited, and she was concerned that the vehicle would stop functioning upon her arrival at the location. She explained that this situation caused unexpected delays and logistical difficulties, making it impossible for her to be present at the declared location between 20:00 and 21:00.
13. The Athlete further stated that she had notified the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (“**CCES**”)³ by e-mail at 20:00 and then updated her Whereabouts information in ADAMS at 20:02 on 27 February 2025 to change the location of her overnight accommodation.
14. On 25 March 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 27 February 2025 against her. The Athlete was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 8 April 2025 and was advised that, if she failed to do so, the Whereabouts Failure would be considered as a first Whereabouts Failure for the purposes of Rule 2.4 ADR.
15. No request for an administrative review was received by 8 April 2025.
16. Accordingly, the AIU recorded a first Whereabouts Failure⁴ against the Athlete effective 27 February 2025.

II. Second Whereabouts Failure – Missed Test and Filing Failure on 17 August 2025

17. In summary, a DCO arrived at the address specified in the Athlete’s Whereabouts information (being the same address as for the First Whereabouts Failure) for her 60-minute time slot (08:00-09:00) on 17 August 2025 at 08:00 and attempted to locate the Athlete for Testing.
18. Having been unsuccessful in locating the Athlete, at 08:55, the DCO attempted to contact her by phone using the number listed in her Whereabouts information but was unable to reach her. The DCO remained at the location until 09:00 but was unable to locate the Athlete for Testing.
19. Therefore, on 20 August 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete requesting her explanation for an apparent Whereabouts Failure which occurred on 17 August 2025 by no later than 3 September 2025.

³ Now Sport Integrity Canada.

⁴ This Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as a Filing Failure.

20. No explanation was received by 3 September 2025 (or at all).
21. On 4 September 2025, the AIU therefore wrote to the Athlete and confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 17 August 2025 against her. The Athlete was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 18 September 2025 and was advised that, if she failed to do so, the Whereabouts Failure would be considered as her second Whereabouts Failure in the twelve-month period beginning on 27 February 2025.
22. No request for an administrative review was filed by 18 September 2025.
23. Therefore, the AIU recorded a Whereabout Failure⁵ against the Athlete effective 17 August 2025 as her second Whereabouts Failure in the twelve-month period beginning on 27 February 2025.

III. Third Whereabouts Failure – Filing Failure on 23 August 2025

24. In summary, a DCO was authorized by the CCES to conduct Testing on the Athlete (“the **CCES DCO**”) and arrived at the address specified in her Whereabouts information for her 60-minute time slot (08:30-09:30) on 23 August 2025. The CCES DCO arrived at 08:30 and met the Athlete, who informed him that she had to leave immediately to participate in the filming of a television gameshow and needed to be at the TV studios by 09:00.
25. The Athlete invited the CCES DCO to accompany her to the TV studios, which the CCES DCO declined, principally because there was no guarantee that access to the studios would be permitted. The CCES DCO instead proposed to the Athlete to postpone the Sample collection until later the same evening, to which she agreed⁶. The Athlete subsequently provided a Sample later that day.
26. A preliminary evaluation conducted by the AIU concluded that the circumstances constituted a failure by the Athlete to be available for Testing during the declared 60-minute time slot at the specified location, as well as a failure to update her Whereabouts information to reflect the change in circumstances on 23 August 2025.
27. Therefore, on 29 September 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete requesting her explanation for an apparent Whereabouts Failure which occurred on 23 August 2025 by no later than 13 October 2025.
28. Following extensions of time to submit explanations until 30 October 2025, the AIU received written submissions from the Athlete’s appointed attorney on 28 October 2025, in which the Athlete explained that she had been present, willing to comply and available to provide a Sample at the address specified in her Whereabouts information, but that she was unable to

⁵ This Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as both a Missed Test and a Filing Failure.

⁶ The DCO confirmed that the proposal to postpone Testing originated from the CCES, that the Athlete agreed to it as reflected in the signed Supplementary Report, and that the Athlete was not informed of the potential consequences of not providing a Sample during the 60-minute time slot.

provide a urine Sample immediately upon the DCO's arrival because she had just used the toilet.

29. The Athlete further explained that, shortly before the DCO's arrival, at 08:15, she had received a call from her assistant informing her that the filming schedule for the television gameshow had been moved forward to 09:00. The Athlete submitted that no Filing Failure should be recorded against her because she had provided sufficient information to enable the DCO to locate her and access the address specified in her Whereabouts information on 23 August 2025.
30. On 23 January 2026, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 23 August 2025 against her. The AIU noted that the evidence provided in support of the Athlete's explanation either contradicted her claims or was absent, regarding the alleged change to the filming schedule and call time⁷.
31. The AIU concluded that the Athlete had failed to include in her Whereabouts information for 23 August 2025 a location where she would be available and accessible for Testing for the full 60-minute time slot as required by Article 4.8.8.3 of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations ("ISTI") and that she had failed to update her Whereabouts information for 23 August 2025 as soon as possible after her circumstances changed in accordance with Article 4.8.8.6 ISTI. The AIU therefore confirmed the Athlete's third Whereabouts Failure within the twelve-month period beginning on 27 February 2025⁸.
32. The Athlete was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 6 February 2026 and was advised that, if she failed to do so, the Whereabouts Failure would be considered as the Athlete's third Whereabouts Failure for the purposes of Rule 2.4 ADR.
33. On 27 January 2026, the AIU received written confirmation from the Athlete's appointed attorney that she would not seek an administrative review of the AIU decision confirming the Whereabouts Failure of 23 August 2025.
34. Accordingly, the AIU recorded a third Whereabouts Failure against the Athlete effective 23 August 2025.

Disciplinary proceedings

35. On 3 February 2026, in accordance with Article B.3.4 and Article 5.3.2 ISRM, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation pursuant to Rule 2.4 ADR and invited her to provide a detailed written explanation in response by no later than 10 February 2026.

⁷ In particular, the AIU noted that the call time of 09:00 was indicated to the Athlete in an e-mail dated 22 August 2026 and that the Athlete's call history provided no evidence that she had received a call from her assistant as she claimed. To the contrary, the Athlete's call history indicated that she had placed a call to her assistant.

⁸ This Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as a Filing Failure.

36. The Athlete was also informed that the AIU had decided to impose a Provisional Suspension upon her with effect from 3 February 2026, pursuant to Rule 7.4.1 ADR, and was advised of her right to submit written submissions seeking the lifting of the Provisional Suspension by no later than 10 February 2026.
37. On 3 February 2026, the Athlete's appointed attorney informed the AIU that the Athlete wished to explore a resolution of her case on a without prejudice basis pursuant to Rule 10.8.2 ADR.
38. On 2 March 2026, the Athlete provided without prejudice written submissions in response to the AIU's Notice of Allegation and in support of her request to resolve the matter pursuant to Rule 10.8.2 ADR.
39. On 13 April 2026, WADA confirmed that it did not agree to resolve the matter by way of a Case Resolution Agreement in accordance with Rule 10.8.2 ADR.⁹
40. Notwithstanding WADA's position, the Athlete confirmed that she wished to resolve the matter by agreement with the AIU outside of the context of Rule 10.8.2 ADR. The summary details of the Athlete's explanation for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation are as follows.
41. The Athlete did not dispute that she had committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation. However, the Athlete explained that the Whereabouts Failures had occurred in the context of a period of significant personal and professional change, which she described as increasingly disorganised and overwhelming, and followed a decision that she had previously made to end her athletics career.
42. The Athlete requested a reduction in the applicable period of Ineligibility based, inter alia, on her degree of Fault for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
43. Following review of the Athlete's submissions, on 14 April 2026, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and proposed a period of Ineligibility of twenty (20) months, based on her degree of Fault for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation, with the period to be backdated to commence on 3 December 2025 in accordance with Rule 10.13.1 ADR (see Consequences below for further details).
44. On 15 April 2026, the AIU received from the Athlete a signed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violation and Acceptance of Consequences Form, confirming her acceptance of the proposed Consequences.

⁹ Rule 10.8.2 requires that WADA must agree to the resolution of a matter pursuant to a Case Resolution Agreement.

Consequences

45. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
46. 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 or Fault. The flexibility between two (2) years and one (1) year of Ineligibility in this Rule is not available to Athletes 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."

47. Accordingly, the starting point for a violation under Rule 2.4 ADR is a two (2)-year period of Ineligibility, subject to a possible reduction down to a minimum of one (1) year on a sliding scale basis depending on the Athlete's degree of Fault.
48. The flexibility between two (2) years and one (1) year is not available where there is evidence of a pattern of last-minute Whereabouts changes or other conduct raising a serious suspicion that the Athlete was attempting to avoid being available for Testing.
49. In the present case, the AIU finds that there is no evidence of a pattern of last-minute changes or any conduct suggesting that the Athlete was seeking to evade Testing. Accordingly, the flexibility provided under Rule 10.3.2 ADR applies, and the appropriate period of Ineligibility must be determined by reference to the Athlete's degree of Fault.

(i) The Athlete's Level of Fault

50. The definition of Fault is set out in the Rules in the following terms:

"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."

51. In assessing the Athlete's degree of Fault, the AIU considers the reasoning in *CAS 2013/A/3327 & CAS 2013/A/3335 Marin Čilić v. International Tennis Federation*, as subsequently applied in

the context of a Rule 2.4 ADRV in *CAS 2020/A/7528 Christian Coleman v. World Athletics*¹⁰, to be instructive.

52. In particular, the AIU notes the “subjective” factors relevant to the assessment of Fault in *Čilić*, including youth/inexperience, language or environmental difficulties, and personal impairments, including a high level of stress and circumstances in which an Athlete’s level of awareness has been reduced by a careless but understandable mistake.
53. The AIU also notes that the Athlete’s degree of Fault must be assessed in relation to each of the three Whereabouts Failures forming the basis of the Rule 2.4 ADR violation in accordance with the CAS case law.¹¹
54. In assessing the Athlete’s degree of Fault in the circumstances, the AIU first notes that the Athlete is neither young nor inexperienced/uneducated. To the contrary, she is a 31-year-old, experienced, International-Level Athlete and Olympic medallist who has been included in a Registered Testing Pool since 2012 and in the AIU International Registered Testing Pool since 2013.
55. The AIU further notes that there are no language or environmental difficulties identified in this case, and it is not asserted that the Athlete was suffering from a high degree of stress or any comparable impairment.
56. The AIU rejects the Athlete’s arguments that the fact that there is no evidence that she deliberately avoided Testing, sought to mask the use of Prohibited Substances, or was using Prohibited Substances, should be taken into account in assessing her degree of Fault. If such evidence had been apparent, then (a) this may have excluded the potential for reduction based on the Athlete’s level of Fault (see para. 48, above) and/or (b) additional Anti-Doping Rule Violations may have been pursued. The absence of these elements is simply not a mitigating factor in assessing the Athlete’s level of Fault in this case¹².
57. The AIU also rejects the Athlete’s argument that her level of Fault should be reduced because the Whereabouts Failures occurred at a time when her life was outside of its normal routine¹³. The Whereabouts system is designed specifically to account for circumstances which fall outside of a normal routine, including to accommodate changes to an Athlete’s Whereabouts information in ADAMS up until immediately before the Athlete’s designated 60-minute time slot.

¹⁰ *CAS 2020/A/7528 Christian Coleman v. World Athletics*, para. 187 “*That is a helpful guide, though the calibration would necessarily be different here in light of the different possible period of Ineligibility of 12 -24 months; thus (albeit using slightly different labels) the following levels of fault would correspond to whereabouts cases: “high” (20 -24 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).*”

¹¹ See *CAS 2020/A/7528 Christian Coleman v. World Athletics*, para.172 and 173.

¹² See *World Athletics v. Fred Kerley*, decision dated 27 February 2026, para. 166.

¹³ Relying on *USADA v. Brianna Rollins*, AAA No. 01-17-001-3244 at para 8.4.

58. The above notwithstanding, the AIU nevertheless accepts that there may be circumstances which are so unique when compared to an athlete's usual/typical routine that they may be considered in the assessment of Fault.
59. In this respect, the AIU accepts the Athlete's assertion that she had decided to gradually bring her international athletics career to an end during 2025, a fact that is corroborated by her substantially more limited competitive schedule in 2025 when compared to 2024. Although she could and should have formally retired from the sport in 2025 (a fact she herself accepts in hindsight)¹⁴, the AIU accepts on balance that the Athlete had effectively decided to end her international competitive athletics career before the Whereabouts Failures occurred and that this is a sufficiently unique/exceptional factor that may be considered in assessing her level of Fault in the matter. The AIU is prepared to accept in these specific circumstances that the Athlete's failures to update her Whereabouts information for the first and third Whereabouts Failures constituted careless but understandable mistakes that are capable per *Čilić* of subjectively reducing the Athlete's degree of Fault¹⁵ (see further paragraph 63 below).
60. The AIU also notes that Rule 10.13.1 ADR allows for the period of Ineligibility to commence as early as the date the ADRV occurred where there have been substantial delays in Results Management or other aspects of Doping Control.
61. The AIU was informed of the Athlete's third Whereabouts Failure on 3 September 2025 and issued the Notice of Apparent Whereabouts Failure on 29 September 2025. Following the granting of an extension of time, the Athlete's explanation was received on 28 October 2025. The AIU subsequently confirmed the third Whereabouts Failure on 23 January 2026 and issued the Notice of Allegation on 3 February 2026.
62. Allowing for a reasonable period to notify the Athlete and assess her explanation, the AIU accepts that there was a delay of approximately eight weeks in administering the Athlete's third Whereabouts Failure.
63. In all the circumstances, the AIU considers that the Athlete's level of Fault for her Anti-Doping Rule Violation is still in the "high" range¹⁶, but at the lower end of that range, and that a period of Ineligibility of twenty (20) months (i.e., a reduction of four (4) months based on the Athlete's level of Fault for the first and third Whereabouts Failures) is appropriate. The AIU is also prepared to accept that there were delays not attributable to the Athlete in this matter and that the period of Ineligibility may therefore be backdated by a period of two (2) months in accordance with Rule 10.13.1 ADR to commence on 3 December 2025.

¹⁴ Although the Athlete accepts that she could and should have retired in 2025, the Athlete has not since formalised her retirement since to do so would result in any period of Ineligibility remaining as of the date of her retirement needing to be served if the Athlete later decides to return to athletics pursuant to Rule 5.6.2 ADR.

¹⁵ *CAS 2013/A/3327 Marin Čilić v. International Tennis Federation (ITF)*, Award of 11 April 2014, para. 76 (in particular para. 76(iv)), where the Panel held that a "careless but understandable mistake" may, in specific circumstances, amount to an impairment capable of subjectively reducing an Athlete's degree of Fault.

¹⁶ See footnote 10.

64. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted to committing an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.4 ADR, and accepted the period of Ineligibility of twenty (20) months, the AIU confirms by its decision the following consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

64.1. a period of Ineligibility of twenty (20) months commencing on 3 December 2025 and expiring on 2 August 2027; and

64.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 23 August 2025, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.

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

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

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

68. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, the Athlete, WADA and the CCES 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.

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

Monaco, 29 April 2026