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The tourism investment in Egypt affected by some changeable which are "opportunities and challenges for the tourism investment" which both of them plays an important role in the development of investment in any country.

Opportunities include protecting the production from nationalization or taking off, interesting with prived sector, reforming the customs system and taxation, increasing of free areas sitting up web sites for Egypt that can provide all details and information about investment in Egypt and issues the law for 1997.

On the other hand, there are some challenges which are the world crisis and inner wars and also the economic challenges which are in the continuous changes in the economic policies and also environmental challenges which are the pollution of both air and sea also legal obstacles such as there is not legal laws enough to protect the investor, human obstacles which are lack nesses workers and experts in the tourism field. Obstacles of infrastructure which are lack of basic services and lowness of its level.

The researcher also applied these opportunities and challenges for one of the upper Egypt governorate (Minia Governorate) through personal interviews which depend on the questionnaire.

**Study Problem:**

Although The tourism development calls for the justice of the investment distributions all over the country but the Government constricted on same areas especially the coastal, and natural areas where the tourism activities are found In Cairo and South Egypt where the elements and supports Of cultural Tourism are There also In The North Shore because Of the plenty of luxurious tourism
and neglect same other governorates and one formats ElMinia Which has A lot Of Elements Which attract The Investments But it still has no good Chance Of The Investment for example The amount of Investment in Cairo Through The period 2000 : 2009 was 13539.60 million and in Red sea was18119.03 milion and was in Luxor 799.83million and In Elminia government was4.65 so the researcher has done this study to know the problem which prevent the attraction of the tourism Investment and find the suitable solution to develop the tourism Minia Governorate through the tourism Investment.

**The limitation of the study:**

As a result of the difficult in estimating the volume of The Investment in the Tourism sector all over Egypt, the researcher concentrated on the Tourism companies and hotels which can be found in Minia Government which can tell us about the tourism in investment in Minia Governorate she chose the tourism companies and hotels in Minia Government because she can't deal with all the companies and hotels in Egypt in addition to The study aims generally to set eyes on the tourism investment in Egypt through knowing the investment atmosphere and what this include apportioned and challenge that face the tourism investment in Egypt .and it aims especially to:

1- Knowing challenge that face the tourism investment in Minia Governorate.

2- The study of the current position for the tourism investment in Minia. Governorate and knowing the available
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apportioned that face the tourism investment in Minia Governorate.

3- To show the importance of tourism investment in Minia governorate.

The hypotheses of the study:

The study based on testing 3 main suppositions

1- The infrastructure in Minia governorate encourage the investment.

2- The organized laws for the tourism investment don't have the clearness which agrees with protecting the rights of investor.

3- Vary challenge of tourism investment in Minia Governorate Concentrate on the tourism sector in Minia Governorate in this sector.

The objective of the study:

The study aims generally to set eyes on the tourism investment in Egypt through knowing the investment atmosphere and what this include apportioned and challenge that face the tourism investment in Egypt .and it aims especially to:

1- Knowing challenge that face the tourism investment in Minia Governorate

2- The study of the current position for the tourism investment in Minia governorate and knowing the available apportioned that face the tourism investment in Minia Governorate.

3-To show the importance of tourism investment in Minia governorate.
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The importance of the study:

The importance of the study appears through the going with the current governmental direction that interested in the development of the upper Egypt area as it try to set eyes on the chances and challenges that face of tourist investors in one of the upper Egypt government.

Methodology:

Limit the society and the sample: to achieve the goals of the study and supposition of the study the researcher depend on the whole count style of the whole all the companies and hotels that can be found in Minia Governorate.

The reference of collection the information:

The researcher depends on the following reference:
- Minor reference: which are books magazines that have relation with the study.
- Pilot study: which can be finding in interviews which depend on the questionnaire.

The structure of the study

The structure of the study includes the first chapter "Introduction" the second chapter "the definition and development of the investment the third chapter" investment environment in Egypt apportioned and challenges", the fourth chapter" apportioned and challenges tourism investment in Minia Government", the fifth chapter" material and methods", the six chapter "the results and discussion", and summery and conclusions "is the seven chapter.
PRESS RELEASE
FOOTBALL
CASE FC SION / EL-HADARY / FIFA / AL-AHLY
SPORTING CLUB:
THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT (CAS) REDUCES THE
FINANCIAL COMPENSATION DUE TO THE EGYPTIAN CLUB

Lausanne, 1 June 2010 - The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) has rendered its final decision in the arbitration between FC Sion (Switzerland), the Egyptian football player Essam El-Hadary, the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) and the Egyptian football club Al-Ahly Sporting Club. The CAS has stated that the appeal of FC Sion Association (amateur club) was inadmissible. The appeal of Essam El-Hadary has been partially upheld and the CAS has reduced the financial compensation for breach of contract, which was initially fixed at EUR 900'000 by FIFA, to an amount of USD 796'500. However, the sporting sanction

In June 2008, the club Al-Ahly filed a claim at FIFA to argue that Essam El-Hadary had breached his contract unilaterally and that FC Sion had induced the player to act in that way. The Egyptian club requested FIFA to impose sanctions and to order a financial compensation in its favour. On 16 April 2009, the FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber (DRC) ordered Essam El-Hadary to pay the amount of EUR 900'000 to Al-Ahly and decided that the "Swiss club FC Sion" be jointly liable for such payment. Furthermore, the FIFA DRC imposed a four-month suspension against the player and prevented the FC Sion (generic term) from registering any new players, either nationally or internationally, for the next two transfer periods

On 18 June 2009, the FC Sion Association, on one hand, and Essam El-Hadary, on the other hand, each filed an appeal with the CAS in order to request the annulment of the FIFA decision. Both Appellants requested that the execution of the FIFA decision be stayed until the end of the arbitration procedure. These requests were granted by the CAS on 7 July 2009. The case was then referred to a Panel of CAS
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arbitrators composed of Prof. Massimo Coccia, Italy (President), Mr Olivier Carrard, Switzerland and Prof. Ulrich Haas, Germany. A hearing took place in Lausanne on 9 December 2009 during which the parties, their legal representatives and their witnesses were heard.

The CAS Panel has first stated that FC Sion Association did not have standing to appeal the FIFA decision before the CAS, considering that said association lacked legal interest to do so. Indeed, the examination of the procedure conducted before FIFA has shown that 1) FC Sion/Olympique des Alpes SA (professional club) was designated in the claim of Al-Ahly and that 2) FC Sion/Olympique des Alpes SA was willing to act in the FIFA procedure, in accordance with the mandate that the club had given to its legal advisor. Therefore, even if FIFA used a generic term to designate the club purchasing Essam El-Hadary, there is no doubt for the 2 For further information related to the CAS activity and procedures in general, please contact either Mr Matthieu Reeb, CAS Secretary General, or Ms Katy Hogg, Media Assistant. Château de Béthusy, Avenue de Beaumont 2, 1012 Lausanne, Switzerland. Tel: (41 21) 613 50 00; fax: (41 21) 613 50 01, or consult the CAS website: www.tascas.org CAS that the club concerned by this matter and party to the procedure before FIFA was FC Sion/Olympique des Alpes SA. As FC Sion/Olympique des Alpes SA did not file an appeal against the FIFA decision, the club remains bound by such decision. After examination of the circumstances of the breach of contract between Essam El Hadary and Al-Ahly, the CAS Panel has fixed the financial compensation due by the player to his former club at USD 796'500.--. This amount has been fixed taking into account several criteria, the most important one being the evaluation of the transfer fee Al-Ahly was deprived of because of the breach of contract by the player. FC Sion/Olympique des Alpes SA being jointly liable for the payment of that amount, it benefits indirectly from the reduction. Furthermore, the four-month suspension, which has not yet been served by the player, will come into effect at the beginning of the next season.

For further information related to the CAS activity and procedures in general, please contact either Mr Matthieu Reeb, CAS Secretary General, or Ms Katy Hogg, Media Assistant. Château de Béthusy,
Lausanne, 31 May 2010 - The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) appeals filed by the International Cycling Union (UCI) and the World Anti (WADA) against the Spanish Cycling Federation (RFEC) and the Spanish cyclist Alejandro Valverde. Accordingly, the CAS has imposed a two year suspension but has denied the request of the UCI and WADA that results obtained by the athlete prior to the beginning of the suspension be annulled. This matter arose as a result of the Spanish criminal investigation (began in May 2004. On 29 August 2007, the UCI requested the RFEC to initiate disciplinary proceedings against Alejandro Valverde on the basis of the evidence gathered within the Operación Puerto proceedings, including the blood bag blood from which was purported to belong to Mr Valverde. On 7 September 2007, the RFEC denied the UCI’s request and refused to open disciplinary proceedings against Mr Valverde. In October 2007, both the UCI and WADA found Alejandro Valverde be found guilty of an anti-doping violation and an anti suspension be imposed. Later, the Italian authorities opened disciplinary proceedings against Mr Valverde on the basis of evidence which they had in their possession, including a sample and DNA analysis of the blood from “blood bag number 18”. On 11 May 2009, the CONI Anti Doping Tribunal (TNA) ruled that Mr Valverde had committed prohibited substance or a prohibited method” two years from participating in events organised under the auspices of CONI or related nationalsports organisations in Italy. Mr Valverde appealed the TNA decision to the 16 March 2010, the CAS confirmed the two year ban. In its decision, the CAS Panel found, by a majority, that it could use the evidence collected in the course of the Operación Puerto for the purpose of the CAS arbitration. The CAS Panel al found, by a majority, that the scientific evidence which c
Lausanne, 21 May 2010 - The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) has dismissed the appeal filed by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) against the decision of the American Arbitration Association (AAA) imposing a one year suspension on the US swimmer Jessica Hardy, commencing on 1 August 2008.

In July 2008, Jessica Hardy competed in the US Olympic team trials in Omaha, USA, in order to qualify for the Beijing Olympic Games. During this event, Jessica Hardy underwent a doping control which was later reported to be positive for clenbuterol, a prohibited substance (steroid). Such adverse analytical finding was confirmed by the B sample analysis. By a decision of 30 May 2009, the AAA confirmed a preliminary decision in the same matter, which imposed a one year ban commencing on 1 August 2008. The AAA Panel considered that the negligence of the athlete was not significant as she took nutritional supplements after having obtained assurances from the manufacturer.

On 11 June 2009, the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) filed a statement of appeal with the CAS requesting that Jessica Hardy be sanctioned with a period of suspension of two years, starting on the date of the CAS award.

The case was submitted to a panel of CAS arbitrators composed of Prof. Luigi Fumagalli, President (Italy), Prof. Ulrich Haas (Germany) and Mr Michele Bernasconi (Switzerland). A
hearing took place in New York on 12 March 2010 during which the parties and their counsel were heard. The CAS arbitrators confirmed the challenged decision. They agreed that Jessica Hardy had shown good faith efforts before ingesting the food supplements at stake: she had made the research and investigation which could reasonably be expected from an informed athlete wishing to avoid risks connected to the use of food supplements. In particular, the athlete had personal conversations with the manufacturer about the supplements’ purity prior to taking them, she obtained the supplements directly from the manufacturer, not from an unknown source; the supplements she took were not labelled in a manner which might have raised suspicions.

Consequently, the CAS Panel confirmed the one year suspension commencing on 1 August 2008 and concluding on 31 July 2009, a suspension which has already been served by the athlete.

In her submissions, Jessica Hardy requested that the International Olympic Committee (IOC) be added as a party to the arbitration procedure and requested a declaratory finding from the CAS as to the applicability of Rule 45 of the Olympic Charter in her case considering that in accordance with such provision, an athlete sanctioned with a suspension of more than six months would be ineligible to participate in the next edition of the Olympic Games. The CAS Panel
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rejected the request to have the IOC joined in the arbitration procedure and did not issue any opinion on the applicability of Rule 45 of the Olympic Charter. The full award, with the grounds, is published on the CAS website (http://www.tascas.org/recent-decision).
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Scientific evidence that such blood contained DNA evidence that clearly demonstratedMr Valverde’s bloodwas sufficient to conclude considering that Mr Valverde’s bloodArticle 15 of the Anti-Doping ADR: “Use or attempted use by a rider of a prohibited substance or prohibited method”). basis of the same regulations, a twostarting on 1 January 2010, in order to take into account, CAS hearing which was initially scheduled for November 2009 had to be postponed until March2010. Finally, the CAS considered that there was no evidence that any of the results obtained byMr Valverde prior to 1 Janu appellants’ request to annul those results should be denied. The award, with the grounds, is published on the CAS website (www.tasdecision).
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For further information related to the CAS activity and procedures in general, please contact either Mr Matthieu Reeb, CAS Secretary General, or Ms Katy Hogg, Media Assistant. Château de Béthusy, Avenue de Beaumont 2, 1012 Lausanne, Switzerland. Tel: (41 21) 613 50 00; fax: (41 21) 613 50 01, or consult the CAS website: www.tas-cas.org

FOOTBALL
THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT DISMISSES THE APPEAL FILED BY FC BAYERN MUNICH AND FRANCK RIBÉRY
Lausanne, 17 May 2010 - The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) has rendered its final decision in the appeal filed by FC Bayern Munich and Franck Ribéry against the decision taken by the UEFA Appeals Body on 5 May 2010. This expedited procedure was referred to a CAS Panel composed of Mr Bernhard Welten (Switzerland) President, Dr Stephan Netzle (Switzerland) and Dr András Gurovits (Switzerland). A hearing was held at the CAS headquarters today, during which the parties and their legal representatives were heard. The CAS Panel has dismissed the appeal and confirmed the three-game suspension imposed by
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the UEFA Appeals Body on the Bayern Munich player Franck Ribéry. Accordingly, the player will not be eligible to play in the final of the 2010 Champions League.

The reasons for the decision will be published by the CAS in a few days.
WHAT IS THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT?

The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) is an institution independent of any sports organization which provides for services in order to facilitate the settlement of sports-related disputes through arbitration or mediation by means of procedural rules adapted to the specific needs of the sports world.

The CAS was created in 1984 and is placed under the administrative and financial authority of the International Council of Arbitration for Sport (ICAS).

The CAS has nearly 300 arbitrators from 87 countries, chosen for their specialist knowledge of arbitration and sports law. Around 300 cases are registered by the CAS every year.

Origins

At the beginning of the 1980s, the regular increase in the number of international sports-related disputes and the absence of any independent authority specialising in sports-related problems and authorised to pronounce binding decisions led the top sports organisations to reflect on the question of sports dispute resolution.
In 1981, soon after his election as IOC President, H.E. Juan Antonio Samaranch had the idea of creating a sports-specific jurisdiction. The following year at the IOC Session held in Rome, IOC member H.E. Judge Kéba Mbaye, who was then a judge at the International Court of Justice in The Hague, chaired a working group tasked with preparing the statutes of what would quickly become the “Court of Arbitration for Sport”.

The idea of creating an arbitral jurisdiction devoted to resolving disputes directly or indirectly related to sport had thus firmly been launched. Another reason for setting up such an arbitral institution was the need to create a specialised authority capable of settling international disputes and offering a flexible, quick and inexpensive procedure.

The initial outlines for the concept contained provision for the arbitration procedure to include an attempt to reach a settlement beforehand. It was also intended that the IOC should bear all the operating costs of the court. Right from the outset, it was established that the jurisdiction of the CAS should in no way be imposed on athletes or federations, but remain freely available to the parties.

In 1983, the IOC officially ratified the statutes of the CAS, which came into force on 30 June 1984. The Court of Arbitration for Sport became operational as of that time, under the leadership of President Mbaye and the Secretary General, Mr Gilbert Schwaar.

**Organisation of the CAS from its creation until 1994**

The CAS Statute of 1984 was accompanied by a set of procedural Regulations. Both were modified slightly in 1990. Under these rules, the CAS was composed of 60 members appointed by the IOC, the International Federations (IF), the National Olympic Committees (NOC) and the IOC President (15 members each). The IOC President had to choose those 15 members from outside the other three groups. In addition, all the operating costs of the CAS were borne by the IOC. In principle, the proceedings were free of charge, except for disputes of a financial nature, when the parties could be required to pay a share of the costs. The annual budget was approved by the CAS President alone. What is more, the CAS Statute could be modified only by the IOC Session, at the proposal of the IOC Executive Board.

The CAS Statute and Regulations provided for just one type of contentious proceedings whatever the nature of the dispute. The claimant lodged his request with the CAS, accompanied by the arbitration agreement. The request was then examined by a “Requests’ panel” which ruled on the admissibility of the request, subject to a final decision by the panel of arbitrators which would then be called on to hear and rule on the dispute, if necessary. The parties thus remained free to continue their action in spite of a rejection decision by the Requests’ panel.
The proceedings could then begin with an attempt at achieving conciliation, either at the proposal of the parties, or pursuant to a decision by the CAS President if he judged that the dispute was suitable for conciliation to be attempted. If this failed, the arbitration procedure itself was started.

Alongside this contentious procedure there was also an advisory procedure open to any interested sports body or individual. Through this procedure, the CAS could give an opinion on a legal question concerning any activity related to sport in general. The advisory procedure still exists, but it has been modified somewhat, and access to it restricted (see below).

In 1991, the CAS published a Guide to arbitration which included several model arbitration clauses. Among these was one for inclusion in the statutes or regulations of sports federations or clubs. This clause read as follows: "Any dispute arising from the present Statutes and Regulations of the ... Federation which cannot be settled amicably shall be settled finally by a tribunal composed in accordance with the Statute and Regulations of the Court of Arbitration for Sport to the exclusion of any recourse to the ordinary courts. The parties undertake to comply with the said Statute and Regulations, and to accept in good faith the award rendered and in no way hinder its execution."

This clause prefigured the subsequent creation of special rules to settle disputes related to decisions taken by sports federations or associations (appeals procedure).

The International Equestrian Federation (FEI) was the first sports body to adopt this clause. This was the starting point for several "appeals" procedures even if, in formal terms, such a procedure did not yet exist. After that, other national and international sports federations adopted this appeals arbitration clause, which meant a significant increase in the workload of the CAS.

Up to 1991-1992, a wide variety of cases were submitted to the CAS involving issues such as the nationality of athletes and contracts concerning employment, television rights, sponsorship and licensing. With the appearance of the appeals arbitration clause, numerous doping cases were subsequently brought before the CAS, and it was as the result of, or thanks to one such case that the structure of the CAS would have to evolve.

The Paris Agreement

The creation of the ICAS and the new structure of the CAS were approved in Paris, on 22 June 1994, with the signing of the “Agreement concerning the constitution of the International Council of Arbitration for Sport”, known as the “Paris Agreement”. This was signed by the highest authorities representing the sports world, viz. the presidents of the IOC, the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations (ASOIF), the Association of International Winter Sports Federations (AIWF) and the Association of National Olympic Committees (ANOC).

The preamble of the Agreement states that "with the aim of facilitating the resolution of disputes in the field of sport, an arbitration institution entitled the
"Court of Arbitration for Sport" (hereinafter the CAS) has been created, and that, with the aim of ensuring the protection of the rights of the parties before the CAS and the absolute independence of this institution, the parties have decided by mutual agreement to create a Foundation for international sports-related arbitration, called the "International Council of Arbitration for Sport" (hereinafter the ICAS), under the aegis of which the CAS will henceforth be placed.”

The Agreement determined the appointment of the initial members of the ICAS and the funding of the CAS. In 2003, the ICAS/CAS budget totalled CHF 7,3 million.

Since the Paris Agreement was signed, all Olympic International Federations and many National Olympic Committees have recognised the jurisdiction of the Court of Arbitration for Sport and included in their statutes an arbitration clause referring disputes to the CAS. Since the World Conference on Doping in Sport, held in March 2003, the Olympic Movement and numerous governments have promulgated the World Anti-Doping Code, Article 13 of which states that the CAS is the appeals body for all international doping-related disputes.

ORGANISATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE ICAS AND CAS


Since 22 November 1994, the Code of Sports-related Arbitration (hereinafter: the Code) has governed the organisation and arbitration procedures of the CAS. The Code was revised in 2003 in order to incorporate certain long-established principles of CAS case-law or practices consistently followed by the arbitrators and the Court Office. The latest version of the Code of Sports-related Arbitration entered into force on 1 January 2010. The 70-article Code is divided into two parts: the Statutes of bodies working for the settlement of sports-related disputes (articles S1 to S26), and the Procedural Rules (articles R27 to R70). Since 1999, the Code has also contained a set of mediation rules instituting a non-binding, informal procedure which offers parties the option of negotiating, with the help of a mediator, an agreement to settle their dispute.

The Code thus establishes rules for four distinct procedures:

- the ordinary arbitration procedure;
- the appeals arbitration procedure;
- the advisory procedure, which is non-contentious and allows certain sports bodies to seek advisory opinions from the CAS;
- the mediation procedure.

There are two classic phases to arbitration proceedings: written proceedings, with an exchange of statements of case, and oral proceedings, where the parties are heard by the arbitrators, generally at the seat of the CAS in Lausanne.
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The mediation procedure follows the pattern decided by the parties. Failing agreement on this, the CAS mediator decides the procedure to be followed.

2. The International Council of Arbitration for Sport (ICAS)

The ICAS is the supreme organ of the CAS. The main task of the ICAS is to safeguard the independence of the CAS and the rights of the parties. To this end, it looks after the administration and financing of the CAS.

The ICAS is composed of 20 members who must all be high-level jurists well-acquainted with the issues of arbitration and sports law.

Upon their appointment, the ICAS members must sign a declaration undertaking to exercise their function in a personal capacity, with total objectivity and independence. This obviously means that in no circumstances can a member play a part in proceedings before the CAS, either as an arbitrator or as counsel to a party.

The ICAS exercises several functions which are listed under article S6 of the Code. It does so either itself, or through the intermediary of its Board, made up of the ICAS President and two vice-presidents, plus the two presidents of the CAS Divisions. There are, however, certain functions which the ICAS may not delegate. Any changes to the Code of Sports-related Arbitration can be decided only by a full meeting of the ICAS and, more specifically, a majority of two-thirds of its members. In other cases, a simple majority is sufficient, provided that at least half the ICAS members are present when the decision is taken. The ICAS elects its own President, who is also the CAS President, plus its two Vice-presidents, the President of the Ordinary Arbitration Division, the President of the Appeals Arbitration Division and the deputies of these divisions. It also appoints the CAS arbitrators and approves the budget and accounts of the CAS.

3. The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS)

The CAS performs its functions through the intermediary of arbitrators, of whom there are at least 150, with the aid of its court office, which is headed by the Secretary General. One of the major new features following the reform of the CAS was the creation of two divisions: an “Ordinary Arbitration Division”, for sole-instance disputes submitted to the CAS, and an “Appeals Arbitration Division”, for disputes resulting from final-instance decisions taken by sports organisations. Each division is headed by a president.

The role of the division presidents is to take charge of the first arbitration operations once the procedure is under way and before the panels of arbitrators are appointed. The presidents are often called upon to issue orders on requests for interim relief or for suspensive effect, and intervene in the
framework of constituting the panels of arbitrators. Once nominated, the arbitrators subsequently take charge of the procedure.

The 275 CAS arbitrators (2007 figure) are appointed by the ICAS for a renewable term of four years. The Code stipulates that the ICAS must call upon “personalities with a legal training and who possess recognised competence with regard to sport”. The appointment of arbitrators follows more-or-less the same pattern as for the ICAS members. The CAS arbitrators are appointed at the proposal of the IOC, the IFs and the NOCs. The ICAS also appoints arbitrators “with a view to safeguarding the interests of the athletes” (article S14 of the Code), as well as arbitrators chosen from among personalities independent of sports organisations.

Even when the CAS arbitrators are proposed by sports organisations, the fact remains that they must carry out their functions with total objectivity and independence. When they are appointed, they have to sign a declaration to this effect.

The arbitrators are not attached to a particular CAS division, and can sit on panels called upon to rule under the ordinary procedure as well as those ruling under the appeals procedure. CAS panels are composed either of a single arbitrator or of three. All arbitrators are bound by the duty of confidentiality and may not reveal any information connected with the parties, the dispute or TYPES OF DISPUTES SUBMITTED TO THE CAS

Generally speaking, a dispute may be submitted to the Court of Arbitration for Sport only if there is an arbitration agreement between the parties which specifies recourse to the CAS. Article R27 of the Code stipulates that the CAS has jurisdiction solely to rule on disputes connected with sport. Since its creation, the CAS has never declared itself to lack jurisdiction on the grounds of a dispute’s not being related to sport (see in this regard the award delivered in the arbitration TAS 92/81 in the Digest of CAS Awards 1986-1998).

In principle, two types of dispute may be submitted to the CAS: those of a commercial nature, and those of a disciplinary nature.

The first category essentially involves disputes relating to the execution of contracts, such as those relating to sponsorship, the sale of television rights,
the staging of sports events, player transfers and relations between players or coaches and clubs and/or agents (employment contracts and agency contracts). Disputes relating to civil liability issues also come under this category (e.g. an accident to an athlete during a sports competition). These so-called commercial disputes are handled by the CAS acting as a court of sole instance.

Disciplinary cases represent the second group of disputes submitted to the CAS, of which a large number are doping-related. In addition to doping cases, the CAS is called upon to rule on various disciplinary cases (violence on the field of play, abuse of a referee).

Such disciplinary cases are generally dealt with in the first instance by the competent sports authorities, and subsequently become the subject of an appeal to the CAS, which then acts as a court of last instance.

he proceedings themselves

THE DECENTRALISED CAS OFFICES AND THE AD HOC DIVISIONS

In 1996, the ICAS created two permanent decentralised offices, the first in Sydney in Australia, and the second in Denver, in the United States of America. In December 1999, the Denver office was transferred to New York. These offices are attached to the CAS court office in Lausanne, and are competent to receive and notify all procedural acts. Creating them made it easier for parties domiciled in Oceania and North America to have access to the CAS.

Later in 1996, the ICAS created a CAS ad hoc division with the task of settling finally and within a 24-hour time-limit any disputes arising during the Olympic Games in Atlanta. This ad hoc division was composed of two co-presidents and 12 arbitrators who were in the Olympic city throughout the Games. To ensure easy access to the ad hoc division for all those taking part in the Olympic Games (athletes, officials, coaches, federations, etc.), a special procedure was created for the occasion, which was simple, flexible and free of charge. A total of six cases were submitted to the CAS ad hoc division in Atlanta.

Since 1996, ad hoc divisions have been created for each edition of the Olympic Summer and Winter Games. Ad hoc divisions were also set up for the Commonwealth Games since 1998, for the UEFA European Championship since 2000 and for the FIFA World Cup in 2006.

The Court of Arbitration for Sport was also asked by UEFA, European football's governing body, to create an ad hoc division for the European Football Championships held in Belgium and the Netherlands in June and July 2000. This was repeated for the European Championships held in Portugal (2004) and in Switzerland/Austria (2008).
The success of these ad hoc divisions has played a large part in making the Court of Arbitration for Sport known among athletes, sports organisations and the media all over the world. The creation of this ad hoc structure is unquestionably a key point in the history of the CAS.