



SPORT  RESOLUTIONS <sup>(UK)</sup>  
SPECIALIST INDEPENDENT DISPUTE SERVICE

---

ANNUAL REPORT 2013 - 2014



# CONTENTS

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

---

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT	2
2013-14 REVIEW OF THE YEAR	5

## **SPORT RESOLUTIONS**

---

ARBITRATION & MEDIATION CENTRE	6
SEMINAR PROGRAMME REVIEW	8

## **NATIONAL ANTI-DOPING PANEL**

---

PRESIDENT'S REPORT	10
UK ANTI-DOPING V CRAIG WINDSOR JNR	12

## **NATIONAL SAFEGUARDING PANEL**

---

PRESIDENT'S REPORT	14
COACH X V NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY	16

## **ATHLETE SELECTION & ELIGIBILITY**

---

ATHLETE S V NATIONAL ICE SKATING ASSOCIATION	18
--	----

## **CASE MANAGEMENT**

---

SR 2013-14 CONCLUDED CASES	20
2013-14 STATISTICS	22
MANAGEMENT BOARD	24

## CHAIRMAN'S REPORT



My first year as Chairman has been an exciting and challenging one for Sport Resolutions. I have tried to build upon the hard work of my predecessor Gerard Elias QC. All involved in Sport Resolutions owe Gerard a great vote of thanks for his hard work and success in taking us forward. It has been important to ensure continuity as well as trying to achieve growth during the past year. In today's economic climate, Sport Resolutions recognises the pressures on Government funding and is keen to grow and expand alternative sources of income whilst maintaining and protecting our key values of independence and integrity.

Firstly, may I thank all the directors of Sport Resolutions for their support during my first year as Chairman. We have seen recent changes in the directors nominated by our member organisations with Ian Braid, for the British Athletes Commission, Adam Horne for the British Paralympic Association and Shahab Uddin replacing Sara Sutcliffe for the British Olympic Association, working alongside our independent non-executive directors.

We have made special efforts to link more closely with our member organisations with visits to meet the key sporting organisations in Cardiff, Belfast,

Glasgow and Edinburgh. These are important in demonstrating that we are a UK body not solely "London centric" and are keen to strengthen our wider UK activities and involvement. I was delighted to support the elections of Richard Hendicott, of the Welsh Sports Association, to the Deputy Chairmanship of the board and of Keith McGarry, of the Northern Ireland Sports Forum, to the Management Board.

Our work in the ever more important area of child safeguarding in sport continues to grow and recent events only emphasise the vital need in our society for this service and the expertise of the National Safeguarding Panel, under the leadership of its President Stephen Bellamy James QC.

Once again I must thank UK Sport for its continued support of our work and efforts. The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) has agreed to extend our contract to operate the National Anti-Doping Panel (NADP) for a further year under the Presidency of Peter Leaver QC and we intend to grow our efforts and expertise in this vital area and to continue to work with DCMS and UK Anti-Doping in future years.

The Secretariat had its busiest year so far, in responding to 222 case enquiries and helping to resolve 115 disputes, with most matters arising from safeguarding, anti-doping, athlete selection, match-fixing and the regulation of professional football. In some cases the consequences have proved to be very serious for those concerned.

We must remain alert to the fact that with increased profile comes

greater scrutiny and the need to ensure that our performance in all our areas of business is constantly of the highest standard.

This could not happen without the skills and strength of all the people who work for us and contribute in so many ways to our growing reputation. May I thank the arbitrators and mediators on our panels for their commitment to working with all relevant parties to resolve the disputes that come before us. We are very fortunate to have skilled, committed, experienced and enthusiastic staff, growing in number under the able leadership of Ed Procter and Richard Harry. Ross Macdonald runs the office as efficiently as he does his triathlons. Jen Lincoln, Chris Lavey and Jo Parry have helped to run a highly efficient casework service and Honor Lansdell has made a big difference to our marketing efforts and our presence on social media platforms. On behalf of the directors may I thank all the staff for their individual and collective contributions to our success.

Our big challenge is to keep our independence and integrity whilst at the same time increasing our efforts to diversify our income sources. We recognise the issues and problems in doing this but hope that with the continued support of the growing numbers of sporting organisations and people who use our services, the abilities and commitment of our panel members, excellent professional staff and the valuable contributions of our directors, we can continue to achieve our objectives.

**Peter Crystal**



## 2013-14 REVIEW OF THE YEAR



Edward Procter

Executive Director Ed Procter looks back at another busy and successful year for Sport Resolutions. It saw the launch of the National Safeguarding Panel, the delivery of a successful seminar programme and the resolution of over 100 disputes involving allegations of match-fixing, discrimination, anti-doping, child protection and athlete selection and eligibility.

### APRIL to JUNE

The National Safeguarding Panel completes its first cases having finalised its procedural rules and protocol for undertaking child protection investigations.

Sport Resolutions' Non-Executive Director Di Ellis is made a Dame in the Queen's Birthday Honours List, recognising a lifetime's commitment to sport.

Boxer, Craig Windsor Jnr, receives a ban of three years and nine months from the National Anti-Doping Panel following an online confession to having taken anabolic steroids.

### JULY to SEPTEMBER

Sport Resolutions appoint former national schools tennis champion Honor Lansdell to a newly created Marketing role.

Office Manager Ross Macdonald completes the Zurich Ironman challenge in under ten hours in searing 36 degree heat.

A Sport Resolutions tribunal chaired by Adam Lewis QC bans snooker player Stephen Lee for eight years on charges of match-fixing.

### OCTOBER to DECEMBER

Sport Resolutions kicks off a series of eight seminars with "How to avoid, manage and resolve conflict in sport" led by mediation panel members Neil Goodrum and Chris Newmark.

Executive Director Ed Procter and Dispute Resolution Manager Richard Harry give a presentation on child protection in sport to a Law and Sport Conference hosted by the Northern Ireland Law Society in Belfast.

### JANUARY to MARCH

Glasgow 2014 announces a Commonwealth Games pro bono legal advice and representation service which is to be operated by Sport Resolutions in conjunction with the Law Society of Scotland and the Faculty of Advocates.

Sport Resolutions tribunals help to resolve athlete selection appeals in the sports of speed-skating and bobsleigh for the Winter Olympic Games in Sochi.

An independent tribunal convened by Sport Resolutions under FA Rule K dismisses a legal challenge to a red card given to West Ham striker Andy Carroll in a Premier League game against Swansea City.

## ARBITRATION & MEDIATION CENTRE



"I have no doubt we will use your venue again in the future."



"The centre was excellent and the Tribunal appreciated the lightness of the main room."

"Thanks to @SportRes\_UK for the meeting room today – good value, great location just off Fleet Street."

**I Trust Sport**  
(@itrustsport)



### Arbitration and Mediation Centre offers private refuge in the heart of London

Since opening in March 2011, Sport Resolutions' 1 Salisbury Square arbitration and mediation centre has provided the venue for the resolution of numerous sporting and non-sporting disputes. This has included all London based National Anti-Doping Panel hearings, athlete selection appeals, safeguarding tribunals and various appeals and arbitrations for 30 different sports including football, cricket, rugby union and tennis. All have been resolved in a purposely designed building overlooking a quiet square at the St Paul's Cathedral end of Fleet Street, a few minutes walk from Blackfriars and City Thameslink stations.

Offering a main hearing room and four breakout rooms, the centre is also proving a popular venue for mediation. All rooms are sound proofed and clients like the fact that the centre is self contained

giving them sole use. Additional privacy is offered by locating opposing parties on different floors with access to separate facilities. The centre also leads out onto a quiet and leafy square with numerous benches which allow users to grab some fresh air and collect their thoughts away from the intensity of an arbitration or mediation.

#### Centre Manager Ross Macdonald explained:

*"Whilst our main focus is sport we welcome organisations and individuals from all other sectors. We often take bookings for board meetings, seminars and workshops as well as for hearings and mediations. All the rooms have large windows which bring in natural daylight and come equipped with free WI-FI, climate control system and Nespresso coffee machines"*

**For centre enquiries please contact Ross on 020 7036 1966 or [rmacdonald@sportresolutions.co.uk](mailto:rmacdonald@sportresolutions.co.uk)**



"I can only say positive things about the venue, convenience, lunch and facilities."

## SEMINAR PROGRAMME REVIEW

### Case studies are key to seminar programme success

187 delegates from 32 different sports attended Sport Resolutions' autumn and spring seminar programme to learn lessons arising from recent cases involving athlete selection, anti-doping and child protection. All seminars were led by experienced members of Sport Resolutions' panel of arbitrators and mediators.

The seminars were designed to provide a forum for delegates to discuss and examine issues using practical case study material. Numbers were restricted to provide an interactive learning experience for all who attended. Feedback was very positive, with 74% of delegates rating the seminars as excellent.

Date	Seminar Title	Seminar Leaders
October	How to avoid, manage and resolve conflict and disputes in sport	Neil Goodrum Christopher Newmark
November	How to manage athlete selection	Richard Harry William Norris QC
November	How to investigate safeguarding concerns in sport	Kim Doyle Carol Chamberlain
January	Case Histories: Lessons to be learnt from doping cases in sport	Richard Harry Christopher Quinlan QC
February	How to run a model sport disciplinary process	Jane Mulcahy QC Dan Saoul
March	How to be an effective panel member in sport tribunals	Nicholas Stewart QC

Sport Resolutions now looks forward to welcoming delegates to its 2014-15 seminar programme.

"Great seminar with @SportRes\_UK today on disciplinary procedures. Lots of best practice to work on."

**Jon Napier**  
(@NapierJon)



"Thoroughly interesting day at @SportRes\_UK looking at Sports Disciplinary processes. Lots of useful info shared and discussed."

**Rebecca Morgan**  
(@Bec\_m\_84)



"Good mix of presentation styles and audience participation."

## PRESIDENT'S REPORT



In the last year the National Anti-Doping Panel (NADP) has dealt with a wide range of anti-doping rule violations ranging from positive tests to possession and trafficking.

In my last Annual Review I commented on the number of methylhexanamine (MHA) cases that were coming before the NADP. The panel has not seen such a case now since March 2013, hopefully a sign that the message is getting out to athletes of the risk of ingesting this substance through the taking of supplements.

Over the last year there has been an even split of cases between analytical and non-analytical. Of the analytical, the substances included MHA, amphetamines, ephedrine and oxilofrine.

It is noteworthy that an increasing number of referrals to the NADP are of a non-analytical nature. These include cases involving use, possession and trafficking. The decisions that have been handed down in such cases reflect their

seriousness, attracting sanctions ranging from 3 years and 9 months up to 8 years.

The NADP has also received its first referral utilising the athlete biological passport system. This is the first case of its type in the UK and will independently test the robustness of the use of the passport as an anti-doping tool. I am sure that the wider anti-doping community will be watching the outcome of this case quite carefully, as it may affect whether sports choose to utilise the system and influence how other National Anti-Doping Organisations (NADO's) use information obtained through the passport in shaping charges against athletes.

At the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) Conference in November 2013 in Johannesburg, the final draft of the 2015 Code was agreed by global stakeholders. The new 2015 Code will come in to effect in January 2015.

There are some notable changes from the current version, including the increase of the standard sanction from the existing two years up to four years. The rationale for this change is that whilst the current Code provides for an increase of sanction where there are "aggravating circumstances", this is not widely applied.

The intention from 2015 is that the standard four year sanction

will apply to intentional cheating. Whilst the Code sets out how this is to be determined, it will be interesting to see how panels will interpret and apply these new provisions.

Another change sees an attempt to deal more effectively with those individuals who work with athletes, such as coaches, trainers and other support personnel. International Federations are now required to adopt rules which obligate the National Federations to require such support personnel to agree to the results management processes of the relevant NADO's.

Along the same lines, athletes can also potentially commit an Anti-Doping Rule Violation (ADRV) if they associate with a prohibited person, although they must first receive written notification from the NADO that they are doing so and be required to desist from such association from receipt of the notification.

Once again, I would like to thank all members of the NADP for their continued excellence, and to the NADP Secretariat at Sport Resolutions for their efficiency and professionalism. In its short life, the NADP has become acknowledged as an example of excellence in the fight against doping.

  
**Peter Leaver QC**



## UK ANTI-DOPING V CRAIG WINDSOR JNR

### Background

The athlete, a professional boxer, was charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations (ADRV's) under Article 2.2 and Article 2.6 (use and possession of a Prohibited Substance) of the World Anti-Doping Code (WADA Code). The substances involved were the anabolic steroids oxandrolone and stanozolol. The charges were brought by UK Anti-Doping (UKAD) which relied upon admissions made by the athlete in messages sent to another athlete on the social networking website Facebook. In the Facebook conversation, the athlete stated the substances that he was taking and described the effects and benefits on his body and performance. The case was referred to the National Anti-Doping Panel (NADP) for resolution under the Anti-Doping Rules of the British Boxing Board of Control.

### Reasoning and

#### Decision of the Tribunal

The athlete initially denied the charges and argued that he could not be charged when he had not tested positive. Despite his protestations, the athlete subsequently made an admission at the start of the hearing. The Tribunal therefore considered

the length of sanction only. UKAD argued that aggravating circumstances were present that justified a period of ineligibility greater than the standard period of two years. The athlete accepted that aggravating circumstances were present, namely that:

1. the ADRV's involved the possession of multiple Prohibited Substances and the use was over a significant period;
2. the athlete had specifically planned his doping in preparation for the nuances of his sport, and
3. the athlete only admitted the ADRV's on the day of the hearing.

The Tribunal was satisfied that there were aggravating circumstances and ruled it appropriate to impose an increased period of ineligibility of 3 years and nine months.

#### Analysis

This case highlights the fact that an athlete does not have to provide a positive sample to be charged with an ADRV and shows how facts can be established by any reliable means, including admissions and conversations on social media.





## PRESIDENT'S REPORT



The first full year of the National Safeguarding Panel (NSP) has seen various national governing bodies of sport amending their rules and regulations so they can refer safeguarding matters to the Panel. There has been a growing awareness amongst sporting bodies that in order to protect themselves from criticism they require an independent body of experts to arbitrate in relation to safeguarding children and vulnerable adults in sport.

Recent well-publicised reports affecting the safety of children, including the Jimmy Savile scandal, the cases of Max Clifford, Stuart Hall and others, have highlighted the effects such scandals have on organisations but above all of the need to be vigilant to ensure the safety of children in a variety of environments.

Every day huge numbers of children participate in some form of sporting activity. Research has revealed that traditionally their safety has not received the attention it needs. The sporting environment is no exception to children being abused but historically there has been a poor response to it. This is changing but often too slowly.

Often the safeguarding measures that are in place are not adequate or not properly followed and the standard and quality of investigation can vary. Slowly these matters are being dealt with but some sporting bodies still have not fully grasped the need for an independent authority, outside their own internal bodies, to adjudicate upon them. Good progress has been made within the sporting world to put in place standards and procedures for dealing with the safeguarding of children. The challenge for sporting bodies is to develop expertise in properly managing and investigating safeguarding complaints and to recognise when external professional help is required.

Sport Resolutions worked closely with the NSPCC Child Protection in Sport Unit on appointments to the NSP set against stringent criteria, in an open competition. As an independent body comprising child safeguarding experts drawn from a mix of legal, policing, social work, offender management and sport administration backgrounds the NSP is uniquely placed to provide this independent service.

The NSP both investigates safeguarding complaints and/or acts as an independent arbitration service on a wide range of safeguarding issues. Any National Governing Body or other sports organisation, which has a referral mechanism in its rules, can refer a matter to the NSP. Individuals who are the subject of an NGB decision may also refer or appeal to the NSP where NGB or NSP procedures allow this or there is clear consent of all parties to confer jurisdiction upon the NSP.

The past year has seen a number of referrals to the NSP. Investigations have been conducted on behalf of several NGB's where allegations have been made of bullying and historic sexual abuse and the Panel has been active in the regulatory field holding inquiries in a variety of sports. Increasingly, the NSP is being requested to review the processes and decisions that have already been concluded by NGB's, often in response to individual claims that those processes have not been fair.

A number of successful seminars on investigating safeguarding concerns in sport have been held with Sport Resolutions for all levels of safeguarding personnel. Due to their success future seminars are being planned.

The NSP itself is also keen to remain abreast of developments and good practice and holds regular review and training meetings. Recently we were privileged to receive a presentation from Professor Celia Brackenridge OBE on her distinguished and pre-eminent work in this field. The Panels' existing expertise is being constantly enhanced by both the referrals to it and these seminars.

The NSPCC and its CPSU have been hugely supportive of the Panel and its work along with UK Sport which has helped to fund essential secretariat services.

**Stephen Bellamy James QC**



## COACH V NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY

### Background

Coach X appealed the decision of a National Governing Body (“NGB”) Child Protection Committee to restrict his coach licence by excluding him from coaching children and young persons under the age of 18 years, due to the risk that he could pose to children and young people within the sport. The appeal was referred to Sport Resolutions in accordance with the appeal procedure of the NGB’s child protection policy. Following a de novo re-hearing the independent appeals panel dismissed the appeal and upheld the licence restriction.

### Reasoning and Decision of the Tribunal

The Child Protection Committee’s decision was made following a police investigation after Coach X acquired a DVD via a naturist website which contained images of naked girls. In a subsequent search of Coach X’s house, 18 indecent images of children were found on his computer, including two which depicted images of the most serious levels of child sexual abuse. One such image fell within Category 4 and one image fell within Category 5 of the COPINE Scale. Coach X denied accessing material showing nude pictures of

children for sexual gratification. His explanation was that the images must have appeared as unsolicited pop-ups from naturist websites he admitted frequently visiting.

The appeals panel ruled that once such material is found in a person’s possession, the evidential burden shifts to that person. Subsequently, they ruled that Coach X did not adduce sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the images were unsolicited and as a result, the appeal should be dismissed. The appeals panel upheld the decision of the Child Protection Committee to restrict Coach X’s coaching licence to the coaching of persons over the age of 18 given the risk that he could pose to children and young people within the sport.

### Analysis

This case highlights the need for NGBs to request and obtain relevant information from the police that may arise out of a criminal investigation, to support internal disciplinary proceedings. As with this case, criminal charges are often not pursued, leaving it to the NGB to establish the facts of a case and to decide the matter in accordance with its sporting rules and regulations.





## ATHLETE S V NATIONAL ICE SKATING ASSOCIATION

### Background

Athlete S appealed the decision of the National Ice Skating Association (NISA) Selectors not to nominate him for selection to the GB Non-Relay speed skating team at the 2014 Sochi Winter Olympic Games on the grounds that the NISA Selectors had not followed the published Selection Criteria. An Appeals Panel was appointed by Sport Resolutions in accordance with NISA's Selection Policy.

### Reasoning and Decision of the Tribunal

Athlete S appealed on the grounds that the NISA Selectors had not followed the published Selection Criteria when selecting the athlete to fill the third and final individual place available. The first two places went to the two highest ranked skaters from the World

Cup Rankings. In relation to the third place, the Selection Criteria stated that "the Performance Director will take into account performance indicators from the 2013/14 season and other past performances". Two athletes were eligible for selection for the third and final place, and Athlete R was selected over Athlete S. Athlete S argued that the Performance Director had failed to properly consider all relevant performance indicators and that had he done so, he would have selected Athlete S.

NISA's Performance Director stated in his selection decision that "the third place on the team is a Performance Director's selection and I continue with the same objective process that the third highest ranked skater from a single distance from World Cup

Rankings 1, 2, 3 and 4" should be selected. Athlete R, ranked third highest, was therefore selected and Athlete S, ranked fourth highest, was not selected.

The Appeals Panel noted that in his statement, the Performance Director added that whilst a subjective argument for both skaters could be made using training times, lower level competitions, relay tests and time trials, he had ultimately taken the view that as the skaters were similar in all areas, to make a decision using the World Cup ranking, as had been used for the first two skaters, was the fairest and most obvious objective analysis.

The Appeals Panel found that the Performance Director had not taken the decision in accordance with the Selection Criteria, as that required him to take into account information wider than the World Cup rankings. The Appeals Panel recognised that what weight to

give to the different elements of that wider information, including the 2013/14 World Cup performances, was to be a matter for the Performance Director's own fair and honest judgment, but he was not entitled to discard the wider information entirely.

The Appeals Panel therefore upheld the appeal, set aside the Performance Director's recommendation, and ordered that the Performance Director consider the selection afresh, taking into account performance indicators from the 2013/14 season and other past performances.

A second selection decision was made by the Performance Director and ratified by the NISA Selectors which again did not select Athlete S. Athlete S appealed against the second selection decision on the basis that it was made:

i) contrary to the Selection Criteria;

ii) contrary to natural justice and in particular to the duty on a sports governing body to take into account all relevant criteria when reaching decisions; and  
iii) contrary to the first Appeal Panel's direction that the Performance Director must take into account performance indicators that could reasonably have a bearing on his decision.

When the Performance Director informed Athlete S of his second selection decision he provided a two page document of written reasons for non-selection. The Appeals Panel stated that these reasons should not be approached as a carefully written judgment where any apparent contradiction or omission could lead readily to an inference that material factors had been disregarded or given unreasonable weight. The Panel noted that there is a difference between considering a criterion and then giving it little

or no weight and not giving it consideration at all.

The Appeals Panel found that whilst there were some errors in the second selection process, the Performance Director had followed the correct procedure. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

### Analysis

This case highlights the need for NGB's to follow and apply the criteria set out in a Selection Policy when going through the selection process. Applying different criteria, or disregarding criteria set out in the policy, may well give rise to a successful appeal if challenged.

The NGB must also follow the policy and/or the directions of an Appeals Panel when reconvening to re-consider selection. Any failure in this regard may result in an athlete appealing again on the basis that the correct process was not followed.

## SR 2013-14 CONCLUDED CASES

### Arbitration

Parties	Type of Dispute	Jurisdiction	Arbitrator(s)
Player vs FA	Anti-Doping	FA Rules	Christopher Quinlan QC
Doncaster Belles vs FA	Appeal	FA Rules	Craig Moore
Player vs FA	Anti-Doping	FA Rules	Blondel Thompson
Thurrock FC vs FA	Appeal	FA Rule K	David Casement QC
Kinsella vs FA	Anti-Doping Appeal	FA Rules	Christopher Quinlan QC
FA vs Anelka	Discipline & Integrity	FA Rules	Christopher Quinlan QC
West Ham United (Carroll) vs FA	Discipline & Integrity	FA Rule K	Nicholas Stewart QC
WPBSA vs Lee	Integrity & Discipline	WPBSA Rules	Adam Lewis QC
WPBSA vs Lee (1)	Integrity & Discipline Appeal	WPBSA Rules	Edwin Glasgow QC, Peter Stockwell
WPBSA vs Lee (2)	Integrity & Discipline Appeal	WPBSA Rules	Nicholas Stewart QC
Cowan & Others vs British Parachute Association	Employment & Discrimination	BPA Ltd Rules	Graham Stoker
Sport Wales	Independent Review 1 & 2	By consent of the parties	David Casement QC
Stanley vs NISA	Athlete Selection & Eligibility	NISA Rules	Nicholas Stewart QC, Janice Shardlow, Gordon Barnes
Stanley vs NISA (post-successful appeal)	Athlete Selection & Eligibility	NISA Rules	Nicholas Stewart QC
Athlete vs British Disabled Ski Team	Athlete Selection & Eligibility	Pursuant to NGB selection policy	Adam Lewis QC
Athlete vs British Swimming	Athlete Selection & Eligibility	British Swimming Rules	Robert Englehart QC
Athlete vs British Swimming	Funding Appeal	British Swimming Rules	Jane Mulcahy QC
Athlete vs British Bobsleigh	Athlete Selection & Eligibility	Pursuant to NGB selection policy	Adam Lewis QC

### National Anti-Doping Panel

Parties	Type of Dispute/Substance	Decision	Arbitrator(s)
British Boxing Board of Control UKAD vs Whyte	Stimulants (MHA)	Appeal dismissed	Charles Flint QC, Dr Barry O'Driscoll, Colin Murdock
British Boxing Board of Control UKAD vs Windsor	Application to lift provisional suspension	Application refused	Peter Leaver QC
British Boxing Board of Control Windsor vs UKAD	Anabolic Steroids	Three years, nine months ineligibility	Christopher Quinlan QC, Lorraine Johnson, Dr Barry O'Driscoll
British Boxing Board of Control Windsor vs UKAD	Appeal	Appeal dismissed	Peter Leaver QC
British Boxing Board of Control Anderson vs UKAD (Appeal)	Appeal	Appeal dismissed	Charles Flint QC, Dr Barry O'Driscoll, Lorraine Johnson
British Boxing Board of Control UKAD vs Hoffmann	Stimulant	Two years ineligibility	David Casement QC, Dr Kitrina Douglas, Lorraine Johnson
Welsh Rugby Union UKAD vs Colclough	Anabolic steroids (trafficking & possession)	Eight years ineligibility	Christopher Quinlan QC, Carole Billington-Wood, Dr Barry O'Driscoll
Welsh Rugby Union Colclough vs UKAD (Appeal)	Appeal	Appeal withdrawn	Paul Gilroy QC, Colin Murdock and Kitrina Douglas
British Boxing Board of Control UKAD vs P Tinklin	Anabolic steroids (trafficking)	Life time ineligibility	Paul Gilroy QC, Carole Billington-Wood, Dr Neil Townsend
Rugby Football League UKAD vs Kolasa	Sample refusal	Two years ineligibility	Matthew Lohn, Lorraine Johnson, Colin Murdock

Rugby Football League Kolasa vs UKAD (Appeal)	Appeal	15 months ineligibility	Tim Kerr QC, Dr Terry Crystal, Dr Neil Townshend
UCI UKAD vs Croall	Stimulants	Six months ineligibility	William Norris QC, Colin Murdock, Kitrina Douglas
Welsh Rugby Union UKAD vs Edwards	Application to lift provisional suspension	Application Refused	Peter Leaver QC
Welsh Rugby Union UKAD vs Edwards	Anabolic steroids (Possession & use)	Three Years	Christopher Quinlan QC, Dr Barry O'Driscoll, Lorraine Johnson

### National Safeguarding Panel

Parties	Reason	Jurisdiction	Panel Member
N vs National Governing Body	Safeguarding Appeal	Administered appointment heard under NGB Rules	Gillian Irving QC, Ian Wilson, Amanda Quirke
X vs National Governing Body	Safeguarding Appeal	Appointment heard under NGB Rules	Ian Wilson
National Governing Body	Safeguarding Review	Consent of parties	Kate Gallafent QC
National Governing Body	Investigation	Consent of parties	Carol Chamberlain
National Governing Body	Investigation	Consent of parties	Martyn Dew
National Governing Body	Chair Appointment for Disciplinary Appeal	Pursuant to NCB Disciplinary Rules	Kate Gallafent QC
National Governing Body	Safeguarding Review	Consent of parties	Carol Chamberlain
Individual vs National Governing Body	Safeguarding mediation	Consent of parties (withdrawn)	Jane Mulcahy QC

### Mediation

NGB	Type of Dispute	Jurisdiction	Mediator(s)
N vs National Governing Body	Integrity & Discipline	Mediation Agreement (withdrawn)	Jonathan Dingle
Manager vs Club	Commercial	Mediation Agreement	Jane Mulcahy QC
Club vs National Governing Body	Integrity & Discipline	Mediation Agreement	Paul Johnson
Agent vs Club	Commercial	Mediation Agreement	Christopher Newmark
NGB vs NGB	Commercial	Mediation Agreement	Jane Mulcahy QC
Athlete vs Agent	Commercial	Nomination	Confidential

*"Thanks again for your professional response to my request...SR acted in a genuine, straight and forthright way."*

## 2013-14 STATISTICS

**222** 222 requests for dispute resolution guidance and help

**115** 115 case referrals

**187** 187 delegates attending Sport Resolutions' seminars

**74%** 74% delegates give Sport Resolutions' seminars an "excellent" rating

**39** Helped to resolve disputes across 39 different sports

**30** 30 different sports used 1 Salisbury Square Arbitration and Mediation Centre



## MANAGEMENT BOARD



**Peter Crystal**  
Independent Chairman

Peter is a solicitor and expert in corporate finance and sports law. He is founder and senior partner of Memery Crystal LLP, as well as chairman and non-executive director of various public and private companies. Peter is also a trustee of several charities.



**Dame Di Ellis**  
Non-Executive Director

Di represents the Sport and Recreation Alliance and also sits on the board's Panel and Appointment Review Committee. Di was British Rowing's Chair for 24 years until 2013, when she was awarded a DBE, recognising a lifetime commitment to sport. She is now Honorary President of British Rowing.



**David Rigney**  
Independent Non-Executive Director

David is a qualified chartered accountant with extensive financial, human resource management and non-executive director experience. He is the Chairman of Bacs Payment Schemes Limited and also chair of Sport Resolutions' Finance and Human Resources Committee.



**Richard Hendicott**  
Vice-Chairman

Richard has represented the Welsh Sports Association on the Sport Resolutions board for 10 years, before becoming Vice-Chairman in 2013. He is a retired District judge and also a qualified golf referee.



**Richard Harry**  
Company Secretary

Richard is the Dispute Resolution Manager at Sport Resolutions. He is a sports lawyer, former Chief Executive of the Welsh Rugby Players' Association and consultant to the World Anti-Doping Agency.



**Trevor Watkins**  
Non-Executive Director

Trevor is a leading sports lawyer, heading up the sports legal team at Pinsent Masons. He is also a former Chairman of AFC Bournemouth and has previously been a divisional representative on the board of the Football League and a founding director of Supporters Direct. Trevor is also chair of Sport Resolutions' Marketing and Service Development Committee.



**Simon Cliff**  
Independent Non-Executive Director

Simon is General Counsel of Manchester City FC and a former corporate finance lawyer, who acted for Abu Dhabi United Group in its acquisition of Manchester City. Simon is also chair of the board's Panel and Appointment Review Committee.



**Keith McGarry**  
Non-Executive Director

Keith is a Solicitor Advocate who represents the Northern Ireland Sports Forum on the Sport Resolutions board. He also sits on the board's Finance and Human Resources Committee.



**Margot Daly**  
Independent Non-Executive Director

Margot is a business woman, accredited mediator and judge of the UK Competition Appeal Tribunal. She also sits on the board's Marketing and Service Development Committee and is Sport Resolutions' Equality Champion.



**Edward Procter**  
Executive Director

Ed is the Chief Executive Officer of Sport Resolutions. He has previously held senior roles for the Legal Services Commission and Sport England.

### Member Association Directors

Simon Barker – Professional Players' Federation  
John Kerr – Scottish Sports Association  
Warren Phelops – European Sponsorship Association  
Ian Braid – British Athletes' Commission  
Shahab Uddin – British Olympic Association  
Adam Horne – British Paralympic Association

### Secretariat

Edward Procter – Executive Director  
Richard Harry – Dispute Resolution Manager/Solicitor  
Ross Macdonald – Office Manager  
Jenefer Lincoln – Case Officer  
Chris Lavey – Case Assistant  
Joanna Parry – Case Assistant  
Honor Lansdell – Marketing Assistant



**Sport Resolutions (UK)**

**1 Salisbury Square London  
EC4Y 8AE**

**Tel: 0207 036 1966**

**Fax: 0207 936 2602**

**[resolve@sportresolutions.co.uk](mailto:resolve@sportresolutions.co.uk)**

**[www.sportresolutions.co.uk](http://www.sportresolutions.co.uk)**