2025/ADD/133 World Aquatics v. Océane Cassignol

FINAL DECISION

delivered by the

ANTI-DOPING DIVISION
OF THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

sitting in the following composition:

Single Judge: Mr Markus Manninen, Attorney-at-Law in Helsinki, Finland

in the dispute between

World Aquatics, Switzerland

Represented by Mr Justin Lessard and Mr Nicolò Juglair, Aquatics Integrity Unit, Lausanne, Switzerland

Claimant

and

Ms Océane Cassignol, France

Respondent

I. PARTIES

1. World Aquatics (the "Claimant"), headquartered in Lausanne, Switzerland, is the world governing body for the sport of aquatics.

2. Ms Océane Cassignol (the "Athlete" or the "Respondent") is a French swimmer and open water swimmer born in 2000. She competed, *inter alia*, at the Paris 2024 Olympic Games.

3. The Claimant and the Respondent are hereinafter referred to as the "Parties" and individually as a "Party".

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

4. Below is a summary of the relevant facts and allegations based on the Parties' written submissions and evidence adduced in this procedure. Additional facts and allegations found in the Parties' written submissions and evidence may be set out, where relevant, in connection with the legal discussion that follows. While the Single Judge has considered all the facts, allegations, legal arguments, and evidence submitted by the Parties in the present proceedings, he only refers to the submissions and evidence he considers necessary to explain his reasoning.

5. On 15 October 2024, World Aquatics sent the Athlete an e-mail informing her that she was re-included in the World Aquatics Registered Testing Pool ("RTP"). In the notification of inclusion letter attached to the e-mail, World Aquatics informed the Athlete that she was required *inter alia* to file her quarterly whereabouts information before the beginning of each quarter, update the whereabouts information when necessary and be available for unannounced testing at the location indicated in her whereabouts filings at any time and at any place, including during the 60-minute time slot. The Athlete was also informed that she would remain in the World Aquatics RTP until such time as World Aquatics or the International Testing Agency ("ITA") notifies her of her exclusion, or until World Aquatics or the ITA receives written notice of her retirement from sport.

6. On 7 January 2025, a doping control officer ("DCO") filed an unsuccessful attempt report ("UAR") stating that the Athlete could not be located for an out-of-competition ("OOC") test. The registered 60-minute time slot for 7 January 2025 was from 06:00 to 07:00 a.m. and the Athlete had filed "*277 Rue De Saint Priest Apt 89, Montpellier, France*" as her address and overnight accommodation on the Anti-Doping Administration and Management System ("ADAMS").

7. On 5 February 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete an apparent missed test notification requesting the Athlete to comment in writing on her apparent whereabouts failure by 19 February 2025.

8. On 19 February 2025, the Athlete replied by e-mail. She concluded that "*After the no-show I take the responsibility I was not able to be there because I didn't change my new address i'm sorry it was my fault so I apologies*" (sic).

9. On 20 February 2025, the ITA issued a recorded missed test notification. It stated that this was the first whereabouts failure of the Athlete in the last 12 months.

10. On 5 June 2025, a DCO filed a UAR stating that the Athlete could not be located for an unannounced OOC test between 05:52 and 7:00 a.m. at the address filed for testing and overnight accommodation "*Résidence Le Chais Du Monestié, 5 Mail Philippe Lamour, Appartement 3 / Étage 0, 34760 Boujan-Sur-Libron, France*".

11. On 12 June 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete an apparent missed test notification requesting the Athlete to comment in writing on her apparent whereabouts failure by 26 June 2025.

12. On 26 June 2025, the Athlete replied to the notification and contested it, stating, in relevant part, the following: "*At the time of the incident, I was in the midst of a complex move, alternating between three different addresses. In addition, I am currently recovering from a shoulder injury, which has significantly disrupted my usual schedule. I attempted to update my whereabouts in ADAMS, but I experienced several technical issues with the application, including difficulties saving the correct address (…). It is very likely that, due to these malfunctions, the location recorded was not the one I was actually at during the control window.*"

13. On 16 July 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete a recorded missed test notification. The ITA noted that it had evaluated the Athlete's explanations and asked the WADA to obtain further information on the Athlete's ADAMS account activities for the days prior to the unsuccessful attempt. According to the ITA, WADA had confirmed that the Athlete did not connect to ADAMS between 25 May 2025 and 8 June 2025. In addition, the ITA submitted that the Athlete had not reported technical issues with ADAMS or requested assistance to update her whereabouts filings. Finally, the ITA stated that the Athlete had not updated her whereabouts filings using any alternative methods, such as e-mail or SMS. According to the letter, this was the Athlete's second whereabouts failure in the last 12 months. The Athlete did not request an administrative review of the decision.

14. On 24 June 2025, a DCO filed a UAR stating that the Athlete could not be located for an unannounced OOC test between 06:00 and 07:00 a.m. at the filed address for testing "*2 Quai Alsace Lorraine, Martigues 13500, France*".

15. On 2 July 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete an apparent missed test notification requesting the Athlete to comment in writing on her apparent whereabouts failure by 16 July 2025.

16. On 26 July 2025, the Athlete replied in relevant parts as follows: "*I would like to clarify that I believe I have not committed a Whereabouts Failure. On the day in question, I had initially planned to take a BlablaCar to Martigues, but the ride was cancelled the Friday before. Unfortunately, I forgot to update my whereabouts in the system, as I was preparing to leave for Martigues. The same day, I was contacted by an antidoping control agent. I asked if I could undergo the control upon arrival in Marseille the morning of the 24th, and the agent initially agreed by phone. However, after further communication, the agent informed me via text message that the test could not be conducted as requested. Additionally, I underwent a blood test and urine sample for toxic substances on that day. The blood sample was frozen for future analysis, and I am happy to provide screenshots and any further documentation if required.*"

17. On 31 July 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete a recorded missed test notification. The ITA noted that this was the third whereabouts failure recorded against the Athlete in the last 12 months. The ITA reminded the Athlete that any combination of three missed tests and/or filing failures committed within a 12-month period shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation ("ADRV") for which the sanction is two years. The Athlete did not request an administrative review of the decision.

18. On 22 August 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete a notice of an apparent ADRV stating that three whereabouts failures had been recorded against her within a 12-month period which gave rise to a potential ADRV. The ITA stated that the Athlete had until 5 September 2025 to provide an explanation and any supporting documentation with regard to the potential ADRV.

19. On 10 September 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete an e-mail stating that *"the ITA has not received any response to our previous correspondence. Nevertheless, out of good faith and courtesy, we are giving you a final deadline until 17 September 2025 to reply to the notification of apparent ADRV."*

20. On 12 September 2025, the Athlete submitted her reply. She apologized for the three whereabouts failures and explained that the year following the Paris 2024 Olympic Games had been a very particular period in her life. She had taken a step back from her sporting career and recognised that she did not give the necessary attention to her obligations as an athlete included in the RTP. The Athlete wrote that she had never had any intention to cheat or avoid the anti-doping rules. She also stated that after being notified of the third missed test, she immediately took the initiative to undergo

laboratory analyses in order to demonstrate good faith and commitment to remaining a clean athlete. The Athlete requested that the ITA takes into consideration her sporting background, her consistent compliance with anti-doping rules throughout her career and the particular context of the past year. In addition, she submitted an athlete rights form dated 12 September 2025 where she had marked that she does not voluntarily accept to be provisionally suspended.

21. On 27 October 2025, the ITA issued a notice of charge notifying the Athlete of an alleged ADRV under Article 2.4 of the World Aquatics Doping Control Rules (the "World Aquatics DCR"). The notice of charge provided the Athlete with the option to accept the consequences of her ADRV, namely a period of ineligibility of 24 months and disqualification of her competitive results from 24 June 2025. The Athlete was requested to accept the proposed terms by 16 November 2025. Alternatively, she could expressly refuse to agree to the consequences by 16 November 2025 after which the matter would be referred for adjudication to the Anti-Doping Division of the Court of Arbitration for Sport ("ADD").

22. On 19 November 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete an e-mail concluding that *"[u]nless mistaken, we note that even though the given deadline of 16 November 2025 has passed, we have not received any response to the ITA's Notice of Charge dated 27 October 2025. That said, out of good faith and courtesy, we are hereby giving you a final deadline of 26 November 2025 to provide your explanations, if any."*

23. On 25 November 2025, the Athlete replied and rejected the proposed agreement on consequences and requested a review of her case.

24. On 26 November 2025, the ITA sent the Athlete an e-mail asking her to confirm her willingness to refer her case to the ADD for the initiation of formal disciplinary proceedings.

25. On 27 November 2025, the Athlete confirmed that she wished the case to be referred to the ADD.

III. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

26. On 17 December 2025, the Claimant filed with the ADD a request for disciplinary proceedings (the "Request") in accordance with Article 8 of the World Aquatics DCR (in force as of 1 January 2023) and Article A13 of the arbitration rules applicable to the CAS Anti-Doping Division (2024 edition, the "ADD Rules"). In the Request, World Aquatics stated that *"World Aquatics and the Athlete would agree to the appointment of Mr Markus Manninen as Single Judge. In the event that he is not available, the Parties leave the discretion to appoint the Single Judge to the President of the CAS ADD."*

27. On 18 December 2025, the ADD acknowledged receipt of the Request and noted that a copy of the Request had been sent to the Athlete by e-mail and courier. The ADD invited the Athlete to file an answer to the request ("Answer to the Request") within twenty days of receipt of the ADD's letter by courier. In addition, the ADD noted that unless it hears otherwise from the Athlete by 22 December 2025, the President of the ADD would confirm the appointment of Mr Manninen as the single judge.

28. On 18 December 2025, the ADD informed WADA that World Aquatics had filed the Request and that if WADA intended to participate as a party in the proceedings, it should file an application within ten days upon receipt of the ADD's letter. WADA replied on the same day that it did not wish to participate in the proceedings but reserves its right to appeal if needed.

29. On 23 December 2025, the ADD informed the Parties that the Athlete had not objected to the joint nomination of Mr Manninen as the Single Judge.

30. On the same day, the ADD informed the Parties that a courier service had attempted to deliver the Request and the ADD letter of 18 December 2025 to the Athlete at her address without success. The ADD invited the Athlete to provide her correct postal address and phone number and acknowledge receipt of the Request and all e-mails exchanged so far between the ADD and the Parties. The ADD also invited World Aquatics to provide the Athlete's updated contact information, if known.

31. On the same day, World Aquatics replied to the ADD stating that it does not have any updated contact details for the Athlete beyond those provided by the Athlete on her ADAMS profile.

32. On the same day, the ADD informed the Parties that Mr Markus Manninen, Attorney-at-Law, Helsinki, Finland, had been appointed to act as the Single Judge (the "Single Judge") in the present matter.

33. On 30 December 2025, the ADD informed the Parties that they had not provided the ADD with updated contact information or an alternative address for the Athlete and that the proceedings shall nevertheless continue.

34. On 21 January 2026, the ADD informed the Parties that the Athlete had failed to participate actively in the proceedings. Considering the Athlete's lack of response, the ADD requested the Claimant to provide the ADD with the Athlete's telephone number and written evidence that she has agreed to the nomination of Mr Manninen.

35. On the same day, World Aquatics provided the ADD with the Athlete's telephone number and attached the Parties' correspondence concerning the appointment of Mr Markus Manninen.

36. On 4 March 2026, World Aquatics provided the ADD with an additional address and phone number for the Athlete.

37. On the same day, the ADD sent a letter to the Parties stating that the complete case file would be sent to the Athlete by e-mail. In addition, a copy of the letter would be sent to the Athlete by courier and all deadlines set out in the ADD's letter dated 18 December 2025 would begin to run upon receipt of the letter by courier.

38. On 27 March 2026, the ADD informed the Parties that the courier was unable to deliver the ADD letter dated 4 March 2026 to the Athlete. The ADD invited the Claimant to provide its position regarding the further conduct of the proceedings.

39. On 7 April 2026, World Aquatics sent a letter to the Fédération Française de Natation ("FFN") stating that the Athlete had remained passive in the present proceedings. World Aquatics referred to Article 14.1.1 of the World Aquatics DCR and requested the FFN to confirm by 9 April 2026 that the documentation had been forwarded to the Athlete.

40. On 7 April 2026, the FFN sent an e-mail to the Athlete requesting her to contact World Aquatics. The e-mail also stated that *"As I see, you haven't been a member since August 31st, 2025. What's the situation? Have you ended your [sporting] career?"*

41. On 8 April 2026, the Athlete replied to FFN's e-mail informing that she had taken a break from her sporting career and that she has not competed since the Paris 2024 Olympic Games. She also noted that she would contact World Aquatics.

42. On the same day, the Athlete sent an e-mail to World Aquatics apologizing for her lack of response. The Athlete wrote that she had a temporary change of address of residence due to her seasonal work and that she had not received certain letters addressed to her. The Athlete also noted that *"[h]aving*

ceased all participation in competitions since the Paris 2024 Olympic Games and being engaged in a transition to my professional life, I believed I was no longer subject to the obligations related to active sports monitoring. My last license having expired in 2025, I now consider my sporting career to be over."

43. On 9 April 2026, the Athlete received delivery of the ADD's letter of 4 March 2026 by courier.

44. On 10 April 2026, World Aquatics sent a letter to the ADD stating that *"World Aquatics considers that the Athlete is fully aware of these proceedings and respectfully requests that the Single Judge set a final deadline for the Athlete to file her Answer. In the absence of a response from the Athlete by the applicable deadline, (…) World Aquatics respectfully requests that the proceedings continue ex parte."*

45. On 13 April 2026, the ADD informed the Parties that a courier had successfully delivered the ADD letter of 4 March 2026 to the Athlete and that the Athlete's deadline for filing her Answer to the Request would begin to run on 9 April 2026.

46. On 5 May 2026, the ADD informed the Parties that the Athlete had failed to file her Answer in a timely manner and invited the Parties to indicate whether they consider a hearing necessary by 8 May 2026. Furthermore, the ADD stated that a Party's silence will be considered as an indication that no hearing is necessary and that the Single Judge may proceed with the issuance of the final decision based on the Parties' written submissions.

47. On 5 May 2026, World Aquatics informed the ADD that a hearing was not necessary.

48. On 12 May 2026, the ADD informed the Parties that the Athlete had not expressed a position on whether a hearing should be held.

49. On 13 May 2026, the ADD informed the Parties that the Single Judge considered himself sufficiently well informed to render a decision without a hearing and based on the written submissions pursuant to Article A19.3 (1) of the ADD Rules. Simultaneously, the ADD sent an Order of Procedure to the Parties and requested them to sign and return a copy of it by 20 May 2026.

50. On 13 May 2026, the Claimant signed and returned the Order of Procedure to the ADD.

51. On 26 May 2026, the ADD informed the Parties that the Athlete had not signed the Order of Procedure within the prescribed time limit. The ADD granted the Athlete a final deadline to sign the Order of Procedure by 1 June 2026.

52. On 1 June 2026, the Athlete signed the Order of Procedure.

53. On 2 June 2026, the Athlete returned the Order of Procedure to the ADD.

IV. SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES

A. The Claimant

54. World Aquatics' submissions, in essence, may be summarised as follows:

Whereabouts Violation of the Athlete

- Pursuant to Article 3.6 of the International Standard for Results Management (2023 edition, "ISRM") a whereabouts failure is a filing failure or a missed test.

- A missed test is defined in the ISRM as a failure by an 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.

- Under Article B.2.2 of the ISRM, Athletes in an RTP must specifically be present and available for testing on any given day during the 60-minute time slot specified for that day in their whereabouts filing, at the location that the athlete has specified.

- Pursuant to Article B.2.4 of the ISRM, a results management authority may declare that an athlete has committed a missed test (a) when the athlete was given notice that they had been designated for inclusion in a RTP, they were advised that they would be liable for a missed test if they were unavailable for testing during the 60-minute time slot specified in their whereabouts filing; (b) a DCO attempted to test the athlete on a given day in the quarter, during the 60-minute time slot specified in the whereabouts filing, by visiting that location; (c) during that time slot, the DCO did what was reasonable in the circumstances to try to locate the athlete; (d) Article B.2.3 of the ISRM does not apply or it was complied with; and (e) the athlete's non-availability was at least negligent.

- In the present case, three whereabouts failures were confirmed against the Athlete in the twelve-month period beginning 7 January 2025. The whereabouts failures occurred on 7 January 2025, 5 June 2025, and 24 June 2025, and they were all missed tests. The Athlete has acknowledged the ADRV and, as such, does not challenge the whereabouts failures. The Athlete's case is instead focused on her degree of fault and appropriate sanction for the ADRV.

The requirements to record the missed tests are met

- On 15 October 2024, the Athlete was notified of her re-inclusion in the World Aquatics RTP and the obligations arising from such inclusion, as well as the consequences of any failure to comply with the whereabouts requirements set out in the World Aquatics DCR.

- The first whereabouts failure occurred on 7 January 2025, when the Athlete failed to make herself available for testing during the 60-minute time slot at the location indicated in her whereabouts filing. The DCO filed a UAR and the ITA informed the Athlete of the potential whereabouts failure on 5 February 2025. As a response, the Athlete apologised and stated that she had forgotten to update her address to ADAMS. On 20 February 2025, the ITA notified the Athlete of its decision to record a missed test against her. The Athlete did not request an administrative review of this decision.

- In this case, the requirements to record a missed test are met. The Athlete was informed of her inclusion in the World Aquatics RTP. The DCO attempted to test the Athlete during the 60-minute time slot indicated in her whereabouts filing for that day by attending the specified location. The DCO took all reasonable steps to locate the Athlete by ringing the bell at the Athlete's listed address, after which a man informed the DCO that the Athlete had moved to another address. Then the DCO attempted to contact the Athlete by using the telephone number specified in the mission order and in ADAMS. The DCO could not reach the Athlete, but the Athlete returned the call later and confirmed that she was not present at the address indicated in her whereabouts filing. Article B.2.3 of the ISRM does not apply, as this was the Athlete's first whereabouts failure. The Athlete's unavailability resulted from her own negligence.

- The second whereabouts failure occurred on 5 June 2025, when the Athlete failed to make herself available for testing during the 60-minute time slot at the location indicated in her whereabouts filing. The DCO filed a UAR on 5 June 2025 and the ITA informed the Athlete of the potential whereabouts failure on 12 June 2025. On 26 June 2025, the Athlete responded and explained that she was in the middle of a complex move with three addresses and recovering from a shoulder injury. This had disrupted her usual timetable. In addition, she stated that she had attempted to update her whereabouts information to ADAMS but had technical difficulties saving the correct address. The

ITA evaluated the Athlete's explanation and received information from WADA regarding the ADAMS account activity, which confirmed that the Athlete had not accessed ADAMS between 25 May 2025 and 8 June 2025. The ITA notified the Athlete on 16 July 2025 of its decision to record a missed test against her. The Athlete did not request an administrative review of this decision.

- Also in this case, the requirements to record a missed test are met. The Athlete was informed of her inclusion in the World Aquatics RTP. The DCO attempted to test the Athlete during the 60-minute time slot indicated in her whereabouts filing and took all reasonable steps to locate the Athlete. The DCO arrived at the address declared in ADAMS at 6:00 a.m., observed the gate and intercom that did not have a listing for the apartment number 3 that was specified as the address in the whereabouts filing. Then the DCO managed to approach the building as a car left the premises, but the DCO was still unable to identify the correct apartment as there was no visible signage. At 6:55 a.m. the DCO called the Athlete, who confirmed that she was not at the address. Article B.2.3 of the ISRM is satisfied, as the Athlete had been informed of her first whereabouts failure. The Athlete's unavailability resulted from her own negligence. Even if she had issues with ADAMS, she could have updated her address by e-mail or SMS. She should, at least, have contacted the ITA or World Aquatics to inform them that she had issues with ADAMS.

- The third whereabouts failure occurred on 24 June 2025, when the Athlete failed to make herself available for testing during the 60-minute time slot at the location indicated in her whereabouts filing. The DCO filed a UAR on 24 June 2025 and the ITA informed the Athlete of the potential whereabouts failure on 2 July 2025. On 26 July 2025, after the ITA sent her a reminder, the Athlete responded stating that she had planned to travel to Martigues on 24 June 2025 but her planned ride with a car-sharing service had been cancelled a few days earlier. She acknowledged that she had forgotten to update her whereabouts information. The Athlete stated that upon notification of the third missed test, she immediately underwent laboratory analyses to demonstrate good faith. On 31 July 2025, the ITA informed the Athlete of its decision to record a third missed test against her. The Athlete did not request an administrative review of this decision.

- Also in this case, the requirements to record a missed test are met. The Athlete was informed of her inclusion to the World Aquatics RTP. The DCO took all reasonable steps to locate the Athlete. She arrived at 6:00 a.m. at the Athlete's registered address and rang the doorbell approximately ten times. At 6:55 a.m. she contacted the Athlete by calling her. The Athlete replied and explained that she was not present at the address indicated in her whereabouts filing and would not arrive until noon. Article B.2.3 of the ISRM is satisfied, as the Athlete had been informed of her first and second whereabouts failure. The Athlete's unavailability was due to her own negligence, as she was not present at the address she had provided in her whereabouts filing. After her trip was cancelled, she should have updated her whereabouts filing.

Consequences for the ADRV

- According to Article 10.3.2 of the World Aquatics DCR, "*[f]or violations of Art. 2.4, the period of Ineligibility shall be two (2) years, subject to reduction down to a minimum of one (1) year, depending on the Athlete's degree of Fault.*" The World Aquatics DCR defines fault as any breach of duty or any lack of care appropriate to a particular situation. An athlete's degree of fault must be assessed in relation to all three whereabouts failures. World Aquatics submits that the Athlete must establish that she is at the very lowest level of fault for all three whereabouts failures to benefit from the maximum reduction.

- In her written explanations, the Athlete does not expressly indicate that she seeks mitigation of the consequences. Her decision to deprioritize her sporting career does not relieve her of the strict and continuous obligation to comply with whereabouts requirements while included in the World Aquatics RTP. Likewise, the psychological burden cannot operate as a relevant factor reducing fault and she had not provided any evidence related to that. The Athlete's assertions of good faith, her historical compliance with anti-doping controls, and her voluntary laboratory analyses after the third

missed test may be acknowledged as reflecting her subjective sincerity and attachment to the values of fair play, but these do not alter the objective assessment of fault in this case.

- The Athlete's degree of fault for the three whereabouts failures is high. With respect to the first whereabouts failure, the Athlete had moved away which demonstrated that the whereabouts information had been inaccurate for a prolonged period of time. The Athlete herself expressly acknowledged her responsibility for the failed test and admitted that she had failed to update her address in ADAMS, which constitutes clear evidence of a high degree of fault.

- With respect to the second whereabouts failure, the Athlete had not taken necessary steps to ensure the accuracy of her whereabouts and even assuming that she had encountered technical difficulties with ADAMS, such circumstances do not absolve her of responsibility. She could have updated her whereabouts through alternative means and any diligent athlete would have proactively notified the ITA or World Aquatics of the alleged technical difficulties. Her failure to do so evidences a high degree of fault.

- With respect to the third whereabouts failure, the Athlete acknowledged that she had failed to update her whereabouts in ADAMS. The cancellation of her travel plans occurred more than four days prior to the missed test affording her ample time to update her whereabouts information. The third whereabouts failure took place only nineteen days after the second whereabouts failure, when she was aware of the heightened risk of an ADRV. An athlete in such circumstances is expected to exercise heightened vigilance.

- As a seasoned professional who has competed at the highest international level, the Athlete is expected to have heightened diligence. She has received comprehensive anti-doping education prior to her ADRV. Yet her repeated departures from the standard of care required of an athlete of her standing were particularly egregious. The repeated nature of the failures reinforces the high degree of fault. The period of ineligibility shall therefore be two years commencing on the date of the decision in this matter.

Disqualification of results and other consequences

- Pursuant to Article 10.10 of the World Aquatics DCR, any competitive results obtained by the Athlete from the date of the ADRV occurred through to the commencement of ineligibility period shall be disqualified. Disqualification is the principle and maintaining results is the exception. The burden is on the Athlete to demonstrate that fairness requires that the results are maintained. In this case, the Athlete has failed to establish this. The third whereabouts failure occurred on 24 June 2025. Therefore, all competitive results from that date until the date on which the CAS ADD decision enters into force shall be disqualified.

55. World Aquatics' requests for relief, as set out in the Request, read as follows:

> "*World Aquatics respectfully requests the Anti-Doping Division of the Court of Arbitration for Sport to rule as follows:*
>
> *I. The Anti-Doping Division of the Court of Arbitration for Sport has jurisdiction to decide on the subject matter of this dispute.*
>
> *II. Ms Océane Cassignol is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Article 2.4 of the World Aquatics DCR.*
>
> *III. Ms Océane Cassignol is sanctioned with a period of ineligibility of two years starting on the date on which the CAS ADD decision enters into force.*

IV. All competitive results obtained by Ms Océane Cassignol from 24 June 2025 until the date on which the CAS ADD decision enters into force are disqualified, with all resulting consequences (including forfeiture of medals, points and prizes).

V. Ms Océane Cassignol shall bear any costs, including special costs, of the proceedings.

VI. *World Aquatics is granted a contribution to its legal and other costs.*"

B. The Respondent

56. Although duly invited, the Athlete did not file an Answer to the Request within the prescribed time limit or thereafter. Pursuant to Article A19.6 of the ADD Rules, the Single Judge may nevertheless proceed with the procedure and deliver a final decision.

57. Despite the lack of any formal answer from the Athlete, the legal analysis below will take into account all available relevant information, and it is not restricted to the submissions of World Aquatics. In particular, the Single Judge has taken into account the Athlete's main defence submission, which is included in her e-mail of 12 September 2025 addressed to the ITA. The Athlete submits, in essence, the following:

- The Athlete apologises for the three missed tests that have been reported.

- The year following the Paris 2024 Olympic Games was a particular period in her life. After several years of intense preparation and sacrifices, she needed to take a step back from her sporting career. She temporarily put swimming aside and acknowledges that she did not give the necessary attention to her obligations as an athlete included in the RTP.

- She never had any intention to cheat or to avoid the anti-doping rules. Since the first selections to the French national team, she has always complied with testing procedures and regulations. After being notified of her third missed test, she immediately took the initiative to undergo laboratory analyses, including the freezing of her blood samples to demonstrate her good faith and commitment to remaining a clean athlete.

- She understands the seriousness of this situation and the responsibility that lies with her. At the same time, she would like to share the mental difficulty of facing such a sanction: seeing her career and years of effort put at risk because of organizational mistakes and unavailability is hard to experience.

- The Athlete asks that her sporting background, consistent compliance with anti-doping rules as well as the particular context of the year after the Paris 2024 Olympic Games be taken into account. She is fully aware of her duties as an athlete and now makes a strong commitment to ensuring that such a situation will never happen again.

58. On 8 April 2026, the Athlete wrote to World Aquatics the following:

- She apologises for the lack of responsiveness. The absence was unintentional. Following the Paris 2024 Olympic Games, she ended her high-level sports career and entered the workforce. She worked seasonally in Alpe d'Huez, which resulted in a temporary change of situation and address of residence.

- Regarding the three alleged breaches of her whereabouts obligations, they do not stem from an attempt to avoid testing or evade anti-doping rules. Having ceased all participation in competitions since the Paris 2024 Olympic Games and being engaged in a transition to her professional life, she believed she was no longer subject to the obligations related to active sports monitoring.

- As her last license expired in 2025, she considers her sporting career to be over.

59. In addition to her general submissions, the Athlete has presented grounds for objecting to her second and third alleged missed tests. Those submissions will be addressed in connection with said allegations.

60. On 26 November 2025, the Athlete submitted to the ITA the following request for relief:

> *"I hereby inform you that I refuse the sanction you intend to apply regarding the anti-doping rules.*
>
> *I contest this decision and request a review of my case."*

V. JURISDICTION

61. Article A2, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the ADD Rules provide as follows:

> *"CAS ADD shall be the first-instance authority to conduct proceedings and issue decisions when an alleged anti-doping rule violation has been filed with it and for imposition of any sanctions resulting from a finding that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. CAS ADD has jurisdiction to rule as a first-instance authority on behalf of any WADC signatory which has formally delegated its powers to CAS ADD to conduct anti-doping proceedings and impose applicable sanctions.*
>
> *These Rules apply whenever a case is filed with CAS ADD. Such filing may arise by reason of a specific clause in the Anti-Doping Rules of a WADC signatory, by contract or by specific agreement."*

62. Pursuant to Article 8, paragraph 2 of the World Aquatics DCR, World Aquatics has delegated its responsibilities under Article 8 of the World Aquatics DCR to the ADD:

> *"World Aquatics has delegated its Article 8 responsibilities (…) to the CAS ADD as an appropriate independent arbitration forum. The procedural rules of the arbitration shall be governed by the rules of the CAS ADD. CAS ADD will always ensure that the Athlete (…) is provided with a fair hearing within a reasonable time by a fair, impartial and Operationally Independent hearing panel in compliance with the Code and the International Standard for Results Management."*

63. The jurisdiction of the ADD is not contested by the Athlete, who confirmed that she accepted the jurisdiction in her e-mail of 27 November 2025 to the ITA and by signing the Order of Procedure.

64. In consideration of the foregoing, the Single Judge confirms the jurisdiction of the ADD to decide this matter.

VI. APPLICABLE LAW AND PROCEDURAL RULES

65. Article A20 of the ADD Rules provides as follows:

> *"The Panel shall decide the dispute according to the applicable ADR or the laws of a particular jurisdiction chosen by agreement of the parties or, in the absence of such a choice, according to Swiss law."*

66. The Single Judge observes that World Aquatics has adopted and implemented anti-doping rules, which are in effect from 1 January 2023. Hence, the World Aquatics DCR, incorporating the provisions of the ISRM, as well as Swiss law apply to this arbitration. The applicability of these substantive rules is undisputed by the Parties.

VII. MERITS

67. In view of the Parties' submissions, the main issues to be resolved by the Single Judge are the following:

a. Did the Athlete commit an ADRV under Article 2.4 of the World Aquatics DCR?

b. If the answer to question a. is in the affirmative, what are the appropriate consequences to be imposed on the Athlete?

i. What would be the appropriate length of the ineligibility period?

ii. When should the ineligibility period commence?

iii. Should the Athlete's competitive results be disqualified, and if the answer is in the affirmative, for which period?

68. The Single Judge notes in this context that according to Article A21 of the ADD Rules, *"[t]he final decision shall contain brief reasons."*

A. Did the Athlete commit an ADRV under Article 2.4 of the World Aquatics DCR?

i. Relevant stipulations

69. Article 2.4 of the World Aquatics DCR reads as follows:

> *"Whereabouts Failures by an Athlete*
>
> *Any combination of three (3) missed tests and/or filing failures, as defined in the International Standard for Results Management, within a twelve (12) month period by an Athlete in a Registered Testing Pool"*

70. The ISRM defines a missed test as follows:

> *"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."*

71. Article B.2.2 of the ISRM provides in relevant part as follows:

> *"(…) an Athlete in a Registered Testing Pool must specifically be present and available for Testing on any given day during the 60-minute time slot specified for that day in their Whereabouts Filing, at the location that the Athlete has specified for that time slot in such filing. Where this requirement is not met by the Athlete, it shall be pursued as an apparent Missed Test. (…)"*

72. Article B.2.3 of the ISRM provides as follows:

> *"To ensure fairness to the Athlete, where an unsuccessful attempt has been made to test an Athlete during one of the 60-minute time slots specified in their Whereabouts Filing, any subsequent unsuccessful attempt to test that Athlete (…) during one of the 60-minute time slots specified in their Whereabouts Filing may only be counted as a Missed Test (…) against that Athlete if that subsequent attempt takes place after the Athlete has received notice, in accordance with Article B.3.2(d), of the original unsuccessful attempt."*

73. Article B.2.4 of the ISRM provides as follows:

> *"An Athlete may only be declared to have committed a Missed Test where the Results Management Authority can establish each of the following:*

a) That when the Athlete was given notice that they had been designated for inclusion in a Registered Testing Pool, they were advised that they would be liable for a Missed Test if they were unavailable for Testing during the 60-minute time slot specified in their Whereabouts Filing at the location specified for that time slot;

b) That a DCO attempted to test the Athlete on a given day in the quarter, during the 60-minute time slot specified in the Athlete's Whereabouts Filing for that day by visiting the location specified for that time slot;

c) That during that specified 60-minute time slot, the DCO did what was reasonable in the circumstances (i.e. given the nature of the specified location) to try to locate the Athlete, short of giving the Athlete any advance notice of the test;

[Comment to Article B.2.4(c): Due to the fact that the making of a telephone call is discretionary rather than mandatory, and is left entirely to the absolute discretion of the Sample Collection Authority, proof that a telephone call was made is not a requisite element of a Missed Test, and the lack of a telephone call does not give the Athlete a defense to the assertion of a Missed Test.]

d) That Article B.2.3 does not apply or (if it applies) was complied with; and

e) That the Athlete's non-availability for Testing at the specified location during the specified 60-minute time slot was at least negligent. For these purposes, the Athlete will be presumed to have been negligent upon proof of the matters set out at sub-Articles B.2.4 (a) to (d). That presumption may only be rebutted by the Athlete establishing that no negligent behavior on their part caused or contributed to their failure (i) to be available for Testing at such location during such time slot, and (ii) to update their most recent Whereabouts Filing to give notice of a different location where they would instead be available for Testing during a specified 60-minute time slot on the relevant day."

74. The Single Judge will now examine whether the prerequisites for the alleged missed tests are fulfilled.

ii. General remarks

75. As preliminary issues applicable to all three alleged missed tests, the Single Judge first notes that the Athlete was given notice that she was designated for inclusion in the World Aquatics RTP on 15 October 2024. The obligation to submit whereabouts filings started on 26 October 2024. In that connection, the Athlete was advised that she would be liable for a missed test if she was unavailable for testing during the 60-minute time slot specified in her whereabouts filing at the location specified for that time slot. In addition, she was advised that she would remain in the World Aquatics RTP until such time as World Aquatics or the ITA notifies her of her exclusion, or until she gives written notice of her retirement.

76. The Athlete has submitted that she terminated her sporting career after the Paris 2024 Olympic Games and that her last license expired in 2025. According to the French Swimming Federation, the Athlete has not been a member since 31 August 2025.

77. The Single Judge first notes that the Athlete has not submitted evidence of her alleged retirement from sport. On the contrary, she filed her whereabouts information in ADAMS at all relevant times. On 26 June 2025, she responded to the ITA that she *"would like to reaffirm [her] full commitment to complying with anti-doping regulations."* A month later, on 26 July 2025, she took a voluntary test for toxic substances to show that she has not used prohibited substances. These actions indicate that as late as in July 2025, the Athlete considered herself bound by the anti-doping regulations. While the Single Judge does not question her statement that she has put her sporting career aside, she had not officially retired before the alleged third missed test. When included in the RTP, the Athlete was instructed to give written notice to the ITA using the retirement form, if she no longer wished to participate in competition. In conclusion, the criterion set out in Article B.2.4 (a) of the ISRM is fulfilled.

78. Finally, the Single Judge notes that according to Article 7.7 of the World Aquatics DCR, *"[i]f an Athlete (…) retires while World Aquatics' Results Management process is underway, World Aquatics retains authority to complete its Results Management process."* It follows that the Athlete's statements regarding the termination of her career and the expiry of her license during the results management process do not prevent World Aquatics from completing the process, including these ADD proceedings.

iii. First missed test, 7 January 2025

79. With respect to the first missed test, World Aquatics has provided a UAR as evidence of the events on 7 January 2025. The Athlete has not challenged the fulfilment of any element of the missed test. On the contrary, she submitted on 19 February 2025 that she accepted responsibility for her unavailability. According to her, the reason for the unavailability was that she had not updated her address to ADAMS. In conclusion, the first missed test is undisputed.

iv. Second missed test, 5 June 2025

80. World Aquatics has provided the UAR describing the details of the DCO's attempt to locate the Athlete on 5 June 2025. The Athlete has not challenged the fulfilment of the prerequisites (a) – (d) of Article B.2.4 of the ISRM. Instead, she has invoked (1) the fact that she was moving and alternating between three different addresses, (2) recovery from a shoulder injury, which has disrupted her schedule, and (3) technical issues with the ADAMS application. In other words, the Athlete submits that she was not negligent either in being unavailable for testing or in failing to update her whereabouts information.

81. The Single Judge notes that none of these explanations can be accepted as removing the Athlete's negligence. The whereabouts information can be updated at any time and through different methods. As noted in the notification of inclusion letter, changes in the whereabouts information can be filed in ADAMS online or via the ADAMS mobile phone application. In addition, in exceptional circumstances an SMS function can be used. As a last resort, an athlete may also send an update to the ITA via e-mail. If the Athlete indeed was experiencing technical difficulties, even at the last moment before the 60-minute time slot on 5 June 2025, she could and should have informed the ITA of the same. She did not do that.

82. In summary, the Single Judge finds that the Athlete has not established that no negligent behaviour on her part caused or contributed to her failure to update her whereabouts information and be available for testing. Therefore, the recording of a second missed test against the Athlete was justified.

v. Third missed test, 24 June 2025

83. The Athlete has not challenged the fulfilment of the prerequisites (a) – (d) of Article B.2.4 of the ISRM. Instead, she has invoked the fact that her planned ride with a car-sharing service had been cancelled on Friday, 20 June 2025. According to the Athlete, she forgot to update her whereabouts information.

84. The Single Judge acknowledges that forgetting is human. However, the Athlete has not provided any arguments, let alone evidence, that would rebut the assumption that her unavailability for testing on 24 June 2025 or updating her whereabouts information was negligent. In this respect, the voluntary drug test taken by the Athlete on 25 June 2025 is irrelevant. Therefore, the recording of a third missed test against the Athlete was justified.

vi. Conclusion

85. Based on the above, the Single Judge is comfortably satisfied that the Athlete has committed an ADRV. She has breached Article 2.4 of the World Aquatics DCR given that three missed tests occurred within a twelve-month period. Next, the Single Judge will address the appropriate consequences of such ADRV.

B. What consequences should be imposed on the Athlete?

i. Period of ineligibility

86. Article 10.3.2 of the World Aquatics DCR provides as follows:

> *"For violations of Art. 2.4, the period of Ineligibility shall be two (2) years, subject to reduction down to a minimum of one (1) year, depending on the Athlete's degree of Fault. (…)"*

87. Fault is defined in the World Aquatics DCR as follows:

> *"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 or other Person's degree of Fault include, for example, the Athlete's (…) experience, whether the Athlete (…) 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 (…) degree of Fault, the circumstances considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Athlete's (…) departure from the expected standard of behavior."*

88. As confirmed in CAS case law, an athlete's degree of fault must be assessed in relation to all three whereabouts failures (see e.g. CAS 2020/A/7526 & CAS 2020/A/7559 para. 206). When assessing an athlete's degree of fault in the context of a whereabouts failure, CAS jurisprudence has found that the fault shall be calibrated as follows: (1) "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) (see e.g. CAS 2020/A/7528 para. 187).

89. As noted by World Aquatics, the Athlete has submitted different reasons that in her view explain and mitigate her behaviour: psychological burden, putting her sporting career aside, prior compliance with anti-doping rules, voluntary laboratory analyses, and organisational mistakes and moments of unavailability. The Single Judge finds that such explanations do not justify a reduction of the standard sanction. The Athlete has not established a medical condition preventing compliance with the whereabouts obligations. Instead, the Athlete has at all relevant times been an international-level athlete as defined in the World Aquatics DCR and competed as recently as in summer 2024 in the Paris 2024 Olympic Games. She was included in the RTP for the first time in 2019 and had successfully completed anti-doping education for international-level athletes in 2021. In conclusion, the level of care required from the Athlete cannot be considered lowered.

90. With respect to the first missed test in particular, the Athlete has not provided any specific circumstances warranting a finding of a low degree of fault. According to the UAR, the Athlete had moved from the address indicated in her whereabouts filing and the new occupant had already moved in. As moves seldom happen abruptly, it is highly likely that the Athlete had failed to update her whereabouts information for a prolonged period, indicating a high degree of fault.

91. With regard to the second missed test, the Athlete had again failed to consider her ongoing move and its effect on her location. In addition, if she had encountered technical problems with ADAMS, she failed to use any alternative methods to inform the ITA or World Aquatics of the problems and

her updated whereabouts. Neglecting to do anything to comply with the whereabouts filings is an indication of indifference to the Athlete's obligations, and thus of a high degree of fault.

92. Finally, according to the Athlete, her travel plans had changed approximately four days before the third missed test, after which she had forgotten to update her whereabouts information. The Single Judge finds that forgetting to update the location for four days is an indication of a high degree of fault considering, in particular, that she had just recently been notified of her second missed test. The Single Judge agrees with the following finding by the Panel in CAS 2020/A/7528 (para. 184):

> *"For its part, the Respondent submits that, by the time 9 December 2019 came around, whatever had happened in the past, the Athlete was sitting on two Whereabouts Failures and he should have been on 'high-alert'. The Panel agrees. There is no doubt that the Athlete should have been acutely aware of the fact that he was on two out of three strikes and that the consequences of a third were dire. Quite plainly, he should have taken every step within his control to ensure that a third Whereabouts Failure did not happen. It is right to weigh that in the balance when assessing the Athlete's degree of fault in respect of the incident on 9 December 2019."*

93. Based on the above, the Single Judge finds that in each situation, the Athlete was not at her home registered in ADAMS during the 60-minute time slot. None of the incidents involved an emergency or a very last-minute urgent change of plans, or a crisis. Instead, the Athlete's behaviour demonstrates her undisputed disengagement from her sporting career, including anti-doping regulations. The Single Judge concludes that the Athlete's degree of fault is high and she does not deserve a reduction of her ineligibility period. The period of ineligibility imposed on the Athlete shall be two years.

ii. Commencement of the period of ineligibility

94. World Aquatics has requested that the ineligibility period starts on the date on which the ADD decision enters into force.

95. Article 10.13 of the World Aquatics DCR reads as follows:

> *"(…) except as provided below, the period of ineligibility shall start on the date of the final hearing decision providing for ineligibility or, if the hearing is waived or there is no hearing, on the date ineligibility is accepted or otherwise imposed."*

96. The circumstances referred to in Article 10.13 of the World Aquatics DCR relate to (1) substantial delays not attributable to the athlete, and (2) credit for provisional suspension or a period of ineligibility served.

97. The Single Judge observes that the Athlete has not been provisionally suspended, and she did not voluntarily accept a provisional suspension. Neither has she even alleged that there would have been substantial delays in the hearing process not attributable to her. On the contrary, the proceedings could have been concluded more rapidly, had the Athlete reacted to the various notifications sent to her by the ADD. Therefore, because there are no grounds to depart from the main rule set out in Article 10.13 of the World Aquatics DCR, the ineligibility period shall start on the date of this final decision.

iii. Disqualification of results

98. Article 10.10 of the World Aquatics DCR provides as follows:

> *"In addition to the automatic Disqualification of the results (…) all other competitive results of the Athlete obtained from the date a positive Sample was collected (…) or other anti-doping rule violation occurred, through*

the commencement of any Provisional Suspension or Ineligibility period, shall, unless fairness requires otherwise, be Disqualified with all of the resulting Consequences including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes."

99. World Aquatics has requested the disqualification of the Athlete's results from 24 June 2025 i.e., from the third whereabouts failure until the date on which the ADD decision enters into force.

100. The Athlete has not expressly put forth any grounds as to why the Single Judge should deviate from the main rule established in Article 10.10 of the World Aquatics DCR. Nevertheless, the Single Judge has considered whether fairness might warrant a reduction in this period.

101. The Single Judge finds that disqualifying the Athlete's results from 24 June 2025 onwards does not lead to an unfair result in the circumstances of the present case. First, the disqualification period is not exceptionally long. Second, the Athlete has submitted that she has *"temporarily put swimming aside"* and informed the French Swimming Federation on 8 April 2026 that she has not competed since the Paris 2024 Olympic Games. Furthermore, the Athlete expressly refused on 12 September 2025 to accept a provisional suspension. This, combined with her unavailability for the current proceedings, has prolonged the disqualification period, which otherwise could have been limited to a couple of months.

102. In conclusion, the Single Judge finds that application of the main rule of the disqualification period would not lead to unfairness. It follows that the Athlete's results must be disqualified from 24 June 2025 until the date of this decision.

VIII. COSTS

103. Article A23 of the ADD Rules provides in relevant part as follows:

"Upon filing of the request initiating CAS ADD proceedings, the Claimant shall pay a non-refundable CAS ADD Office fee of Swiss francs 1,000.--, without which CAS ADD shall not proceed. The Panel shall take such fee into account when assessing the final amount of costs, where applicable.

Each party shall pay for its own legal and other costs, which includes the costs of its own counsel, witnesses, experts and/or interpreters. (…)"

104. Article A24 of the ADD Rules provides in relevant part as follows:

"Subject to Article A23, the administrative costs of CAS ADD, the fees and costs of the ADD judges and ad hoc clerk (if any), and the expenses of CAS ADD (procedural costs) associated with proceedings involving the IOC, any Olympic IF, or the ITA (on behalf of an Olympic IF delegator) and referred to a Single Judge shall be covered by the budget assigned to the Olympic IFs by the IOC, namely CHF 8,000 per procedure and for up to 4 procedures per civil year (1 January to 31 December), taking into account the chronological order of the filing.

The IOC, Olympic IF, ITA (on behalf of an Olympic IF delegator) shall pay any procedural costs that would exceed the amount fixed at the previous paragraph.

(…)

In the final decision and without any specific request from the parties, the Panel has discretion to grant the prevailing party a contribution towards its legal and other costs incurred in connection with the proceedings. When granting such contribution, the Panel shall take into account the complexity and the outcome of the proceedings, as well as the conduct and financial resources of the parties."

105. The procedural costs of this matter are to be determined and served upon the Parties in accordance with Article A24 of the ADD Rules as set out above, if necessary.

106. In the light of the Parties' submissions, the Single Judge must decide whether either Party should be granted a contribution towards their legal and other costs under Article A24 of the ADD Rules.

107. The Single Judge first notes that World Aquatics has prevailed in establishing the ADRV and the high degree of fault of the Athlete, which were at the core of the present matter. In addition, the Single Judge has accepted World Aquatics' requests for relief in full. With respect to the conduct of the Parties, the Athlete caused World Aquatics to initiate the present proceeding by expressly disputing the ADRV and consequences proposed by World Aquatics. On the other hand, after the proceedings were initiated, the Athlete has remained largely passive. She did not file an Answer and did not request an oral hearing, which has reduced World Aquatics' legal fees compared to a standard disputed anti-doping case. Moreover, World Aquatics has not presented any grounds as to why it should receive compensation for its legal costs. It is also apparent that World Aquatics' financial resources exceed those of the Athlete.

108. Based on the above considerations, the Single Judge finds that the Athlete, i.e. the unsuccessful party, shall reimburse the amount of CHF 1,000 to World Aquatics.

IX. APPEAL

109. Article 13.2 of the World Aquatics DCR provides in its essential parts as follows:

> "*Art. 13.2 Appeals from Decisions Regarding Anti-Doping Rule Violations, Consequences, Provisional Suspensions, Implementation of Decisions and Authority*
>
> *A decision that an anti-doping rule violation was committed, a decision imposing Consequences or not imposing Consequences for an anti-doping rule violation, or a decision that no anti-doping rule violation was committed (…) may be appealed exclusively as provided in this Art. 13.2.*
>
> *Art. 13.2.1 Appeals Involving International-Level Athletes or International Competitions*
>
> *In cases arising from participation in an International Competition or in cases involving International-Level Athletes, the decision may be appealed exclusively to the CAS appeals division.*

110. Article 13.6.1 of the World Aquatics DCR provides in its essential parts as follows:

> *"The deadline to file an appeal to the CAS appeals division shall be twenty-one (21) days from the date of receipt of the decision by the appealing party. (…)"*

111. Pursuant to Article A21 of the ADD Rules, this final decision may be appealed to the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division within 21 days from receipt of the notification of the final decision with reasons. Such appeal is to be filed in accordance with Articles R47 *et seq*. of the CAS Code of Sports-Related Arbitration, applicable to appeals procedures.

*****

ON THESE GROUNDS

The Court of Arbitration for Sport rules that:

1. The Request for Arbitration filed by World Aquatics on 17 December 2025 against Océane Cassignol is upheld.

2. Ms Océane Cassignol is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation in the form of Whereabouts Failures pursuant to Article 2.4 of the World Aquatics DCR.

3. Ms Océane Cassignol is sanctioned with a period of ineligibility of two (2) years starting on the date of this final decision.

4. All competitive results obtained by Ms Océane Cassignol from and including 24 June 2025 until the date of this final decision are disqualified with all resulting consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.

5. The costs of the procedure shall be determined in accordance with Article A24 of the ADD Rules, if necessary.

6. Ms Océane Cassignol is ordered to pay CHF 1,000 (one thousand Swiss francs) as a contribution towards the legal and other costs incurred by World Aquatics in connection with this procedure.

7. All other motions or prayers for relief are dismissed.

Lausanne, Switzerland
Date: 7 July 2026

THE ANTI-DOPING DIVISION
OF THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

Markus Manninen
Single Judge