

DECISION OF THE ATHLETICS INTEGRITY UNIT IN THE CASE OF MOUSAAB HADOUT

Introduction

1. In April 2017, the IAAF established the Athletics Integrity Unit ("AIU") whose role is to protect the integrity of the sport of Athletics, including fulfilling the IAAF's obligations as a Signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code. The IAAF has delegated implementation of the IAAF 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. Mousaab Hadout is a 30-year old Moroccan longdistance runner who is an International-Level Athlete for the purposes of the ADR ("the Athlete").
3. This decision is issued pursuant to Article 8.4.7 ADR which provides that *"[i]n the event that [...] the Athlete or Athlete Support Person admits the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) charged and accedes to the Consequences specified by the Integrity Unit, a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal shall not be required. In such a case, the Integrity Unit...shall promptly issue a decision confirming...the commission of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) and the imposition of the Specified Consequences (including, if applicable, a justification for why the maximum potential sanction was not imposed)"*.

The Athlete's commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation

4. On 5 November 2017, the Athlete underwent an in-competition doping control at the 'Hangzhou International Marathon', held in Hangzhou, China. The Athlete provided a urine sample numbered 6280710 (the "**Sample**").
5. On 23 November 2017, the WADA accredited laboratory in Beijing reported an Adverse Analytical Finding (the "**AAF**") for the presence of recombinant EPO ("**EPO**") in the Sample.
6. EPO is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2017 Prohibited List (S2: Peptide Hormones, Growth Factors, Related Substances and Mimetics). It is a non-Specified Substance and is prohibited at all times. The Athlete did not have a TUE permitting the use of EPO.
7. On 14 December 2017, the AIU notified the Athlete of the AAF and imposed a provisional suspension pending resolution of his case. The Athlete was requested to provide an explanation for the presence of EPO in the Sample and was afforded the opportunity to request analysis of the B Sample.

8. On 9 April 2018, the Athlete provided his explanation for the AAF in which he stated that he had used Actovegin prior to the competition. The Athlete did not request analysis of the B Sample.
9. On 15 June 2018, the AIU charged the Athlete with committing an Anti-Doping Rule Violation pursuant to Article 2.1 ADR (Presence of a Prohibited Substance) and Article 2.2 ADR (Use of a Prohibited Substance). The Athlete was offered the opportunity to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and accept a four (4) year sanction, or to request a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal.
10. On 25 June 2018, the Athlete admitted committing an Anti-Doping Rule Violation for the Presence of EPO in the Sample and the Use of EPO, having ingested EPO in order to treat muscle soreness.
11. On 29 June 2018, he signed an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violation and Acceptance of Sanction Form.

Consequences

12. This constitutes the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation under the ADR.
13. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted to committing an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Article 2.1 ADR and Article 2.2 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
 - 12.1 a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years pursuant to Article 10.2.1(a) commencing on 29 June 2018; and
 - 12.2 disqualification of the Athlete's results since 5 November 2017 with all resulting consequences including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points and prize and appearance money pursuant to Articles 9 and 10.8 ADR.
14. The Athlete has accepted the above consequences for his Anti-Doping Rule Violation and has expressly waived his right to have those consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

Publication

15. In accordance with Article 8.4.7(b) ADR, the AIU shall publicly report this decision on the AIU's website.

Rights of Appeal

16. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Article 8.4.7 ADR.

17. Further to Article 13.2.4 ADR, WADA has 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 Article 13.7.2 ADR.
18. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Article 13.9.3 ADR.

Monaco, 18 July 2018