
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Kibiwott Kandie

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 Kibiwott Kandie ("the **Athlete**") is a 30-year-old elite-level Kenyan road runner, specialising in the half-marathon discipline¹. In December 2020, the Athlete won the Valencia Half-Marathon setting a then world record (57:32), which remains the national record for Kenya. The Athlete also won the Valencia Half-Marathon in 2022 and 2023. In the 10,000 metres, the Athlete was bronze medallist at both the 2022 Commonwealth Games and the 2023 Kenyan National Championships.

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)."*

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/kibiwott-kandie-14780952>

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:

“2.3 Evading, Refusing or Failing to Submit to Sample Collection by an Athlete

[...]

2.5 Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control by an Athlete or other Person”

5. On 1 March 2025, Doping Control Personnel (“**DCP**”) (specifically, a Doping Control Officer (“**DCO**”) and a Chaperone (“**Chaperone**”)) were authorised by the AIU (on behalf of World Athletics) to test the Athlete Out-of-Competition at his residential address in Eldama Ravine Kenya (the “**Eldama Ravine Address**”) according to information provided in his Whereabouts information. The Eldama Ravine Address is approximately 75km south-east of Eldoret, a 2-hour journey by car.
6. The DCO and the Chaperone arrived at the Eldama Ravine Address at 11:35 and were greeted by a third party who informed them that the Athlete and his wife were present. The DCO and the Chaperone introduced themselves to the Athlete’s wife and were invited into his house.
7. At 11:45, the Athlete entered his living room. The DCO and the Chaperone introduced themselves and the Athlete was formally notified that he was required to provide samples (urine and blood) for doping control purposes. The Athlete signed the Notification section of the electronic Doping Control Form (“**DCF**”) to confirm that he had been notified for Testing at 11:45 and a Doping Control Station (“**DCS**”) was established at the location for Sample Collection procedures to take place.
8. During this time, the DCO witnessed the Athlete talking to someone on his phone.
9. As the DCO was about to apply a tourniquet to the Athlete to facilitate the collection of a blood sample, the Athlete stood up and informed the DCO that he “*had an important payment to make*”. The DCO told the Athlete that he was required to stay seated for 10 minutes before the blood sample could be collected. The Athlete ignored this instruction and went outside, accompanied by the Chaperone.
10. Whilst outside, the Athlete was seen speaking on his phone again. Although the Chaperone could hear the Athlete speaking, he did not understand what was being said as the Athlete was speaking a different language (Kalenjin). The Chaperone recalls that the phone call lasted for around 20 minutes before he indicated to the Athlete that he needed to finish the call and return to the DCS inside to provide a Sample.
11. At or around 12:23, the Athlete informed the Chaperone that he needed to leave for Eldoret to “*make a payment*”. The Athlete asked whether he could only give a blood Sample as it would take him a long time to provide a urine Sample.
12. At or around 12:28, the Athlete re-entered the house and sat down again. He informed the DCO that he needed to leave for Eldoret, some two hours away, to make a payment to National Construction Authority (“**NCA**”) officers who were about to shut down work at his construction site (the “**Eldoret Construction Site**”). The Athlete asked for Testing to be rescheduled for later that day in Eldoret. However, the DCO informed the Athlete that he was

not permitted to leave after being notified and before providing the required blood and urine Samples. The Athlete informed the DCO that he would not provide any Sample. The DCO explained to the Athlete that a refusal to provide a Sample “*could lead to consequences the same as testing positive*” (i.e., a ban).

13. At or around 12:48, the DCO contacted the Lead DCO for Kenya by phone and explained that the Athlete had refused to provide a Sample. The Athlete asked to speak with the Lead DCO directly who explained to the Athlete that, if he did not provide a Sample, it would be treated as a refusal which could lead to a four-year ban.
14. The Athlete confirmed that he understood the consequences of not providing a Sample but maintained that he could not provide a Sample because he had to “*leave for an emergency*”. He then passed the phone back to the DCO and walked outside. The Athlete was witnessed making taking further phone calls as he walked outside.
15. At or around 12:57, the DCO witnessed the Athlete standing outside, next to some cars whilst speaking on the phone.
16. At or around 13:00, the Lead DCO called the DCO to get an update and the DCO confirmed that the Athlete had still not provided any Sample and that he had left the DCS but not the property.
17. At or around 13:12, the Athlete got into his car and, without further interaction with the DCO or Chaperone, drove away from the Eldama Ravine Address.
18. Before the DCO and Chaperone left the Athlete's property, the Athlete's wife informed them that she had tried to convince the Athlete to be tested but he had refused. She also confirmed that she was aware that this might result in the Athlete being banned. The DCO and Chaperone then left the Athlete's property in their car.

Notice of Allegation and Initial Interview

19. On 13 March 2025, AIU representatives issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of a breach of Rule 2.3 ADR (Evasion, Refusal, Failure to Submit to Sample Collection), in person, in Barcelona, Spain.
20. The AIU also issued the Athlete with a Demand pursuant to Rule 5.7.5 ADR and Rule 5.7.7 ADR, requiring him to provide to the AIU for inspection, extraction, copying or downloading any electronic device in his possession (the “**Device Demand**”). The Athlete gave his consent to the Device Demand and provided his mobile telephone to AIU representatives for forensic imaging.
21. The AIU also conducted an immediate in-person interview with the Athlete in relation to the circumstances of the attempt to test the Athlete on 1 March 2025. In summary, the Athlete:
 - 21.1. accepted that he left the DCS without providing any Sample;
 - 21.2. stated that, whilst he was with the DCO, he received a call from government officials that had arrived at the Eldoret Construction Site and stopped construction work from continuing until he appeared ‘*with some papers for the construction*’;
 - 21.3. stated that he had asked the DCO for the test to be rescheduled until after he had resolved the issue at the Eldoret Construction Site, but that the DCO had refused to do so; and

- 21.4. stated that he had offered to provide a blood Sample but was told by the DCO that they wanted urine and blood.
22. On 14 March 2025, having considered the information the Athlete had provided in interview, the AIU issued a Notice of Provisional Suspension and Public Disclosure, and imposed an immediate Provisional Suspension upon the Athlete.
23. On 10 April 2025, the Athlete's lawyer made an application on the Athlete's behalf to lift the Provisional Suspension in the context of a Provisional Hearing pursuant to Rule 7.4.4 ADR. The application to lift the Provisional Suspension relied upon:
- 23.1. the Athlete's explanation given to AIU representatives on 13 March 2025, that on 1 March 2025 he was instantly and immediately required to attend the Eldoret Construction Site due to the arrival of National Environment Management Authority ("**NEMA**") representatives to conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment, which included the suspension of construction works pending the completion of that assessment, and that this constituted a "*dire emergency*";
- 23.2. an assertion that this emergency caused him "*significant stress*" because the Athlete "*was facing an impending outcome wherein his extensive, financial, emotional and time investments were on the brink of a needless drawback, which would be solely triggered and precipitated by his absence during the inspection*"; and
- 23.3. a Certificate of Application for an Environmental Impact Assessment from the NEMA, dated 26 February 2025, which purported to order that:
- 23.3.1. 'approved documents' were to be presented to '*NEMA – UASIN GISHU*';
- 23.3.2. all site works should cease forthwith pending inspection;
- 23.3.3. there be a mandatory site inspection scheduled for 1 March 2025; and
- 23.3.4. the client and authorised consultant be available for site inspection.
24. On 13 May 2025, the AIU issued a decision, rejecting the Athlete's application to lift the Provisional Suspension.

Further investigation

25. The Athlete did not file an objection to the Device Demand in accordance with Rule 5.7.8(c) ADR. Therefore, the AIU inspected and analysed the information obtained from the forensic imaging of the Athlete's mobile telephone undertaken on 1 March 2025.
26. That analysis revealed that, during the test attempt on 1 March 2025, the Athlete had made repeated attempts to call a number linked to a registered nurse ("the **Nurse**"), particularly:
- 26.1. between 11:35 and 11:42 (the period of time between DCP arriving at the Eldama Ravine Address and the Athlete entering his home to meet the DCP), the Athlete made three call attempts to the Nurse, the last of which was successful and lasted 23 seconds;
- 26.2. between 11:59 and 12:22 (the period when the Athlete had left the DCS and was stood outside whilst being observed by the Chaperone), he made a further five separate calls to the Nurse lasting a total of 20 minutes and 41 seconds;
- 26.3. at 12:26, after having spoken to the Lead DCO, the Athlete made a further call to the Nurse, lasting 2 minutes and 41 seconds; and

- 26.4. at 13:13 (at approximately the time that the Athlete was leaving the Eldama Ravine Address), the Athlete made three further calls to the Nurse, lasting a total of 6 minutes and 1 second.
27. With the assistance of the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya (“**ADAK**”), the AIU also sought the Athlete’s M-PESA² records.
28. On 7 August 2025, ADAK provided the AIU with the Athlete’s M-PESA records for the period July 2024 to March 2025. These records demonstrated that the Athlete made 11 separate transfers of different amounts (between KSh200 to KSh4000) to the Nurse in that period totalling KSh18,200 (circa €120.00).
29. Following further investigative enquiries and review of the information obtained in the further investigation, the AIU decided to conduct a further interview of the Athlete.

Second Interview

30. On 15 January 2026, the Athlete took part in a second interview (remotely) with the AIU and was questioned about his calls and relationship with the Nurse. In summary, the Athlete explained that:
- 30.1. the Nurse was someone who sells small household items to him;
- 30.2. he regularly had his blood tested as preparation for running a marathon and would send the Nurse his analysis results to see if his haemoglobin (Hb) levels were “*adequate*”;
- 30.3. on 1 March 2025, he had called the Nurse as there were some items he was taking to Eldoret and he wanted to see if she would be there;
- 30.4. the reason for calling the Nurse so many times on 1 March 2025 was that she was not answering his calls and he wanted to know where to meet her in Eldoret;
- 30.5. he checked with the Nurse what she thought of his Hb values, and was told by her that they were ‘*all good*’; and
- 30.6. he had never taken anything to enhance his performance.

Tampering

31. On 4 March 2026, the AIU requested the assistance of ADAK to verify the authenticity of documents, including the Certificate of Application from the NEMA, that the Athlete had submitted as part of his application to lift the Provisional Suspension.
32. On 26 March 2026, the AIU received, via ADAK, a letter from the NEMA regarding the Certificate of Application submitted by the Athlete, which confirmed the following:
- 32.1. the application reference number provided on the Certificate of Application does not exist within the NEMA records;
- 32.2. the Athlete’s name is not recognised within the NEMA records;
- 32.3. NEMA hold no record of any site inspection at the location stated on the Certificate of Application (the Eldoret Construction Site);

² M-PESA is a Kenyan mobile-phone-based money transfer service which allows users to deposit, withdraw and transfer money without a bank account.

- 32.4. there is no requirement for an applicant to be physically present at a site during a NEMA inspection; and
- 32.5. the Certificate of Application is not genuine and deemed to be invalid.
33. Based on the information obtained from the AIU investigation into the Certificate of Application from the NEMA, the AIU decided to conduct a further interview with the Athlete.

Third Interview

34. On 7 April 2026, the Athlete attended a third interview (remotely) with AIU representatives and was questioned about the provenance of the Certificate of Application from the NEMA that he supplied to the AIU with his application to lift the Provisional Suspension.
35. During interview, the Athlete maintained that he had received the document from the NEMA. He insisted that he had not fabricated the document and that he had not asked anyone else to fabricate the document for him. The Athlete offered no explanation for the NEMA confirming that the document was not genuine.

Notice of Charge

36. Following review of the information from the AIU investigation and the explanations provided by the Athlete in his three interviews, the AIU remained satisfied that the Athlete had committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.3 ADR on 1 March 2025. The AIU also concluded that the evidence obtained during the investigation was sufficient to demonstrate that the Athlete had also committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.5 ADR (Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control by an Athlete).
37. Therefore, on 6 May 2026, 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 he was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.3 ADR and Rule 2.5 ADR (“the **Charge**”) and that those Anti-Doping Rule Violations warranted a total period of Ineligibility of eight (8) years pursuant to Rules 10.3.1 ADR and 10.9.3(c) ADR (i.e., four (4) years for Evading, Refusing or Failing to Submit to Sample Collection and four (4) years for Tampering or Attempted Tampering to be served consecutively).
38. The Athlete was informed *inter alia* of his right to request a hearing and given the opportunity to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations to potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR. The AIU invited the Athlete to respond to the Charge confirming how he wished to proceed by no later than 26 May 2026.
39. On 20 May 2026, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

Consequences

40. Collectively, the Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.3 ADR and Rule 2.5 ADR constitute the Athlete’s first Anti-Doping Rule Violation pursuant to Rule 10.9.3 ADR.
41. Rule 10.3.1 ADR specifies the period of Ineligibility to be imposed for a breach of Rule 2.3 ADR or Rule 2.5 (Tampering or Attempted Tampering) as follows:

“10.3.1 For violations of Rule 2.3 or Rule 2.5, the period of Ineligibility will be four (4) years except: (i) in the case of failing to submit to Sample collection, if the Athlete can establish that the commission of the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional, the period of Ineligibility will be two (2) years; (ii) in all other cases, if the Athlete or other Person can establish exceptional circumstances that justify a reduction of the period of Ineligibility, the period of Ineligibility will be in a range from two (2) years to four (4) years depending on the Athlete's or other Person's degree of Fault; or (iii) in a case involving a Protected Person or Recreational Athlete, the period of Ineligibility will be in a range between a maximum of two (2) years and, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, depending on the Protected Person or Recreational Athlete's degree of Fault.”

42. The Athlete has not established any exceptional circumstances that exist to justify any reduction in the period of Ineligibility of four (4) years to be imposed for the Anti-Doping Rule Violations committed pursuant to Rule 2.3 ADR or Rule 2.5 ADR.

43. Rule 10.9.3(c) ADR states as follows:

“10.9.3 Additional rules for certain potential multiple violations

[...]

(c) If the Integrity Unit establishes that an Athlete or other Person committed a violation of Rule 2.5 in connection with the Doping Control process for an underlying asserted anti-doping rule violation, the violation of Rule 2.5 will be treated as a stand-alone first violation and the period of Ineligibility for such violation must be served consecutively (rather than concurrently) with the period of Ineligibility, if any, imposed for the underlying anti-doping rule violation. Where this Rule 10.9.3(c) is applied, the violations taken together will constitute a single violation for purposes of Rule 10.9.1.

44. The Athlete committed the violation of Rule 2.5 ADR in connection with the Doping Control Process (specifically, during Results Management of the violation of Rule 2.3 ADR) and therefore falls squarely within this provision. The violation of Rule 2.5 ADR shall therefore be treated as a stand-alone first violation and the four (4)-year period of Ineligibility must be served consecutively to the four (4)-year period of Ineligibility imposed for the violation of Rule 2.3 ADR (i.e., a total period of Ineligibility of eight (8) years).

45. 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.”

46. A Notice of Charge was issued to the Athlete on 6 May 2025. On 26 May 2025, the Athlete confirmed that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility of eight (8) years.
47. 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.
48. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.3 ADR and Rule 2.5 ADR, and in accordance with Rule 10.3.1 ADR and Rule 10.9.3(c) ADR, and by application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
- 48.1. a period of Ineligibility of seven (7) years commencing on 14 March 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
- 48.2. disqualification of the Athlete’s results on and since 1 March 2025 with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

50. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
51. 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.
52. 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, 25 June 2026