

Rethinking the pyramidal structure of sport

-An insight from the national perspective-

Marko Begović

German Sport University

Intro



What we are talking about?

❖ Natural entities?

- Athletes?
- Coaches?
- Referees/Delegates/Officials?
- Managers?
- Entourage?

Figure 1 - The pyramid structure of sport



Data source: European Commission, 1998 (adapted).

Dilemmas in methodological setting

- Jurisprudence
- Governance related theories
- Analytic method

Methodology

- Directions for research design
 - a) Formalistic
 - b) Structural
 - c) Functional

Fields of interest

- Position of stakeholders
- Governance
- Administration
- Dispute resolution mechanisms
- Control mechanism

Synthetic method

- Historical method
- Doctrinal research approach
- Desk research using HTA
- Focus groups with athletes

Findings

1. Normative setting and governance structure

- None of the NSFs adopted rules that limit terms of office.
- Only 1 NSF (6.7%) has no active politicians or decision-makers within public administration, while for 4 NSFs (26.7%) there is no available data.
- None of the NSFs publish the statement/report on remuneration or remuneration policy.

2. Administrative and organizational procedure

- None of the NSFs publish the Act on job classification and systematization of posts.
- Only 2 NSFs (13.3%) have strategy in place.
- Only 1 NSF (6.7%) has action plan in place.
- None of the NSFs adopted social responsibility, environmental protection, gender mainstreaming and anti-discrimination policies.

3. Dispute resolution and control mechanisms

- Only 3 NSFs (20%) have Ethics code in place.
- None of the NSFs adopted provisions that applies to decision-makers in regard to integrity, rules on expenses or conflict of interest.
- Only 1 NSF (6.7%) has an external audit procedure in place.
- None of the NSFs adopted integrated risk management and control system.

Legal aspect

- Adoption and enforceability of internal regulations
- Registration procedures
- Dispute resolution/arbitration proceedings
- Constitutionality of the Law on Sport?

4. Institutional position of athletes

- Only 2 NSFs (13.3%) envisaged within the statute that athletes could be represented within governance bodies.
- None of the NSFs foresees procedures to file an anonymous complaint.
- None of the NSFs foresees legal aid for athletes within dispute resolution processes.
- None of the NSFs foresees a procedure to choose arbitrator in arbitration proceedings.

Historical overview

- 1974 Constitution
- RSIZ
- SOFK

Analysis of the Sport Movement functionality 1980 – Socialist Republic of Montenegro

- Nepotism/cronyism
- Lack of implementation of delegate system
- Inability for association of natural entities
- Inadequate organizational culture
- The absence of selection procedure

Introduction of the good governance principles

- RSIZ Program from 1980
- "Program of activities on implementation and improvement of collective work and responsibility of one-year presidential mandate" - set of good governance principles

GG principles

- Enabling direct representation through appropriate delegate system
- Term limits
- Self-management control
- Transparency

Additional good governance principles for organization of competitions

- Representation/openness
- Amateurism
- Compliance
- Consistency
- Sustainability

Has anything change from 80s?

- Nepotism/cronyism
- Lack of implementation of delegate system
- Inability for association of natural entities
- Inadequate organizational culture
- The absence of selection procedure

Conclusion – way to go

- importance of critical thinking
- the need to develop and consolidate structure
- to anticipate and to define positions

GG principles

- Representation as a prerequisites – **direct representation**
- Balance in governance - **based on separation of powers**
- Accountability – **introduction of collegial decision-making system**

Thank you for your patience



Game Set Peace