



TAS / CAS
TRIBUNAL ARBITRAL DU SPORT
COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT
TRIBUNAL ARBITRAL DEL DEPORTE

COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT (CAS)
Ad Hoc Division – Games of the XXXIII Olympiad in Paris

**CAS OG 24/04 Israel Football Association & Mr. Roy Revivo v. Fédération
Internationale de Football Association (FIFA)**

sitting in the following composition:

President: Mr Lars Hilliger
Arbitrators: Prof. Song Lu
Dr Leanne O'Leary

AWARD

in the arbitration between

Israel Football Association ("First Applicant")

and

Mr. Roy Revivo ("Second Applicant")

and

Fédération Internationale de Football Association ("Respondent")

and

The Israeli Olympics Association ("First Interested Party")

and

Union of European Football Associations ("Second Interested Party")

I. PARTIES

1. The First Applicant is the Israel Football Association (the “IFA”), which is the governing body of football in Israel.
2. The Second Applicant, Mr Roy Revivo (the “Player”), is a member of the Israeli Olympic football team (U23), which qualified for the Olympics based on their placing in the U21 EURO 2023.
3. The Respondent (or “FIFA”) is the international governing body of football and is an association under Article 60 et seq under the Swiss Civil Code.
4. The First Interested Party, the Israeli Olympics Association, is the National Olympic Committee of Israel, recognised as such by the IOC.
5. The Second Interested Party, UEFA, is the association of European football federations and the governing body of European football.
6. The First Applicant and Second Applicant are collectively referred to as the “Applicants”.
7. The First Applicant, Second Applicant and Respondent are collectively referred to as the “Parties”.

II. FACTS

A. Background Facts

8. The elements set out below are a summary of the main relevant facts as established by the Panel by way of a chronology and based on the submissions of the Parties. Additional facts may be set out, where relevant, in the legal considerations of the present award.
9. On 21 March 2024, the Player received a direct red card in the match between Israel and Iceland in the context of the UEFA Euro 2024 Qualifiers, Senior Team.
10. On 23 April 2024, and following that incident, the UEFA Control, Ethics and Disciplinary Body (the “CEDB”) imposed a two-match suspension on the Player (the “CEDB Decision”), which decision was never appealed.
11. The CEDB Decision was issued without grounds and the operative part of the decision reads as follows:

“The Control, Ethics and Disciplinary Body decides:

1. To suspend Israel Football Association player, Mr. Roy Revivo, for a total of two (2) UEFA representative team competition matches for which he would be otherwise eligible, for serious rough play.

2. The Israel Football Association ensures that the player is personally informed of this decision.”

12. On 9 July 2024, FIFA requested UEFA to confirm any suspensions pending to be served ahead of the Olympic Games, stating, *inter alia*, as follows:

“We refer to the above-mentioned matter, as well as to the contents of both art. 69 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code, 2023 edition (FDC) and circular no. 6 issued in connection with the above-referenced tournament.

In this context, ahead of the competition’s commencement, we hereby kindly request you to provide our services with a list of any pending suspensions concerning players and officials belonging to the member associations of UEFA which are due to be served during the Final Competition (Men’s and Women’s Olympic Football Tournaments). [...]

13. On 16 July 2024, and following a reminder from FIFA, UEFA informed FIFA as follows:

“Please see below information on sanction that must be served during the next Olympic games, as requested:

| Team | Player | DOB | Suspension | Offence | DC | Next Olympic game match scheduled | Match |
|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Israel_Men Team A | Roy Revivo | 22/05/2003 | 2 | Serious rough play | 38309- EURO- 2023/24 | 24/07/2024 | Mali v Israel |
| | | | | | | 27/07/2024 | Israel v Paraguay |

14. On 21 July 2024, in the context of the Team Arrival Meeting held with the IFA, the FIFA Team Services reported that UEFA had informed FIFA that the Player was suspended for the first two (2) matches of the Olympic Football Tournament 2024 (the “OFT”).
15. Consequently, on 22 July 2024, the IFA filed a protest (the “Protest”) with reference to Article 10.3 of the Regulations - Olympic Football Tournaments Games of the XXXIII Olympiad Paris 2024 – Final Competition (the “ROFT”).
16. On the same day, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee issued the Appealed Decision declaring the Protest inadmissible. The full text of the Appealed Decision reads as follows:

“We refer to the above-mentioned matter as well as to the protest lodged on 22 July 2024 by the Israel Football Association ahead of the Olympic Football Tournaments - Games of the XXXIII Olympiad Paris 2024 Final Competition (OFT) in connection with the player Roy Revivo, which has received our best attention.

In this respect, on behalf of the Chairperson of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee, we have taken due note of your concerns and request for clarification on the eligibility of the player in question.

Considering the abovementioned scenario, we kindly recall that Mr Revivo was shown a direct red card in the match between the representative teams of Israel and Iceland on 21 March 2024 in the context of the UEFA Euro 2024 Qualifiers, Senior Team.

Contextually on 23 April 2024, the UEFA Control, Ethics and Disciplinary Body decided to suspend Mr Revivo for two matches for serious foul play.

In this sense, we also would like to indicate that according to UEFA Disciplinary Regulations, if a suspension is not served in the competition where the offence was committed, it shall be automatically carried forward to the next UEFA competition, or an equivalent age category FIFA World Cup or Olympic tournament.

Consequently, it seems that Mr Revivo has not yet served any of the match suspensions, as indicated in your protest, and thus he shall serve them in the upcoming matches of the Israeli national team in the OFT.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, we would like to recall the contents of the relevant provisions of the FIFA Regulations concerning the OFT (ROFT), pursuant to which (i) OFT is scheduled to be played between 24 July and 10 August 2024 and (ii) protests regarding player eligibility should be submitted no later than five days before the first match of the tournament.

In this context, and on behalf of the Chairperson of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee, it appears that the protest at hand was not lodged within the deadline listed under Art. 10.3 ROFT. As a result, please note that the present case will be closed accordingly in that your protest is considered inadmissible.”

We thank you for taking note of the above. We wish you the best of luck in the upcoming OFT and trust in your understanding. We equally remain fully available in case of further queries”

III. THE CAS PROCEEDINGS

17. On 23 July 2024 at 11:23 am (Paris time), the Applicants filed an Application with the CAS Ad Hoc Division against the Respondent with respect to the Appealed Decision. They further designated the Israeli Olympics Association as Interested Party.
18. On 23 July 2024 at 1:52 pm (Paris time), the CAS Ad Hoc Division invited the Respondent and the First Interested Party to file a reply and *amicus curiae* brief, respectively, by 23 July 2024 at 6:00 pm (Paris time).
19. On 23 July 2024 at 2:30 pm (Paris time), the CAS Ad Hoc Division notified the Parties of the Arbitral Tribunal's composition as follows:

President: Mr Lars Hilliger, Denmark

Arbitrators: Prof. Song Lu, P.R. China

Dr Leanne O`Leary, United Kingdom/New Zealand

The Parties' attention was drawn to a disclosure made by Mr Hilliger and were invited to inform about any objection to his appoint by 5 pm, failing which it would be considered that they had no objection.

20. On 23 July 2024 at 5:35 pm (Paris time), the Respondent filed its Reply to the Application and at 6:06 pm (Paris time) the First Interested Party filed its *amicus curiae* brief.
21. On 23 July 2024 at 8:20 pm (Paris time), the Parties were informed that the Panel had decided to also call UEFA as an interested party, and by the same time informing UEFA that should UEFA not appear at the hearing, “*the Panel would be grateful if it could indicate [...] whether or not, the wording “to suspend for [...] UEFA representative team competition matches for which he would be otherwise eligible,” is the standard wording used in decisions that impose a suspension against a player in representative team matches.*”
22. On 24 July 2024 at 8:47 am (Paris time), UEFA answered, *inter alia*, as follows:
- “In this respect, UEFA notes the invitation to attend. However, given that the hearing clashes with a full plenary meeting of its Control Ethics and Disciplinary Body this morning and UEFA is already in a position to provide a clear answer to the question posed by the Panel, it respectfully considers that its participation is not needed in the present case.*
- With respect to the question posed, UEFA confirms that the wording “to suspend for [...] UEFA representative team competition matches for which he would be otherwise eligible” is the standard wording used in decisions that impose a suspension against a player in representative team competitions.”*
23. On 24 July 2024 at 9:00 am (Paris time), a hearing was held with the participation of the following persons, in addition to the Panel, Ms Pauline Pellaux and Ms Alexandra Veuthey, Counsels to the CAS:

For the Applicants:

- Mr Roy Revivo, the Player
- Mr Ran Cohen Nissan, Head of IFA Legal Department
- Mr Amid Pines and Mr Aviad Gurman, Counsel

For the Respondent:

- Mr Miguel Liétard, Director of Litigation
- Ms Cristina Pérez and Mr Rodrigo Morais, Senior Legal Counsel

None of the Interested Parties attended the hearing.

24. There were no objections to the composition of the Panel and the Respondent confirmed that it maintained its objection to jurisdiction.
25. Before the hearing was concluded, the Parties expressly stated that they did not have any objection to the procedure adopted by the Panel and confirmed that their right to be heard and to be treated equally had been respected.

26. On 24 July 2024 at 4:41 pm (Paris time), the Panel issued the operative part of the award which was notified to the Parties and Interested Parties by the CAS Ad Hoc Division.

IV. THE PARTIES' SUBMISSIONS AND REQUESTS FOR RELIEF

27. The Parties' submissions and arguments shall only be referred to in the sections below if and when necessary, even though all such submissions and arguments have been considered.

A. The Applicants

a. Applicants' Submissions

28. The Applicants' submissions may be summarized, in essence, as follows:
- The clear and unambiguous language of the CEDB Decision limits the scope of its application to "*competitions organized by UEFA*". UEFA does not organise the OFT and the suspension cannot be applied in this tournament.
 - The Appealed Decision erroneously disregarded the clear language of the CEDB Decision and relied solely on UEFA Disciplinary Regulations ("DR") without due consideration to Articles 68.1 and 68.4(a) UEFA DR. The Player and IFA were entirely justified in relying on the understanding that the CEDB Decision applied solely to "*competitions organized by UEFA*".
 - It is inconceivable that FIFA would interpret the punishment more broadly than the body that originally imposed it and it lacks the authority to modify the punishment. The Appealed Decision represents an unauthorised alteration of the original penalty. FIFA cannot impose a punishment that exceeds the penalty imposed by a UEFA disciplinary body (*cf.* CAS 2017/A/5498, paras 59-69).
 - The Applicants submit that they reasonably believed that the punishment applied in UEFA competitions only and had the CEDB intended to impose a punishment applicable to all representative competitions, it should have expressly stated "for a total of two (2) representative competitions" instead of expressly referencing "UEFA competitions".
 - An appeal to this Panel constitutes new proceedings (Article 16 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules for the Olympic Games (the "CAS Ad Hoc Rules")) and permits the examination of any claim. The unexpected application of the punishment to the OFT prevented the Applicants from making a timely protest.
 - It should also be noted that while decisions of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee are ordinarily appealed to the FIFA Appeals Committee, the urgent nature of the present matter precludes the exhaustion of FIFA's internal remedies (Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules). The impending Olympic Games constitute sufficient reason to bring the application without exhausting FIFA's internal remedies.

- As an alternative argument, the Player was due to participate in a friendly match on 26 March 2024 between Israel and Bosnia, which was cancelled at UEFA's behest and under those circumstances it would be reasonable that the Player has effectively served one match of his suspension, leaving only one match remaining.

b. Applicants' Requests for Relief

29. The Applicants' request for relief is as follows

- 1) *The FIFA Disciplinary Committee's decision of 22 July 2024 be annulled and set aside;*
- 2) *Mr Revivo be permitted to participate in the first Olympic match [and all subsequent Olympic matches]; and*
- 3) *Alternatively the cancelled match between Israel and Bosnia be recognised as one of the suspended matches, allowing Mr Revivo to participate in the team's second Olympic match.*

B. The Respondent

a. Respondent's Submissions

30. The Respondent's submissions may be summarized, in essence, as follows:

- The Appealed Decision declared the Protest inadmissible because it was filed late by IFA. The issue is whether or not the FIFA Disciplinary Committee was right to issue the declaration of inadmissibility.
- According to Article 10.3 ROFT any protest regarding the eligibility of players for the OFT was to be filed at the latest five days before the first match. The first match is scheduled to be played on 24 July 2024 and therefore any protest should have been filed no later than 19 July 2024.
- The Applicants allege that the Player's suspension for two matches of the OFT only came to their attention "*by chance*" and "*only*" as part of a presentation slide in the Team Arrival Meeting held on 21 July 2024. However, the Applicants would have been aware of the Player's two-match suspension from the point the CEDB Decision was notified on 23 April 2024, and as members of UEFA, should have been aware of the relevant provisions on enforcement of suspensions in the UEFA DR (*cf.* Article 68 UEFA DR).
- The Applicants have focussed their application on the merits of the eligibility and have not challenged the inadmissibility of the Protest; the application should be dismissed for that reason alone.
- The Respondent also has serious doubts as to whether the present matter can be adjudicated in the absence of UEFA as a Respondent. The issue of enforcement of the CEDB Decision is an issue pertaining to UEFA as it was taken in accordance

with the UEFA DR and the relief sought by the Applicants, and the issues under discussion directly impact on UEFA's rights.

- For the sake of completeness, the Respondent considers that Article 68.4(a) UEFA DR clearly establishes how match suspensions imposed on players participating in representative team competitions are to be enforced. In principle, the suspension must be carried forward to the next UEFA competition in the same age category unless it can be served during an Olympic tournament first. The OFT is to be played before the next UEFA senior men's representative team competition is scheduled, so the Player's suspension shall be served in it.
- There is no violation of the principle of legality, because of the clear wording of the UEFA DR. The Applicants' purported ignorance of the UEFA DR does not exempt them from complying with the UEFA DR provisions. UEFA's reference to "*UEFA representative team competition matches*" is standard and not incompatible with the enforcement of suspensions under Article 68.4(a) UEFA DR. The fact that UEFA expressly confirmed to FIFA on 16 July 2024 that the Player was to serve the suspension in the OFT supports FIFA's view that the UEFA CEDB did not decide on any different form of enforcement of the Player's suspension.
- The Panel cannot adjust the Player's eligibility to participate in the first two matches of the OFT on the basis that the Player has served one suspension due to the cancellation of the Israel v Bosnia friendly match originally scheduled for 26 March 2024 because: i) such a determination cannot be made in the absence of UEFA as a respondent; ii) UEFA confirmed that it does not consider that the Player has served any suspension derived from the CEDB Decision; iii) the CEDB Decision and Article 68.4(a) UEFA DR expressly refer to serving the suspension in "*competition matches*" (so not friendly matches); and iv) Article 70 UEFA DR provides that a match suspension is only regarded as served under certain circumstances which are not applicable in the present dispute.

b. Respondent's Requests for Relief

- 1) *Rejecting the requests for relief sought by the Applicants;*
- 2) *Confirming the DC Decision; and*
- 3) *Ordering the Applicants to bear the full costs of these arbitration proceedings.*

C. The Interested Parties

31. The First Interested Party submitted that "*it believed that sports will be given justice and Olympic values will be promoted in general and in particular*" and it requested that "*the Honourable Panel will be asked to accept the appeal of IFA and the athlete*".
32. The Second Interested Party was unable to attend the hearing, but in response to a question posed by the Panel stated that the wording used in the CEDB Decision was "*standard wording*" used in a disciplinary decision that imposes a suspension against a player in representative team competitions.

V. JURISDICTION AND ADMISSIBILITY

33. Rule 61.2 of the Olympic Charter provides as follows:

“61 Dispute Resolution

[...]

2. 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 (CAS), in accordance with the Code of Sports-Related Arbitration”.

34. Furthermore, Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules provides as follows:

“Article 1. Application of the Present Rules and Jurisdiction of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS)

The purpose of the present Rules is to provide, in the interests of the athletes and of sport, for the resolution by arbitration of any disputes covered by Rule 61 of the Olympic Charter, insofar as they arise during the Olympic Games or during a period of ten days preceding the Opening Ceremony of the Olympic Games.

In the case of a request for arbitration against a decision pronounced by the IOC, an NOC, an International Federation or an Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, the claimant must, before filing such request, have exhausted all the internal remedies available to him/her pursuant to the statutes or regulations of the sports body concerned, unless the time needed to exhaust the internal remedies would make the appeal to the CAS Ad Hoc Division ineffective.”

35. The Appealed Decision was rendered on 22 July 2024.

36. The Panel notes that the Respondent objects to the jurisdiction of the CAS Ad Hoc Division, alleging i) that the Applicants have not exhausted the applicable internal remedies according to Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, and ii) that the dispute does not have sufficient “*connection to*” the Olympic Games in accordance with Rule 61.2 of the Olympic Charter.

37. With regard to i), the Respondent submits, that the Applicants should first have lodged an appeal against the Appealed Decision before the FIFA Appeal Committee under Articles 60-61 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code (the “FIFA DC”) which reads, inter alia, as follows:

“60. Jurisdiction

1.The Appeal Committee is competent to decide on appeals against any of the Disciplinary Committee’s decisions that FIFA regulations do not declare as final or referable to another body, as well as on cases referred by the chairperson of the Disciplinary Committee or their deputy for consideration and decision

2.The Appeal Committee is also competent to decide appeals against decisions of the Ethics Committee, as set out in the FIFA Code of Ethics.

[...]

38. In accordance with the mentioned disposition of the FIFA DC, the Panel observes and is satisfied that, indeed, the Applicants should have, in the first place, challenged the Appealed Decision with the FIFA Appeal Committee, since the Appealed Decision clearly falls within the jurisdiction of that Committee.
39. The Panel finds as a starting point that, in strict compliance with Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, the Applicants have not exhausted the internal remedies of FIFA, which should result, in principle, in the CAS Ad Hoc Division not having jurisdiction to hear the present case, unless the Panel is satisfied that *“the time needed to exhaust the internal remedies would make the appeal to the CAS Ad Hoc Division ineffective”* (Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules).
40. The Panel agrees with the Panel in OG 22/004 (63) that the extraordinary character of the specific exception provided for at Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules shall *“be applied only in particular circumstances of, e.g., extreme, evidenced urgency. The assessment of the possible application of the exception to the need to exhaust the internal remedies has to be assessed on a case by case basis and in consideration of all circumstances of the particular case. In addition, the Panel notes that the burden to prove the existence of exceptional circumstances justifying a departure from the principle of exhaustion lies on the applicant, which shall prove the “illusory character” of the internal legal remedies (s. MAVROMATI/REEB, The Code of the Court of Arbitration for Sport: Commentary, Cases and Materials, n. 35 ad Article R47 of the Code)”*
41. The Panel notes that the Applicants have underlined the utmost urgency of the present matter and the need to have the dispute decided no later than 7:00 pm on 24 July 2024 to allow the Player to be named as part of Israel’s team list in its first match of the OFT against Mali to be played on the same date at 9:00 pm.
42. As the Appealed Decision was issued on 22 July 2024, the Panel notes that there would be only two days between the date of the Appealed Decision and the date of the first match in which the Player could potentially participate.
43. Based on the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that the Applicants could not reasonably be expected to instigate proceedings before the FIFA Appeal Committee, obtain a decision from the committee and eventually file an application with the CAS Ad Hoc Division in due time for such appeal to be effective.
44. While the Panel notes the essential need to comply with the formality of exhausting internal remedies, failing which jurisdiction shall be denied, the Panel appreciates the urgency, considering the impending match against Mali, and that the time taken for proceedings in the Appeal Committee to be adjudicated could render the appeal to the CAS Ad Hoc Division ineffective.
45. Therefore, considering that the present dispute concerns the question of the Player’s eligibility for the game between Mali and Israel scheduled for 24 July 2024 at 9:00 pm and the risk imposed by the time needed to exhaust the internal remedies in making the appeal to the CAS Ad Hoc Division ineffective, the Panel exceptionally believes that, in the light of the specific circumstances of the present case and based on the

considerations above, the CAS Ad Hoc Division has jurisdiction over the present matter in accordance with the specific exception under Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules.

46. With regard to ii), the Panel is not persuaded by the Respondent's submission that the present dispute lacks sufficient "connection to the Olympic Games". Indeed, the material issue of this dispute is the Player's eligibility for the OFT matches in Paris, even if the FIFA Appeal Committee dismissed the Protest because it was inadmissible and even if the dispute might be centred on the enforcement of the CEDB Decision issued by UEFA.
47. In view of the above, the Panel affirms that it has jurisdiction over the present dispute.
48. The admissibility of the Application is not disputed.

VI. APPLICABLE LAW

49. Under Article 17 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, the Panel must decide the dispute "*pursuant to the Olympic Charter, the applicable regulations, general principles of law and the rules of law, the application of which it deems appropriate.*"
50. FIFA submits that in the context of the present dispute the ROFT constitute the applicable law to the matter at hand and subsidiarily Swiss law shall be applied should the need arise to fill a possible gap in the FIFA regulations. In addition, the UEFA DR may also apply concerning the matter of the Player's eligibility.
51. The Applicants did not address the issue of applicable law, however, in their Application, references are made to the FIFA regulations and the UEFA DR.
52. Based on the above, the Panel notes that this dispute primarily arises under the ROFT, and the Panel determines that the applicable law are the FIFA regulations and subsidiarily Swiss law should the need arise to fill a possible gap in the regulations.
53. Finally, the Panel observes that the Parties invited the Panel to apply the UEFA DR, and the Panel will consider the application of these regulations, if it deems appropriate and only, if necessary, as part of a discussion on the merits.

VII. DISCUSSION

A. Legal framework

54. According to Article 16 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, the Panel has "*full power to establish the facts on which the application is based*".

B. Merits

55. This dispute involves a challenge to FIFA's enforcement of a sanction imposed by the CEDB in the OFT. It is not one that involves a challenge to a sanction imposed by one of FIFA's own disciplinary bodies.

56. The Panel observes that on 16 July 2024, at FIFA’s request, UEFA provided a list of players and officials who had pending suspensions to be served during the OFT. The list recorded the Player’s name as follows:

| Team | Player | DOB | Suspension | Offence | DC | Next Olympic game match scheduled | Match |
|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Israel_Men Team A | Roy Revivo | 22/05/2003 | 2 | Serious rough play | 38309-EURO-2023/24 | 24/07/2024 | Mali v Israel |
| | | | | | | 27/07/2024 | Israel v Paraguay |

57. During the hearing, FIFA confirmed that it made the same request of all confederations, not only UEFA.
58. The Applicants do not challenge FIFA’s power to enforce a sanction imposed by another football organisation’s disciplinary body, in its own tournament; they challenge FIFA’s enforcement of the CEDB Decision in the OFT because the wording of the CEDB Decision permits enforcement only in “*UEFA representative competitions*”.
59. The effect of FIFA’s enforcement of the two-match suspension is that the Player is ineligible to participate in the Israel men’s team’s first two matches of the OFT.
60. The ROFT apply to the organisation and participation of national representative teams in the OFT. Article 10 ROFT provides that:

“ARTICLE 10: PROTESTS

10.1 For the purpose of these Regulations, protests are objections of any kind relating to events or matters that have a direct effect on matches, including but not limited to the state of and markings on the pitch, accessory match equipment, eligibility of players, stadium installations and footballs.

...

10.3 Protests regarding the eligibility of players nominated for matches shall be submitted via the FIFA Legal Portal at legalportal.fifa.com (cf. art. 18 par. 1 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code) no later than five days before the first match of the Tournaments. Such protests shall be dealt with by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee.”

61. The requirement to lodge eligibility protests no later than five days before the first match of the tournament was also outlined in *Circular No. 6 Olympic Football Tournaments Paris 2024: Disciplinary Matters* dated 10 April 2024 that FIFA sent to all member associations that had qualified for the OFT or were still competing in preliminary qualification competitions.
62. The Panel notes that the first OFT match is on 24 July 2024 and that the deadline to lodge a protest under Article 10.3 ROFT was 19 July 2024.

63. The Panel accepts that the Protest was lodged in good faith on the basis of information outlined in a presentation delivered on 21 July 2024 and when IFA appreciated that FIFA would enforce the CEDB Decision in the OFT.
64. Nevertheless, it considers that the FIFA Disciplinary Committee was correct to rule the Protest inadmissible in the Appealed Decision because it was filed late. The Panel notes in this regard that the CEDB Decision was rendered on 23 April 2024, after the last match of the UEFA Euro 2024 Qualifiers for the Israel men's team, and considers that the Applicants, and in particular, IFA, should have known of Article 68.1 and Article 68.4(a) UEFA DR that relates to carrying over match suspensions to be served in other competitions, and therefore had time to bring a protest under ROFT and/or clarify with UEFA when the suspension would be satisfied.
65. The Panel considers, however, that even if the Protest had been raised earlier, it is not within the FIFA Disciplinary Committee's competence to interpret a CEDB Decision.
66. The Panel further observes that pursuant to Article 69 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code, FIFA appears to have the power to enforce sanctions imposed in confederation competitions that have not been served in the competition in which they are imposed, in its own tournaments. The Panel considers, therefore, that in the present circumstances, FIFA is only acting to enforce a sanction on information provided by UEFA and is not responsible for the accuracy, or otherwise, of that information.
67. It is IFA's responsibility to ensure that its players are eligible to play in matches in the OFT (*cf.* Article 26 ROFT and Article 17 Regulations on the Olympic Football Tournament 2024 (Preliminary Competition)). Any challenge to the scope of application of the CEDB Decision, or whether part of the sanction was satisfied by the cancellation of the match between Israel and Bosnia, is an issue for UEFA to resolve - because it is a CEDB Decision - and not FIFA.
68. The Panel notes the Appealed Decision's conclusion that the Protest is inadmissible under the ROFT. While the Appealed Decision refers the Applicants to Article 68(1) UEFA DR, the Panel considers that it does so only for the Applicants' information. The reference to the UEFA DR is not demonstrative of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee applying the regulation.
69. The Panel is unable to rule on whether the sanction was partially satisfied by the cancellation of the match between Israel and Bosnia because it would involve interpreting the CEDB Decision, and interpreting and applying the UEFA DR.
70. Finally, the Panel notes the Respondent's submission regarding standing to be sued, but as the Panel finds that FIFA rightfully deems the Protest inadmissible, it considers that the submission does not require an answer (*cf.* CAS 2022/A/9044, para 88 and CAS 2016/A/4903, para 81).
71. The Panel appreciates that this decision will be disappointing for the Applicants, in particular the Player who attended the hearing and explained to the Panel what participation in an Olympic Games would mean to him. The Panel notes that the Player is not excluded from the Olympic Games as he will be eligible to play at least one match during the OFT. The Panel is, however, unable to provide the relief requested by the Applicants, for the reasons set out above.

72. Accordingly, the Panel dismisses the application.

VIII. COSTS

73. Article 22 para. 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules provides that the services of the CAS Ad Hoc Division “*are free of charge*”.

74. Article 22 para. 2 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, provides that parties to CAS Ad Hoc proceedings “*shall pay their own costs of legal representation, experts, witnesses and interpreters*”.

75. Accordingly, there is no order as to costs.

IX. CONCLUSION

76. In view of the above considerations, the Applicants’ application filed on 23 July 2024 is dismissed.

DECISION

The Ad Hoc Division of the Court of Arbitration for Sport renders the following decision:

The application filed by the Israel Football Association and Mr. Roy Revivo on 23 July 2024 is dismissed.

Operative part: Paris, 24 July 2024

Award with grounds: Paris, 26 July 2024

THE AD HOC DIVISION OF THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

~~Mr. Lars Hilliger~~
President of the Panel

Professor Song Lu
Arbitrator

Dr Leanne O'Leary
Arbitrator