THE AUSTRALIAN

Era of sports sitting in judgment on themselves is over

PAUL HAYES THE AUSTRALIAN 12:00AM May 27, 2017

The announcement this week by the federal Minister for Sport, Greg Hunt, that the government is considering the establishment of a sporting equivalent of the Court of Arbitration is a welcome first step in what could be a timely reform of national, and possibly, international sports governance.

In an era now where most sports have been professionalised, the minister and others are correct to assert that it is no longer appropriate for sports bodies to sit in judgment of themselves.

However, the real worth to the Australian sporting community of the proposed national integrity tribunal will depend on two elements: its availability and affordability; and, its legal structure and powers.

Participation in sport for many is an integral part of Australian life. However, unlike many other aspects of people's daily lives, sport is governed by a private contract between member and sports organisation, which incorporates into it a vast body of international rules and regulations. The fact that most of the world's sports participants (at all levels) are bound to the World Anti-Doping Code is a good example of the reach of international sports law.

When a member infringes the rules of a sports organisation to which he or she is contractually bound, natural justice requires that the member be entitled to a fair hearing before being subjected to any sanction.

Often, as is the case with anti-doping, integrity, off-field conduct, or Olympic selection disputes, these cases carry with them a layer of complexity due to the increased international regulation of sport in recent years.

For most Australian athletes involved in these types of disputes, a first-instance hearing will take place before either a domestic tribunal or the Court of Arbitration for Sport, which is legally anchored in Lausanne in Switzerland (no longer as "fast and affordable" as originally intended when it was established in 1984).

The government's proposal of a third way to determine sporting disputes through a central independent specialist sports tribunal is not a new idea. It has been a topic of discussion within the Australian sports law community for well over a decade.

Centralised government-backed sports disputes tribunals have operated in New Zealand and Canada with considerable success for some years. A similar tribunal (based on a mediation/arbitration model) is currently under development in Malaysia.

One of the main advantages of this form of sports justice is that disputes are determined by a common specialist panel, with the potential for more consistent outcomes to be reached for disputes common to most sports such as anti-doping and match-fixing.

The ability for sports organisations to "opt in" (possibly incentivised by being tied to Australian Sports Commission funding) would be a gentle way to introduce a sports tribunal to the local sporting community.

Another important feature is the ability to compel witnesses to attend before the tribunal and give evidence. The absence of this power in the Essendon doping dispute heard at first-instance before the AFL Anti-Doping Tribunal was starkly exposed when it was determined that subpoenas were not available to the parties to force other persons to produce documents and/or attend and give evidence in that proceeding.

Although a national sports tribunal will go some way towards improving sports justice in Australia, it should not be overlooked that it is impossible for any form of regulatory intervention in Australian sports governance to be a complete panacea to many of the problems currently inherent in Australian sport's administration.

That is because Australian sport remains all but a cog within the international sports system.

The fact that anti-doping cases heard at first instance will always remain subject to appeal to the CAS by reason of the World Anti-Doping Code is a good illustration of this point. Any real reform of sports governance therefore must take place at an international level.

Between 1999 and 2003, Australia played a key role in the establishment of the World Anti-Doping Agency and the International Convention Against Doping in Sport in 2005. Given Australia's good reputation on and off the sporting field, there is no reason why Australia could not once more take the lead in the development of a more harmonised body of international sports regulation.

Properly establishing a national sports tribunal is the first step in ensuring our homegrown attempts to reform sports justice doesn't result in just another kangaroo court.

Paul Hayes is a Melbourne barrister and international sports law expert



Fears for future of skiing

JACQUELIN MAGNAY

When the bureaucrats decide the allocation of funds for the next Olympiad they would do well to look at Greta Small's effort in the downhill.



Skaters cave in to public backlash

Era of sports sitting in judgment on themselves is over

Tearful South Korean speed skaters were forced to publicly apologise for sidelining one of their teammates in echoes of Australia's own internal strife.



\$300m blackhole could sink A-League

RAY GATT

A-League clubs are calling for FIFA to push through reforms by June or the national competition will face serious issues.



Shrunken Super Rugby eyes expansion

WAYNE SMITH SANZAAR and Rugby Australia are about to begin formal work on what guise Super Rugby will take in the future,



Ricciardo prangs new Red Bull

Daniel Ricciardo has crashed Red Bull's new Formula One car on its track debut.



Warner's T20 stars win series

Australia's new-look T20 side claimed tri-series honours with victory over New Zealand in a rain-disrupted final in Auckland.

A NOTE ABOUT RELEVANT ADVERTISING: We collect information about the content (including ads) you use across this site and use it to make both advertising and content more relevant to you on our network and other sites. This is also known as Online Behavioural Advertising. You can <u>find out more about our policy and your choices, including how</u> to opt-out here

A Back to top





Era of sports sitting in judgment on themselves is over

The Australian app	Our Products	Terms of U
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Download on the App Store	Editorial Code
DEE AURICALIAN* O	Download on the App Store	Standards of
A construction of the second s		Subscription t
	App Store	Group Subsc
	Download on the App Store	Accessibility
		Privacy Policy
		Relevant Ads
		Cookie Policy

Terms of Use
Editorial Code of conduct
Standards of Practice
Subscription terms
Group Subscription Terms
Accessibility
Privacy Policy
Relevant Ads Opt-out
Cookie Policy

Contact Us Help Contact Us info Photo Sales News Archive About Us About The Australian Advertise with us Our journalists Subscribe The Australian Plus member benefits Sign up to Newsletters Manage Your Newsletters

Copyright The Australian. All times AEST (GMT +10:00)