

CAS 2019/A/6225 Inês Henriques, Claire Woods, Paola Pérez, Johana Ordóñez, Magaly Bonilla, Ainhoa Pinedo, Erin Taylor-Talcott & Quentin Rew v. IOC & IAAF

ARBITRAL AWARD

delivered by the

COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

sitting in the following composition:

President: Prof. Luigi Fumagalli, Attorney-at-Law in Milan, Italy
Arbitrators: Hon. Dr Annabelle Bennett AC SC, former Judge in Sydney, Australia
Mr Pierre Muller, former Judge in Lausanne, Switzerland
Ad hoc clerk: Ms Stéphanie De Dycker, Attorney-at-law, Signy, Switzerland

between

Ms Inês Henriques, Ms Claire Woods, Ms Paola Pérez, Ms Johana Ordóñez, Ms Magaly Bonilla, Ms Ainhoa Pinedo, Ms Erin Taylor-Talcott and Mr Quentin Rew

Represented by Mr Paul F. DeMeester, Attorney-at-Law, San Francisco, USA

as Appellants

and

International Olympic Committee, Lausanne, Switzerland

Represented by Mr François Carrard, Mr Jean-Pierre Morand, Ms Sophie Roud, Attorneys-at-Law, Kellerhals Carrard, Lausanne, Switzerland

as First Respondent

and

International Association of Athletics Federations, Monaco

Represented by Mr Jonathan Taylor QC, Attorney-at-Law, Bird & Bird LLP, London, United Kingdom

as Second Respondent

I. PARTIES

1. Ms Inês Henriques is a female athlete member of the Portuguese Federation of Athletics (“*Federação Portuguesa de Atletismo*”), which is a member federation of the International Association of Athletics Federations (“IAAF”). Ms Claire Woods is a female athlete member of the Athletics Australia, which is a member federation of the IAAF. Ms Paola Pérez is a female athlete member of the Ecuadorian Federation of Athletics (“*Federación Ecuatoriana de Atletismo*”), which is a member federation of the IAAF. Ms Johana Ordóñez is a female athlete member of the Ecuadorian Federation of Athletics, which is a member federation of the IAAF. Ms Magaly Bonilla is a female athlete member of the Ecuadorian Federation of Athletics, which is a member federation of the IAAF. Ms Ainhoa Pinedo is a female athlete member of the Spanish Federation of Athletics (“*Real Federación Española de Atletismo*”), which is a member federation of the IAAF. Ms Erin Taylor-Talcott is a female athlete member of the USA Track & Field, which is a member federation of the IAAF. Mr Quentin Rew is a male athlete member of Athletics New Zealand, which is a member federation of the IAAF.
2. The International Olympic Committee (“IOC”) is the world governing body of Olympic sport having its registered offices in Lausanne, Switzerland. The IOC is incorporated as an association pursuant to Articles 60 *et seq.* of the Swiss Civil Code.
3. The International Association of Athletics Federations (“IAAF”) is the international federation governing athletics worldwide and has its registered seat in Monaco.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

4. Below is a summary of the main relevant facts and allegations based on the Parties’ submissions and allegations. Additional facts and allegations may be set out, where relevant, in connection with the legal discussion that follows. Although the Panel has considered all the facts, allegations, legal arguments and evidence submitted by the Parties in the present proceedings, it refers in this Award only to the submissions and evidence it considers necessary to explain its reasoning.
5. The present dispute concerns the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Events Program, as set up by the IOC, and, in particular, arises from the fact that although it offers a 50km Race Walk for men, it does not offer it for women.
6. On 9 June 2017, the IOC Executive Board, acting pursuant to Rule 45 of the Olympic Charter (“OC”), adopted the events program for the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games.
7. On the same day, the IOC Director General informed the President of the IAAF as follows:

“The IOC Executive Board met today in Lausanne to finalise the event programme and athlete quotas of the Olympic Games Tokyo 2020. As you know, these considerations were based on the requests received from you, the research data collected at Rio 2016 at an event level and the recommendations received from the Olympic Programme Commission, which were reviewed in the context of the adoption of the Olympic Agenda 2020.”

The Olympic Charter mandates a framework of approximately 10,500 athletes and 310 events for the Olympic Games. In addition to providing a sustainable model for the hosting and organisation of the Games, the proposals of all IF's were reviewed in the context of innovation and youth appeal, overall gender equality, and respect of the overall approximate framework figures.

In this context, the IOC Executive Board has finalised the following Tokyo 2020 event programme for both events and athletes quotas in the sport of Athletics (...).

OFFICIAL PROGRAMME OF THE OLYMPIC GAMES TOKYO 2020										
SPORTS	QUOTAS			MEN'S EVENTS	WOMEN'S EVENTS	MIXED/OPEN EVENTS	TOTAL			
	M	W	T							
ATHLETICS	988	912	1900	24	23	1	48			
				100m	100m	4x400m Mixed Relay				
				200m	200m					
				400m	400m					
				800m	800m					
				1,500m	1,500m					
				5,000m	5,000m					
				10,000m	10,000m					
				110m Hurdles	100m Hurdles					
				400m Hurdles	400m Hurdles					
				3,000m Steeplechase	3,000m Steeplechase					
				4 x 100m Relay	4 x 100m Relay					
				4 x 400m Relay	4 x 400m Relay					
				High Jump	High Jump					
				Pole Vault	Pole Vault					
				Long Jump	Long Jump					
				Triple Jump	Triple Jump					
				Shot Put	Shot Put					
				Discus Throw	Discus Throw					
				Hammer Throw	Hammer Throw					
				Javelin Throw	Javelin Throw					
				Decathlon	Heptathlon					
				20km Race Walk	20km Race Walk					
				Marathon	Marathon					
				50km Race Walk						

(...)

As our respective teams have discussed, we would also like to already initiate and progress discussions with a view towards the evolution of the Athletics programme of the 2024 Olympic Games, with a particular focus on Race Walk events (...).”

8. On 31 July 2018, the IAAF published a document approved by the IAAF Council entitled “*Qualification System – Games of the XXXII Olympiad – Tokyo 2020*”, which states as follows:

“A. *EVENTS (48) AND ENTRY NUMBERS PER EVENT*”

Men’s Events (24)	Women’s Events (23)	Mixed Events (1)
Track 100m (56) 200m (56) 400m (48) 800m (48) 1500m (45) 5000m (42) 10,000m (27) 110m Hurdles (40) 400m Hurdles (40) 3000m Steeplechase (45) 4 x 100m Relay (16) 4 x 400m Relay (16)	Track 100m (56) 200m (56) 400m (48) 800m (48) 1500m (45) 5000m (42) 10,000m (27) 100m Hurdles (40) 400m Hurdles (40) 3000m Steeplechase (45) 4 x 100m Relay (16) 4 x 400m Relay (16)	Track 4 x 400m Mixed Relay (16)
Field High Jump (32) Pole Vault (32) Long Jump (32) Triple Jump (32) Shot Put (32) Discus Throw (32) Hammer Throw (32) Javelin Throw (32)	Field High Jump (32) Pole Vault (32) Long Jump (32) Triple Jump (32) Shot Put (32) Discus Throw (32) Hammer Throw (32) Javelin Throw (32)	
Combined Decathlon (24)	Combined Heptathlon (24)	
Road 20km Race Walk (60) 50km Race Walk (60) Marathon (80)	Road 20km Race Walk (60) Marathon (80)	

(...)

I. ENTRY STANDARDS

The entry standards will be approved by the IAAF on 1 November 2019.

Men	Event	Women
	100m	
	200m	
	400m	
	800m	
	1500m	
	5000m	

	10,000m	
	110m Hurdles / 100m Hurdles	
	400m Hurdles	
	3000m Steeplechase	
	High Jump	
	Pole Vault	
	Long Jump	
	Triple Jump	
	Shot Put	
	Discus Throw	
	Hammer Throw	
	Javelin Throw	
	Decathlon / Heptathlon	
	20km Race Walk	
	50km Race Walk	
	Marathon	

(...)"

9. At its meetings of 3 and 4 December 2018, the IAAF Council decided to submit an official request to the IOC to add the Women's 50km Race Walk to the Tokyo 2020 Athletics Programme.

10. On 10 December 2018, the Counsel for the Appellants wrote to the IOC President, Mr Thomas Bach, *inter alia*

"(...) to urge that the IOC grant the IAAF's request to include the women's 50km race walk event in the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Programme. (...)"

Granting the IAAF request will neither increase the total number of athletes at the Tokyo Games nor increase the number of events, as the women's 50km will be conducted jointly with the men's 50km, albeit with separate classifications. (...)."

11. On 28 December 2018, Mr Paul Hardy, IAAF Competitions and Events Directors, wrote to Mr Kit McConnell, IOC Sports Director, to inform him that:

"The IAAF Council meeting in Monaco on 3, 4 December 2018, agreed to submit an official request to the IOC to add the Women's 50km Race Walk to the Tokyo 2020 Athletics Programme. The women's race could be contested at the same time as the Men's 50km Race Walk using the same course.

This request follows a previous decision of the IAAF Council to add the Women's 50km Race Walk to the programme of the IAAF World Athletics Championships (...).

We understand that the inclusion of the Women's 50km Race Walk would have to fit within the IAAF athlete quota of 1900. Once accepted, we will provide you with our ideas on how to remain within our overall quota with the inclusion of this event."

12. In a letter dated 15 February 2019, the IOC Sports Director, Mr Kit McConnell, replied to the IAAF as follows:

"Thank you for your letter of 28 December requesting the inclusion of the 50km Women's Race Walk in the event programme of the Olympic Games Tokyo 2020.

I am sure you can understand that it is not possible to make any changes to the confirmed event programme of the Olympic Games Tokyo 2020 at this time, not least because of the advanced stages of the Games planning and also the precedent it would open for all other International Federations to make similar requests. As you are aware, the IOC Executive Board finalised the Tokyo 2020 event programme in June 2017 (...)."

13. On 10 March 2019, the IAAF Council approved a revised Qualification System as well as entry standards for the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games. The document approved by the IAAF Council on 10 March 2019 entitled "*Qualification System – Games of the XXXII Olympiad – Tokyo 2020*" states the following:

"A. EVENTS (48) AND ENTRY NUMBERS PER EVENT

Men's Events (24)	Women's Events (23)	Mixed Events (1)
Track 100m (56) 200m (56) 400m (48) 800m (48) 1500m (45) 5000m (42) 10,000m (27) 110m Hurdles (40) 400m Hurdles (40) 3000m Steeplechase (45) 4 x 100m Relay (16) 4 x 400m Relay (16)	Track 100m (56) 200m (56) 400m (48) 800m (48) 1500m (45) 5000m (42) 10,000m (27) 100m Hurdles (40) 400m Hurdles (40) 3000m Steeplechase (45) 4 x 100m Relay (16) 4 x 400m Relay (16)	Track 4 x 400m Mixed Relay (16)
Field High Jump (32) Pole Vault (32) Long Jump (32) Triple Jump (32) Shot Put (32) Discus Throw (32) Hammer Throw (32) Javelin Throw (32)	Field High Jump (32) Pole Vault (32) Long Jump (32) Triple Jump (32) Shot Put (32) Discus Throw (32) Hammer Throw (32) Javelin Throw (32)	
Combined Decathlon (24)	Combined Heptathlon (24)	
Road 20km Race Walk (60) 50km Race Walk (60) Marathon (80)	Road 20km Race Walk (60) Marathon (80)	

(...)

I. ENTRY STANDARDS

The entry standards below were approved by IAAF Council in March 2019 in Doha.

Men	Event	Women
10.05	100m	11.15
20.24	200m	22.80
44.90	400m	51.35
1:45.20	800m	1:59.50
3:35.00	1500m	4:04.20
13:13.50	5000m	15:10.00
27:28.00	10,000m	31:25.00
13.32	110m Hurdles / 100m Hurdles	12.84
48.90	400m Hurdles	55.40
8:22.00	3000m Steeplechase	9:30.00
2.33	High Jump	1.96
5.80	Pole Vault	4.70
8.22	Long Jump	6.82
17.14	Triple Jump	14.32
21.10	Shot Put	18.50
66.00	Discus Throw	63.50
77.50	Hammer Throw	72.50
85.00	Javelin Throw	64.00
8350	Decathlon / Heptathlon	6420
1:21:00	20km Race Walk	1:31:00
3:50:00	50km Race Walk	
2:11:30	Marathon	2:29:30

(...).”

14. On 24 March 2019, the IOC Media Relations received an email of the Counsel for the Appellants inquiring about his request to the IOC President to include the 50km Women’s Race Walk in the event programme of the Olympic Games Tokyo 2020, and more specifically “*whether this gender equality inclusion has been effected or whether the upcoming Executive Board meeting will finalize this inclusion*”. On the same day, the IOC Sports Director, Mr Kit McConnell, received an email of the Counsel for the Appellants of equivalent content.
15. On 25 March 2019, the IOC Media Relations Team replied to the email of the Counsel for Appellants as follows:

“This is one of the topics that will be part of the reports given to the IOC Executive Board during the meeting.”
16. The IOC Executive Board met on 26-28 March 2019. The press releases published by the IOC at the end of each day and at the conclusion of the meeting did not mention any discussion regarding the inclusion of women in the 50km Race Walk at the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games.

17. On 2 April 2019, the IOC Media Relations Team replied to the email of the Counsel for the Appellants of 24 March 2019 to the IOC Sports Director, Mr Kit McConnell, as follows:

“Following the Olympic Charter, the IOC Executive Board finalised the Tokyo 2020 event programme in June 2017, three years prior to the Olympic Games.”

III. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

18. On 31 March 2019, in accordance with Article R47 of the Code of Sports-related Arbitration (the “CAS Code”), the Appellants filed their Statement of Appeal with the Court of Arbitration for Sport (“CAS”) naming the IOC and the IAAF as Respondents. The Statement of Appeal filed by the Appellants identified as the “*subject of this appeal*” two decisions by the Respondents not to include women athletes in the 50km Race Walk Event of the Tokyo Olympic Games: the IAAF’s Council decision of 10 March 2019 approving the Qualification System and Entry Standards for the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games, and the IOC Executive Board’s decisions taken on 26-28 March 2019 not to include the Women 50km Race Walk at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games.
19. In its Statement of Appeal, in addition, the Appellants invited the Respondents to agree to submit the present matter to CAS mediation. They further appointed the Honourable Dr Annabelle Bennett, former Judge in Sydney, Australia, as arbitrator.
20. On 10 April 2019, the Appellants filed their Appeal Brief with the CAS Court Office, which included a request for production of documents by the Respondents.
21. On 11 April 2019, the CAS Court Office invited the Parties to communicate whether they agreed to submit the present matter to CAS mediation.
22. On 15 April 2019, the Counsel of the IOC informed the CAS Court Office that the IOC and the IAAF jointly nominated Mr Pierre Muller as arbitrator. By email of the same day, the IAAF confirmed its agreement to this nomination.
23. On the same day, the CAS Court Office invited the Respondents to file their Answer, as well as their comments on the Appellant’s request for production of documents.
24. On 24 April 2019, the IOC filed a letter with the CAS Court Office stating its position in the present matter, in particular requesting the termination of the present appeal proceedings as manifestly late, and the bifurcation of the proceedings to deal with any preliminary matters, such as jurisdiction and the Appellants’ standing to appeal, which the IOC denied. In addition, the IOC refused to submit the present matter to mediation, and produced, as its own exhibits, the exchange of letters between the IOC and the IAAF, thereby purportedly complying with the Appellants’ request for document production.
25. On the same day, the CAS Court Office invited the Appellants and the IAAF to comment on (a) the IOC’s request that the present proceedings be terminated, (b) the Appellants’ standing to sue; and (c) the IOC’s request to bifurcate the present proceedings. In addition, the CAS Court Office invited the Appellants to communicate, whether and to

what extent, following the IOC's production of exhibits, they maintained their request for production of documents.

26. On 26 April 2019, the IAAF filed a letter with the CAS Court Office stating its position in the present matter, in particular its request to terminate the present appeal proceedings immediately as against it and, in the absence of the Appellants' agreement to do so, to bifurcate the present proceedings. In addition, the IAAF informed the CAS Court Office that it refused to submit the present matter to mediation.
27. On 29 April 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that, in view of the Respondents' refusal to submit the present matter to mediation, the present proceedings shall remain under the CAS Arbitration rules. The CAS Court Office also invited the Appellants and the IOC to comment on the IAAF's letter of 26 April 2019.
28. On 1 May 2019, the Appellants filed their comments on the IOC's letter of 24 April 2019. In their comments, the Appellants contended that bifurcation was not warranted, maintained their initial request for evidentiary measures and submitted new requests for evidentiary measures.
29. On 3 May 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the issues of admissibility of the present appeal and standing of the Appellants as well as the request for bifurcation would be submitted to the President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division for her consideration.
30. On 6 May 2019, the Appellants filed their comments on the IAAF's letter of 26 April 2019. In their comments, the Appellants refused to agree to terminate the present proceedings as against the IAAF. They also maintained their request for evidentiary measures.
31. On the same day, the IOC filed its comments on the IAAF's letter of 26 April 2019, supporting the IAAF's request to terminate the proceedings as brought against the IAAF and, more generally, to terminate the proceedings entirely.
32. On 7 May 2019, the Appellants filed a new Statement of Appeal against the IOC with respect to the decision contained in the letter sent by the IOC Sports Director, Mr Kit McConnell, to the IAAF on 15 February 2019. The CAS Court Office initiated an appeals arbitration procedure under the reference *CAS 2019/A/6274 Inês Henriques et al. v. IOC* (the "Other Arbitration"). In light of the fact that such appeal was directed against another decision, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the Other Arbitration could not be consolidated with the present proceedings.
33. On 8 May 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that their respective positions had been submitted to the President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division for her consideration.
34. On 8 May 2019, the IAAF filed further comments with respect to the Appellants' submissions of 5 May 2019.
35. On 9 May 2019, the CAS Court Office invited the Appellants to file any comments on the IAAF's letter of 8 May 2019.

36. On 14 May 2019, the Appellants filed their comments on the letter of the IAAF of 8 May 2019.
37. On 14 May 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division had decided that it would be for the Panel, once constituted, to rule on the Respondents' request to terminate and/or to bifurcate the present proceedings.
38. On 15 May 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the Panel appointed to decide on the present proceedings was constituted as follows:

President: Prof. Luigi Fumagalli, Attorney-at-law in Milan, Italy
Arbitrators: The Hon. Dr Annabelle Bennett AC SC, former Judge in Sydney, Australia
Mr Pierre Muller, former Judge in Lausanne, Switzerland.
39. On 3 June 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the Panel had decided to bifurcate the present proceedings in accordance with Article 55.5 of the CAS Code, and therefore that the issues of (a) jurisdiction, (b) admissibility of the appeal, (c) standing of the Appellants and (d) the identification of the proper parties to the present dispute would be decided as threshold matters (the "Threshold Matters"). The Panel also requested the Appellants to specify which decisions they were challenging and which of their requests for evidentiary measures were relevant to decide the issues mentioned above. Finally, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the Panel had decided to hold a hearing on the above-mentioned Threshold Matters and proposed possible dates.
40. On 5 June 2019, considering the unavailability of the IOC on the proposed dates, the CAS Court Office proposed new possible dates for the hearing.
41. On 9 June 2019, the Appellants filed a letter to CAS Court Office confirming that the decisions being challenged in the present proceedings are (i) the decision by the IAAF on 10 March 2019, (ii) the IOC Executive Board's Decision dated 26-28 March 2019 as well as (iii) the letter of 15 February 2019 from the IOC to the IAAF. Moreover, the Appellants listed the requested evidentiary measures that are relevant to the Threshold Matters.
42. On 12 June 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that a hearing would be held on 29 and 30 July 2019 in Lausanne to decide on the Threshold Matters in the present proceedings. Considering that the Panel had decided on 12 June 2019 to align the procedure in the Other Arbitration with the present proceedings, the hearing would cover the Threshold Matters in both proceedings.
43. On 14 June 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that it would send the documents in the Other Arbitration to the IAAF only to the extent that the latter so requested.
44. On 14 June 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that Ms Stéphanie De Dycker was appointed as *ad hoc* Clerk to assist the Panel in the present matter.

45. On 17 June 2019, the IOC and the IAAF sent their respective comments on the Appellants' requests for documents production.
46. On 19 June 2019, the CAS Court Office took note of the Parties' respective positions relating to the Appellants' disclosure requests and informed the Parties that the Panel would issue further instructions in due course.
47. On 21 June 2019, the CAS Court Office sent to the Parties two "Redfern Schedules" in the present proceedings as well as in the Other Arbitration. With respect to the "Redfern Schedule" in the present case, the CAS Court Office requested the Parties to confirm that the Schedule as completed reflected the Parties' respective requests and positions, as expressed in their submissions already on file.
48. On 25 June 2019, the IOC confirmed that the "Redfern Schedule" as completed reflected its position as expressed in its submissions already on file.
49. On 26 June 2019, the IAAF informed the CAS Court Office that it agreed that the "Redfern Schedule" reflected its respective positions as expressed in the submissions, save for some additions of text set out by the IAAF.
50. On the same day, the Appellants confirmed that the "Redfern Schedule" reflected their requests and position as expressed in the submissions already on file.
51. On 26 June 2019, the CAS Court Office took note of the Parties' agreement as to the completed "Redfern Schedule" in the present proceedings save as for the additions set out by the IAAF. In addition, with respect to the Other Arbitration, the CAS Court Office noted the Appellants' inclusions into the "Redfern Schedule" concerning the evidence on file and invited the Respondents to complete the "Redfern Schedule" in that case.
52. On 5 July 2019, the Appellants wrote to the CAS Court Office to seek clarification as to whether the witness, Mr Kit McConnell, IOC Sports Director, would appear by videoconference or by telephone at the hearing. In addition, the Appellants sent an amended list of attendees at the hearing.
53. On 9 July 2019, the CAS Court Office noted the IOC's comment that Mr Kit McConnell would be heard by videoconference at the hearing.
54. On 12 July 2019, the CAS Court Office invited the Parties to propose a joint hearing schedule for the present case as well as the Other Arbitration.
55. On 19 July 2019, the CAS Court Office acknowledged receipt of the IOC's letter of the same day stating that the Parties were able to agree on a common hearing schedule, except for the duration of the hearing of Mr Kit McConnell.
56. On 22 July 2019, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the Panel had taken note of the proposed hearing schedule, as well as of the Parties' positions on the duration of Mr Kit McConnell's testimony. In addition, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties of the Panel's decision on the Appellants' requests for document production. In the "Redfern Schedule", as completed by the Panel, the document requests were either

denied as at the time presented or considered generic, as insufficiently identifying the document sought, not available or not existing, based on the other Parties' indications, or irrelevant for the decision on the Threshold Matters.

57. A hearing was held in Lausanne on 29 July 2019. In addition to the Panel, Mr Brent Nowicki, Managing Counsel to the CAS, and the *ad hoc* Clerk, the following persons attended the hearing:

For the Appellant: Mrs Inês Henriques, Mrs Ainhoa Pinedo, Mrs Claire Woods, Mrs Erin Taylor-Talcott, athletes; Mr Paul F. DeMeester, attorney-at-law; Mrs Monica Lang, interpreter.

For the First Respondent: Mr François Carrard, Mr Jean-Pierre Morand, Mrs Sophie Roud, attorneys-at-law.

For the Second Respondent: Mrs Frédérique Reynertz, IAAF Director; Mr Jonathan Taylor, Mrs Arantxa King, attorneys-at-law.

58. At the outset of the hearing, the Parties confirmed that they had no objection to the constitution and composition of the Panel.

59. The Panel, then, heard evidence from Mr Kit McConnell, Sports Director at the IOC. The witness was invited by the President of the Panel to tell the truth, subject to the sanctions of perjury under Swiss law. The Parties and the Panel had the opportunity to examine and cross-examine the witness. The testimony of Mr Kit McConnell can be summarized as follows:

Mr Kit McConnell works in the capacity of Sports Director with the IOC since 2014 and is familiar with the present proceedings, as well as the Other Arbitration. Mr Kit McConnell indicated that, on 9 June 2017, the IOC Executive Board decided the Events Programme for the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games, based on the proposals made by the international federations, including the IAAF. The IAAF requested the inclusion of a woman 50km Race Walk competition in the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games Event Programme for the first time in December 2018, well after expiration of the deadline of three years prior to the opening of the Tokyo Olympic Games, as provided under BLR 45.2.2. of the OC. With respect to the letter from the IOC to the IAAF dated 15 February 2019, Mr Kit McConnell indicated that he wrote that letter without consulting his hierarchy, because his reply was consistent with the internal practice at the IOC, thereby reflecting a policy of the IOC. Indeed, over recent Olympic Games, Events Programmes, once decided, have never been reviewed despite requests from international federations to do so, including with respect to gender equality issues. With respect to the IOC Executive Board meeting of 26-28 March 2019, Mr Kit McConnell indicated that he was consulted in the process of formulation of the agenda of that meeting and that the issue of the inclusion of a woman 50km Race Walk competition at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games was not discussed at that meeting.

60. The Parties thereafter were given full opportunity to present their case, submit their arguments and answer the questions posed by the Panel. At the end of the hearing, the Parties confirmed that they were satisfied with the hearing and as to their right to be heard.
61. On 30 October 2019, the Appellants submitted a request for an order to produce further written pleadings pursuant to Article R44.2 of the CAS Code in relation to the IOC decision to move the venue for the Race Walk Events at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games.
62. On the same 30 October 2019, the IOC opposed the Appellants' request, on the basis that the facts referred to by the Appellants were irrelevant to the decision on the Threshold Matters.

IV. THE PARTIES' SUBMISSIONS

63. The following summary of the Parties' positions is illustrative only and does not necessarily comprise each and every contention put forward by the Parties. Furthermore, this summary focuses on the Parties' positions on the Threshold Matters identified by the Panel, specifically jurisdiction, admissibility and standing to appeal. The Panel, however, has carefully considered all the submissions made by the Parties, even if no explicit reference is made in what immediately follows.

The Appellants

64. The Appellants' submissions may be summarized as follows:

- As to the CAS jurisdiction:
 - with regard to the IOC, the jurisdiction of the Panel to decide upon the present matter is based on Rule 61.2 of the OC; while
 - with regard to the IAAF, the jurisdiction of the Panel is based on Article 84.3 of the IAAF Constitution.

More specifically, the Appellants submit that these arbitration clauses contain an offer to arbitrate and that they accepted such offer by filing their Statement of Appeal, thereby creating an agreement on which the jurisdiction of the Panel is based.

- As to the decisions being challenged by the Appellants and the compliance with applicable time limits to file an appeal to CAS:
 - with respect to the IOC, the Appellants submit that the present appeal is directed against the decisions of the IOC Executive Board of 26-28 March 2019, and that it was initiated within 21 days from the appealed decision. The Appellants' and IAAF's letters and emails dated 10 December 2018, 28 December 2018 and 24 March 2019 indeed put the IOC on notice to fulfil its duty to implement gender equality in the 50km Race Walk event at the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games. By email of 25 March 2019, the IOC Media Relations Team confirmed that the gender equality issue with respect to the 50km Race Walk event had been

brought to the attention of the IOC Executive Board. Nevertheless, at its Executive Board meetings of 26-28 March 2019, the IOC decided not to remedy to the existing gender discrimination with respect to the 50km Race Walk event.

In addition to the decisions of the IOC Executive Board of 26-28 March 2019, the Appellants submit that the present appeal also covers the letter dated 15 February 2019 from the IOC to the IAAF, by which the IOC refused to include women athletes in the 50km Race Walk event at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games. The Appellants indeed contend that they were informed on 24 April 2019 of that letter and that the present appeal was initiated within 21 days time limit as from receipt of this letter, as provided under Article R49 of the CAS Code;

- with respect to the IAAF, the Appellants submit that the appeal is directed against the decision of the IAAF Council on the qualification system for the athletics events of the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games, a decision that became final on 10 March 2019 with the adoption of entry standards for men only. Whereas in the document entitled “*Qualification System – Games of the XXXII Olympiad – Tokyo 2020*” as approved by the IAAF in July 2018, all the spaces for men’s and women’s entry standards for every event – including the 50km Race Walk – were left blank, the decision of 10 March 2019 provided entry standards for all but one category: women 50km race walkers. The present appeal was initiated within 21 days’ time limit from the decision of the IAAF Council of 10 March 2019, as provided under Article R49 of the CAS Code;
- the IOC and the IAAF are jointly responsible for the Olympic athlete programme, including the 50km Race Walk. With their decisions of 15 February 2019, 10 March 2019 and 26-28 March 2019, the IOC and the IAAF wrongfully excluded women athletes from the 50km Race Walk of the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games. Moreover, the IOC cannot avail itself of any defence that the 2020 Olympic Programme was decided upon in June 2017, because (i) it was its decision of February and March 2019 to deny IAAF’s request to include women in the Tokyo 2020 Race Walk event, and (ii) such defence relies on an ordinary statute that must give way to the requirements of the constitutional gender equality values stated in the fundamental principles of Olympism.
- As to the Appellants’ standing to appeal, in the Appellants’ opinion, this is conferred upon them by the OC, which states that “*Every individual must have the possibility of practising sport, without discrimination of any kind (...)*”, that “*the enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Olympic Charter shall be secured without discrimination of any kind, such as (...) sex (...)*”, and which describes the athletes’ interests as “*a fundamental element of the Olympic Movement’s action (...)*” (Fundamental Principles of Olympism 4 and 6; Rule 1.3 of the OC). The Appellants submit that the present proceedings are neither about adding someone’s favourite pastime to the Olympics, nor about claiming a right to be at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games, but rather about making a discriminatory Olympic event gender equal. In addition, the fact that the

athletes' rights are already represented by their international federations and the IOC Athletes' Commission is not relevant since this misreads Rule 61 of the OC and overlooks the fact that despite the IAAF's request to include the women in the 50km Race Walk, the IOC refused to do so.

- As to the law applicable to the present dispute, the Appellants submit that pursuant to Article R58 of the CAS Code, the Panel is bound to apply, with respect to the IOC, the OC and, on a subsidiary basis, Swiss law. With respect to the IAAF, the Panel should apply, pursuant to Article 84.6 of the IAAF Constitution, the IAAF Constitution as well as its Rules and Regulations, and on a subsidiary basis, Monegasque law. In addition, Switzerland and Monaco both having acceded to the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the provisions of such Convention shall apply to the present dispute.

65. In their Appeal Brief the Appellants therefore requested the Panel to decide as follows:

- (a) The Court order Respondents IOC and IAAF to include women athletes in the 50km Race Walk at the 2020 Olympic Games in Tokyo with separate classifications for men and women;*
- (b) The Court order Respondents IOC and IAAF to implement any Court orders hereby requested with immediate effect, in order to allow women athletes to prepare for the 2020 Olympic 50 km Race Walk Event, in light of the qualification period for the event having commenced on 1 January 2019 (...);*
- (c) The Court order Respondents IOC and IAAF to immediately publish the inclusion of women athletes in the 2020 Olympic Games 50 km Race Walk Event on their respective websites and in communication by Respondent IAAF to all its Member Federations;*
- (d) The Court order Respondents IOC (...) and IAAF to pay Appellants their legal fees and costs associated with this appeal; and*
- (e) The Court order such further and other relief as may be appropriate and just.*

The First Respondent

66. The IOC submissions may be summarized as follows:

- The IOC first submits that what the Appellants are actually requesting is the inclusion of a new event, within the meaning of Rule 45.2.2 paragraph 2 of the OC, in the Events Programme for the Tokyo Olympic Games. However, in accordance with Rule 45 of the OC and the Bye-Law 2.2. to Rule 45 ("BLR"), the Tokyo Olympic Games Events Programme was decided upon by the IOC Executive Board within the set deadline of three years prior to the opening of the Tokyo Olympic Games, namely on 9 June 2017, after consultation of the international federations. In addition, there was no subsequent tripartite agreement to waive such deadline for deciding on the Events Programme as required under BLR 45.3.4 of the OC. As a result, pursuant to Article R49 of the CAS Code, the appeal filed by the Appellants is manifestly late.

- In addition, the IOC contends that the decisions, to which the appeal is directed, are not decisions on the subject matter of the present appeal. First, the Executive Board dated 26-28 March 2019 did not even discuss the Event Programme of the Tokyo Olympic Games. Second, the decision of the IAAF Council on 10 March 2019 adopting the qualification entry standards with respect to the 50km Race Walk event at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games for men only, is not a decision on the inclusion of a new event in the Events Programme of the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games. Lastly, the letter from the IOC to the IAAF on 15 February 2019 is not a decision on the inclusion of a new event on the Tokyo Olympic Games Events Programme, but rather a decision not to open a review process of the Events Programme, which – in order to succeed – would in any case have required the approval of three parties, namely the IOC, the IAAF and the Tokyo Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (“TOCOG”).
- The IOC further submits that the Panel lacks jurisdiction *ratione personae* based on Rule 61.2 of the OC, since the IOC has no legal relationship with the individual athletes until they sign their eligibility form with the IOC with respect to their participation in a specific event, which the Appellants obviously have not done at this stage with respect to the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games.
- Moreover, the Appellants have no standing to appeal in the present matter. The decision of the IOC on the Events Programme is a decision of a general nature, which potentially concerns all athletes, and there is consequently no individual right of the athletes to appeal against the decision on the Events Programme for the Tokyo Olympic Games. The CAS has no jurisdiction to decide upon matters of such constitutional nature. The decision on the Events Programme does not constitute an appealable decision within the meaning of Article R47 of the CAS Code.
- Finally, the IOC supports the argument of the IAAF that there is no basis to conduct the present appeal proceedings against the IAAF. First, the IAAF did not make any decision regarding the inclusion of the Women’s 50km Race Walk in the Olympic Games Events Programme, neither in June 2017 nor in March 2019. Second, the IAAF could not have validly made such decision, since the decision on the Events Programme is in any event not within the competence of the IAAF but of the IOC, pursuant to BLR 45.2.2 of the OC.

67. The IOC therefore “(...) *confirms its request to entirely terminate the proceedings.*”

The Second Respondent

68. The IAAF submissions may be summarized as follows:

- The IAAF argues that it never had the right to decide what events were included in the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme, and therefore never decided what events were included in, and what event were excluded from, the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme. The IAAF’s approval and publication of the Tokyo 2020 Qualification System, originally on 31 July 2018 and then in revised form on 10 March 2019, was in no sense a decision to include any event in, or to exclude any event from, the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme. Instead, it was merely the IAAF’s decision on the qualification system and entry standards for those events

that the IOC had already decided to include in the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme. Therefore, the decision being challenged is not a decision by the IAAF, but rather a decision by the IOC. The arbitration agreement at Article 84.3 of the IAAF Constitution relied on by the Appellants “is clearly not related to the dispute at stake”, as provided under Article R52 of the CAS Code, but rather a dispute between the Appellants and the IOC alone.

- The IAAF submits that it has authority to organise, direct and control the Athletics programme at the Olympic Games, but that such authority only arises once the IOC has decided – in its sole discretion – which athletics events will be in that programme. Since the Event Programme for the Tokyo Olympic Games was decided upon in June 2017, the IAAF was bound by that decision, which could not be changed subsequently without the agreement of the IOC and the TOCOG.
- Although the Qualification System that the IAAF published in July 2018 left the entry standards for the athletics events in the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme for later determination, it listed the 50km Race Walk event as a men’s event, with no 50km Race Walk included in the list of women’s events. It also included details of the entry numbers for each event, with 60 places listed for men in the 50km Race Walk event, and none for women. This confirms that the IAAF was simply implementing the IOC’s decision not to include a women’s 50km Race Walk event in the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme.
- The IAAF’s request in December 2018 asking the IOC to consider adding a Women’s 50km race Walk to the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme was made expressly on the basis that the IOC’s agreement was required to revisit its June 2017 decision not to include a women’s 50km Race Walk event in the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme.

69. The IAAF therefore requests the Panel to decide as follows:

- *The IAAF invites the Appellants to agree that these proceedings should be terminated forthwith as against the IAAF.*
- *If the Appellants do not agree to such termination, then the IAAF respectfully submits that this issue should be determined as a preliminary issue. The Appellants should be permitted to make a submission on the issue, the IAAF should be permitted to file a reply, and then a ruling should be made.*
- *For the obvious reasons of procedural economy, such ruling should be obtained before any consideration of the merits. There is no sense in the CAS and the parties expending time and resources on the merits of the proceedings until this potentially dispositive issue is resolved. (...)*

V. JURISDICTION OF THE CAS

70. The question whether or not the CAS has jurisdiction to hear the present dispute must be assessed on the basis of the *lex arbitri*. As Switzerland is the seat of the arbitration and not all Parties are domiciled in Switzerland, the provisions of the Swiss Private International Law Act (“PILA”) apply, pursuant to its Article 176.1. In accordance with

Article 186 of PILA, the CAS has the power to decide upon its own jurisdiction (“*Kompetenz-Kompetenz*”).

71. Pursuant to Article R27 of the CAS Code:

“These Procedural Rules apply whenever the parties have agreed to refer a sports-related dispute to CAS. Such reference may arise out of an arbitration clause contained in a contract or regulations or by reason of a later arbitration agreement (ordinary arbitration proceedings) or may involve an appeal against a decision rendered by a federation, association or sports-related body where the statutes or regulations of such bodies, or a specific agreement provide for an appeal to CAS (appeal arbitration proceedings).

Such disputes may involve matters of principle relating to sport or matters of pecuniary or other interests relating to the practice or the development of sport and may include, more generally, any activity or matter related or connected to sport.”

72. Article R47 of the CAS Code provides as follows:

“An appeal against the decision of a federation, association or sports-related body may be filed with CAS if the statutes or regulations of the said body so provide or if the parties have concluded a specific arbitration agreement and if the Appellant has exhausted the legal remedies available to it prior to the appeal, in accordance with the statutes or regulations of that body.

An appeal may be filed with CAS against an award rendered by CAS acting as a first instance tribunal if such appeal has been expressly provided by the rules of the federation or sports-body concerned.”

73. With respect to the IOC, the Appellants rely on Rule 61.2 of the OC, which states as follows:

“Any dispute arising on the occasion of, or in connection with, the Olympic Games shall be submitted exclusively to the Court of Arbitration for Sport, in accordance with the Code of Sports-Related Arbitration.”

74. In addition, with respect to the IAAF, the Appellants rely on Article 84.3 of the IAAF Constitution, which states as follows:

“Final Decisions made by the IAAF under this Constitution may be appealed exclusively to the CAS which will resolve the dispute definitively in accordance with the CAS Code of Sports-related Arbitration.”

A. Position of the Parties

75. As a preliminary point, the Panel notes that the Parties disagree on what is the substance of the Appellants’ request. According to the Appellants, the present appeal proceedings aim at bringing an end to on-going gender discrimination, which consists in opening a specific competition at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games to men while refusing it to women. According to the Appellants, what they request is therefore that an existing event be gender equal. However, the IOC submits that what the Appellants are actually requesting is the inclusion of a new event, within the meaning of Rule 45.2.2 paragraph

2 of the OC, in the Events Programme for the Tokyo Olympic Games. The IAAF seconds the IOC's approach on this point.

76. The Appellants submit that the Panel holds jurisdiction to decide on the present matter against the IOC based on Rule 61.2 of the OC. In their view, Rule 61.2 of the OC constitutes an offer to all the world to arbitrate at CAS any dispute covered by the provision. By filing their Statement of Appeal, the Appellants say that they accepted such offer to arbitrate, thereby creating an agreement between the Parties, on which the Panel's jurisdiction is based. Moreover, the Appellants submit that the present appeal is brought with respect to the IOC, against the IOC Executive Board meetings of 26-28 March 2019, because, despite having been expressly informed of the existing gender discrimination with respect to the 50km Race Walk event, the IOC Executive Board decided not to remedy the issue. The Appellants also submit that in the letter dated 15 February 2019 from IOC Sports Director, Mr Kit McConnell, to the IAAF, the IOC confirmed that it would not remedy the gender discrimination issue regarding the women's 50km Race Walk at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games.
77. The IOC submits, to the contrary, that the Panel lacks jurisdiction to decide in the present matter. The IOC does not dispute the fact that the present matter qualifies as a "*dispute arising on the occasion of, or in connection with, the Olympic Games*" as provided under Rule 61.2 of the OC. However, in the IOC's view, only the parties to the OC can invoke such arbitration clause, and the Appellants do not have such a quality. Athletes may invoke Rule 61.2 of the OC only as from the moment they have signed an eligibility form.
78. The IOC also contends that the decisions, to which the appeal is directed, are not decisions on the subject matter of the present appeal. Indeed, the Event Programme of the Tokyo Olympic Games was not discussed at the Executive Board meeting dated 26-28 March 2019. In addition, the letter from the IOC to the IAAF on 15 February 2019 is not a decision on the inclusion of a new event on the Tokyo Olympic Games Events Programme, but rather a decision not to open a review process of the Events Programme, which would have required the approval of three parties, namely the IOC, the IAAF and the TOCOG.
79. The Appellants submit that the Panel has jurisdiction to decide on the present dispute with respect to the IAAF, based on Article 84.3 of the IAAF Constitution. The Appellants submit that their appeal is, with respect to the IAAF, directed against the decision of the IAAF Council dated 10 March 2019, setting the qualification system for the athletics events of the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games, a decision that became final on 10 March 2019 with the adoption of entry standards for men only. Indeed, the document entitled "*Qualification System – Games of the XXXII Olympiad – Tokyo 2020*", which was adopted by the IAAF in July 2018, left blank all the spaces for men's and women's entry standards for every event – including the 50km Race Walk, but the decision of 10 March 2019 provided entry standards for all but one category: women 50km race walkers.
80. The IAAF contends to the contrary, that it does not have the authority to decide which event will be at the Olympic Games. The IAAF's approval and publication of the Tokyo 2020 Qualification System, originally on 31 July 2018 and then in revised form on 10

March 2019, was merely the IAAF's decision on the qualification system and entry standards for those events that the IOC had already decided to include in the Tokyo 2020 Event Programme. Besides, the IAAF Qualification System of July 2018 lists the 50km Race Walk event as a men's event, with no 50km Race Walk included in the list of women's events, and, as to entry numbers, it provides for 60 places for the 50km Race Walk men event, and none for women. The IOC supports this line of argument of the IAAF: The IAAF did not take, nor could it have taken, any decision as to the inclusion of the women 50km Race Walk in the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games Events Programme.

B. Position of the Panel

a) Preliminary remarks

81. First, the Panel notes that, in their Statement of Appeal and their Appeal Brief, the Appellants request the Panel to order the IOC and the IAAF “*to include women athletes in the 50km Race Walk Event at the 2020 Olympic Games in Tokyo with separate classifications for men and women.*” The Panel is of the view that what the Appellants are requesting in substance is the inclusion of a new event in the meaning of Article 45.2.2 paragraph 2 of the OC, *i.e.* “*a specific competition in a sport resulting in a ranking giving rise to the award of medals and diplomas*”, in the Events Programme for the Tokyo Olympic Games.
82. Therefore, the Panel shall consider its jurisdiction to decide on the present matter, keeping in mind that the inclusion of a new event in the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games Events Programme is indeed the core issue at stake. This does not mean that, in the Panel's view, the issue of gender discrimination in sports in general is neither relevant nor essential. To the contrary, it is a substantive law issue of utmost importance. Such issue of substantive law – however fundamental it may be – cannot, however, exempt from nor alleviate the Panel's examination of the procedural issues of a preliminary nature, such as its jurisdiction, on the basis of the CAS Code and the applicable regulations.
83. The Panel then turns to the conditions for CAS to have jurisdiction. Based on the consistent jurisprudence of CAS panels pursuant to Articles R27 and R47 of the CAS Code, there are three prerequisites that have to be met in order for CAS to have jurisdiction (see *inter alia*: CAS 2008/A/1513; CAS 2009/A/1919; CAS 2011/A/2436; CAS 2014/A/3775), namely:
 - the parties must have agreed to the competence of the CAS;
 - there must be a “decision” of a federation, association or another sports-related body; and
 - the (internal) legal remedies available must have been exhausted prior to appealing to CAS.
84. In addition, considering that the present appeal is directed against the IOC as well as the IAAF, each of the three conditions must be fulfilled with respect to each of the Respondents. As a result, the three cumulative prerequisites will be addressed below, with respect to the IOC, as well as with respect to the IAAF.

85. Moreover, the Panel notes that interpretation of an arbitration agreement is governed by Article 178.2 PILA (M. REEB, D. MAVROMATI, *The Code of the Court of Arbitration for Sport: Commentary, Cases and Materials* (2015), p. 30-31, nos. 38-40; ATF 4P.253/2003, 25.03.2004). Based on this provision, the Panel applies first and foremost the principles of Swiss law on the interpretation of an arbitration agreement. According thereto, the statutes and regulations of an association shall be interpreted and construed according to the principles applicable to the interpretation of the law rather than to contracts (BSK-ZGB/HEINI/SCHERRER, Art. 60 SCC no. 22; BK-ZGB/RIEMER, Systematischer Teil no. 331; BGE 114 II 193, E. 5a; 4A_600/2016, at 3.3.4.1). The Panel concurs with this view, which also accords with CAS jurisprudence, which has held in the matter CAS 2010/A/2071 as follows:

“The interpretation of the statutes and rules of a sport association has to be rather objective and always to start with the wording of the rule, which falls to be interpreted. The adjudicating body – in this instance the Panel – will have to consider the meaning of the rule, looking at the language used, and the appropriate grammar and syntax. In its search, the adjudicating body will have further to identify the intentions (objectively construed) of the association which drafted the rule, and such body may also take account of any relevant historical background which illuminates its derivation, as well as the entirely regulatory context in which the particular rule is located (...).” (CAS 2010/A/2071, para. 20 of the abstract published on the CAS website; see also: 2017/A/5063; 2016/A/4787; 2016/A/4903; 2016/A/4602; 2014/A/3863).

86. This is the approach the Panel will follow in the examination of its jurisdiction to decide upon the present matter.
87. The Panel shall examine the three cumulative prerequisites for CAS to have jurisdiction successively with respect to the IOC and with respect to the IAAF.

b) CAS Jurisdiction with respect to the IOC

88. It is a basic (and obvious) principle that arbitration is based on consent. Arbitration can be started by an entity against another only if an agreement exists between them to arbitrate a given dispute. As a result, in order to determine the existence of CAS jurisdiction in the case at hand, the first task of this Panel is to verify whether an agreement exists between the IOC and the Appellants (jurisdiction *ratione personae*) covering the dispute at stake (jurisdiction *ratione materiae*) and providing for CAS arbitration.
89. As mentioned, the Appellants ground the CAS jurisdiction to hear the appeal they filed against the IOC on Rule 61.2 of the OC under which *“Any dispute arising on the occasion of, or in connection with, the Olympic Games shall be submitted exclusively to the Court of Arbitration for Sport, in accordance with the Code of Sports-Related Arbitration.”*
90. In regard to that provision, the Panel notes that it undoubtedly provides for CAS arbitration and that it covers the dispute between the Appellants and the IOC, which concerns the inclusion of the 50km Race Walk women competition at the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games. Therefore, it is without doubt a dispute *“arising on the occasion of,*

or in connection with, the Olympic Games". The Parties did not challenge this point. As a result, this Panel would have jurisdiction *ratione materiae*.

91. The crux of the issue, however, concerns the existence of an agreement to arbitrate between the Appellants and the IOC (jurisdiction *ratione personae*), giving the Appellants the right to start CAS proceedings against the IOC and obliging the IOC to submit to arbitration a dispute with the Appellants covered *ratione materiae* by such agreement.
92. The Panel starts the examination from the text of the provision invoked by the Appellants and notes that the arbitration clause contained in Rule 61.2 of the OC describes the jurisdiction of the CAS as exclusive. This follows from the objective construction of the arbitration clause, which states as follows: "*any dispute ... shall be submitted exclusively to the Court of Arbitration for Sport ...*" (underlining added). Such exclusive character of the arbitration clause means that the parties concerned are not only entitled, but also compelled to bring the disputes covered by the arbitration clause to the CAS.
93. In light of the foregoing, the Panel is not convinced by the construction offered by the Appellants of Rule 61.2 of the OC. If, as the Appellants contend, any person can accept the offer to arbitrate included in Rule 61.2 of the OC, then this would mean that before filing their Statement of Appeal, that person has the option of accepting the offer to arbitrate or to disregard it and seize national courts. Such a reading would, in the view of the Panel, mean that Rule 61.2 of the OC contains an optional arbitration clause rather than an exclusive one, which is incompatible with the wording of Rule 61.2 of the OC.
94. In the Panel's view, the corollary of the exclusive character of Rule 61.2 of the OC is that it can only be binding on, and invoked by, persons on a "pre-existing" different basis. Hence, the Appellants would not only have the right to accept an offer to arbitrate at CAS, but also the obligation to do so, so that recourse to ordinary courts would be precluded (because CAS would have "exclusive" jurisdiction). The question is then to determine who is bound by, and can invoke, the arbitration clause contained in the OC, and on which basis. In particular, considering that the Appellants are athletes, the Panel has to examine under what conditions athletes can rely on (and have the obligation to observe) Rule 61.2 of the OC.
95. In order to answer this question, the Panel first reverts to the OC. Pursuant to Rule 1.4 of the OC, "*any person or organisation belonging in any capacity whatsoever to the Olympic Movement is bound by the provisions of the Olympic Charter and shall abide by the decisions of the IOC.*"
96. Based on Rule 1.2 of the OC, athletes are not one of the three main constituents of the Olympic Movement, which are "*the International Committee ("IOC"), the International Sports Federations ("IFs") and the National Olympic Committees (...)*". However, as provided by Rule 1.1 of the OC, "*the Olympic Movement encompasses organisations, athletes and other persons who agree to be guided by the Olympic Charter.*" Moreover, Rule 1.3 of the OC provides that "*the Olympic Movement also encompasses (...) persons belonging to the IFs, in particular the athletes, whose interests constitute a fundamental element of the Olympic Movement's action (...)*".

97. Hence, it arises from the above that the athletes are part of the Olympic Movement. This does not mean, however, that the athletes are members of the IOC, an association established pursuant to Articles 60 *et seq.* of the Swiss Civil Code, and are therefore directly parties to the OC.
98. The Panel is of the view that it is not enough to be part of the Olympic Movement in order to benefit from the arbitration clause contained in Rule 61.2 of the OC, as was confirmed by other CAS awards (CAS 2000/A/288; CAS 2000/A/297; CAS (OG Nagano) 98/001; CAS 2011/A/2474).
99. Indeed, CAS Panels already had the occasion to determine the scope *ratione personae* of Rule 61.2 of the OC or its predecessor. In particular, several CAS Panels stated that: “‘olympic’ athletes, namely athletes duly accredited by the IOC, were able to refer to rule 74 of the Olympic Charter [currently Rule 61.2 of the OC] to submit a request for arbitration or an appeal to the CAS. The Court has considered that athletes with only an interest in taking part in the Olympic Games could not use this arbitration clause to justify the jurisdiction of the CAS.” (CAS 2000/A/288; CAS 2000/A/297; CAS (OG Nagano) 98/001; CAS 2011/A/2474). The Panel concurs with this view.
100. In the Panel’s view, there is no doubt that the Appellants do not qualify as “Olympic” athletes. Indeed, at the stage of the present proceedings, the Appellants are professional athletes who request the inclusion of women in a specific competition at a specific edition of the Olympic Games with separate classifications. Hence, the only relationship that the Appellants have with the IOC is that they have a “sporting interest” in participating in a specific competition at the Olympic Games organised under the auspices of the IOC: they do not have any enforceable right. In the Panel’s view, this is not enough to demonstrate that the Appellants are “Olympic” athletes “*duly accredited by the IOC*”, qualified as eligible to compete in the Olympic Games and/or who have signed an agreement with the IOC (such as an entry form for the Olympic Games) providing for the CAS jurisdiction.
101. Moreover, the Panel deems it relevant to make a distinction between this case and a case where a procedure is brought against a sports federation regarding the latter’s decision not to admit the appellant as its member. The Swiss Federal Tribunal has accepted that, in such specific circumstances, the appellant – who is not a member of the sports federation – may nevertheless avail itself of the arbitration clause included in the sports federation’s statutes, based on the appellant’s formal commitment to abide by those statutes as part of the admission process. In its judgment, the Swiss Federal Tribunal states as follows:
- “*Dans ce contexte, on notera enfin – pour ce qui est de la procédure d’admission des FMN [Fédérations Motocyclistes Nationales] que l’art. 11.1.3 des Statuts confie au CD [Conseil de Direction] le soin de définir dans le RI [Règlement Intérieur] – qu’en vertu de l’art. II.1) al. 1 let. f de ce dernier règlement, pour devenir Membre affilié de la FIM [Fédération Internationale de Motocyclisme] une FMN doit déposer une demande d’admission accompagnée, entre autres documents, d’une déclaration par laquelle elle s’engage notamment à respecter les Statuts, règlements et décisions de l’association faîtière. Or, à l’art. 5 des Statuts, figure précisément la clause arbitrale qui forme l’un des objets de l’engagement à souscrire par la candidate. Dès lors, il est possible d’inférer de la conjugaison de la clause arbitrale et de la disposition topique du RI*

l'existence d'un devoir implicite de la FMN candidate à l'affiliation auprès de la FIM de n'entreprendre que devant le TAS les décisions que rendra cette association à son sujet et, plus particulièrement, une éventuelle décision de rejet de sa candidature prise par l'AG de la FIM. » (SFT, 4A_314/2017, cons. 2.3.2.3).

Unofficial translation: “*In this context, it should be noted – with regard to the admission procedure of the FMNs [National Motorcycling Federations] that Article 11.1.3 of the Statutes entrusts the DC [Governing Council] to define the RI [Internal Regulations] – that under Article II.1.1(f) of the Statutes, in order to become an affiliated member of the FIM (International Motorcycling Federation), a FMN must make a demand of admission accompanied, among other documents, by a declaration that it will obey the statutes, regulations, and decisions of the association. In Article 5 of the Statutes can be found the exact arbitration clause that forms one of the candidate’s obligations. Therefore, it is possible to infer from the combination of the arbitration clause and the notion of the existence of an implicit duty of the candidate FMN with the FIM to bring exclusively before the CAS the FIM decisions and particularly potential decisions rejecting applications made by the AG of the FIM.*” (SFT, 4A_314/2017, cons. 2.3.2.3).

102. In the Panel’s view, the present case covers a very different situation. Indeed, the Appellants are not requesting to become members of the IOC (or the IAAF). Rather, they are professional athletes who have an interest in taking part to a specific competition at the Olympic Games. In addition, at the stage of the present proceedings, the Appellants have not entered into a legal relationship with the IOC, on which consent to arbitration under the OC could be based.
103. As a result, the Panel finds that it does not have jurisdiction, under Rule 61.2 of the OC, to decide upon the present dispute with respect to the Appellants. In view of the conclusion reached by the Panel as to the consent of the IOC and the Appellants to the competence of the CAS, there is no need to analyse the other conditions for the CAS to have jurisdiction in the present matter, namely the existence of an “appealable decision” in the meaning of the CAS Code (which might also be doubted), as well as the exhaustion of internal legal remedies before starting a procedure before CAS. Similarly, there is no need to consider the separate question of the standing of the Appellants to bring these proceedings.

c) CAS Jurisdiction with respect to the IAAF

104. The Panel starts the examination of its jurisdiction with respect to the IAAF with the analysis of the existence of a “decision” of a federation, association or another sports-related body, in the meaning of the CAS Code.
105. The Panel endorses the definition of “decision” and the characteristic features of “decision” stated in the following CAS precedents:
- “*In principle, for a communication to be a decision, this communication must contain a ruling, whereby the body issuing the decision intends to affect the legal situation of the addressee of the decision or other parties*” (CAS 2008/A/1633 para. 31; CAS 2007/A/1251 para. 30; CAS 2005/A/899 para. 61; CAS 2004/A/748 para. 89).

- “A decision is thus a unilateral act, sent to one or more determined recipients and is intended to produce legal effects” (CAS 2008/A/1633 para. 31; CAS 2004/A/748 para. 89; CAS 2004/A/659 para. 36).
 - “The form of the communication has no relevance to determine whether there exists a decision or not. In particular, the fact that the communication is made in the form of a letter does not rule out the possibility that it constitute a decision subject to appeal” (CAS 2008/A/1633 para. 31; CAS 2007/A/1251 para. 30; CAS 2005/A/899 para. 63; CAS 2004/A/748 para. 90).
106. In the present matter, the Panel first notes that, pursuant to Rule and BLR 45.2.2 of the OC, the decision on the Events Programme is within the exclusive competence of the IOC Executive Board. In addition, pursuant to Rule 26 of the OC, international federations assume the responsibility for the control and direction of their sport at the Olympic Games, but this authority comes into play only once the IOC Executive Board has decided what competitions are included in the Olympic Games Event programme. Hence, in the Panel’s view, the Qualification System for the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games, adopted in its original form by the IAAF on 31 July 2018 and in a revised form on 10 March 2019, is only an implementation of the original decision from the IOC Executive Board on 9 June 2017 defining the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games Events Programme.
107. The Panel then turns to the examination of the IAAF Council’s decision dated 10 March 2019. On 10 March 2019, the IAAF Council approved the entry standards for each event of the Tokyo Olympic Games. In doing so, it appears at first from the document entitled “*Qualification System – Games of the XXXII Olympiad – Tokyo 2020*” as adopted and published on 10 March 2019, that the IAAF Council adopted entry standards for all events, men and women, except for women in the 50km Race Walk. However, the Panel notes that, on 10 March 2019, the IAAF Council only finalised the Qualification System, which had already partially been decided upon by the same organ on 31 July 2018. Hence, as provided for in the document entitled “*Qualification System – Games of the XXXII Olympiad - Tokyo 2020*”, as adopted and published on 31 July 2018, the IAAF Council had, already in July 2018, identified the 50km Race Walk as a men’s event: the 50km Race Walk event was indeed not included in the list of women’s events and entry numbers were provided only for the men’s event.
108. In the Panel’s view, this demonstrates that the decision of the IAAF Council of 10 March 2019 in no way contains “a ruling, whereby the body issuing the decision intends to affect the legal situation of the addressee of the decision or other parties” as retained by the CAS case law. Rather, the decision of 10 March 2019 only provided for entry standards for the events for which it had already been decided that they would be included in 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games Events Programme, by the IOC Executive Board on 9 June 2017 in the first place, and by the IAAF on 31 July 2018 as implementation of the IOC’s decision.
109. As a result, the Panel finds that it lacks jurisdiction to decide upon the present matter with respect to the IAAF. Consequentially, and in view of the cumulative character of the conditions set forth above for CAS to have jurisdiction to decide on the present matter, the Panel deems it unnecessary to continue with the analysis of the other conditions.

VI. COSTS

(...).

ON THESE GROUNDS

The Court of Arbitration for Sport rules that:

1. The Court of Arbitration for Sport has no jurisdiction to rule on the appeal filed on 31 March 2019 by Ms Inês Henriques, Ms Claire Woods, Ms Paola Pérez, Ms Johana Ordóñez, Ms Magaly Bonilla, Ms Ainhoa Pinedo, Ms Erin Taylor-Talcott and Mr Quentin Rew against the International Olympic Committee and the International Association of Athletics Federations.
2. (...).
3. (...).
4. All other motions or prayers for relief are dismissed.

Seat of arbitration: Lausanne, Switzerland

Date: 3 February 2020

THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

Luigi Fumagalli
President of the Panel

Annabelle Claire Bennett
Arbitrator

Pierre Muller
Arbitrator

Stéphanie De Dycker
Ad hoc Clerk