Simona Kustec Lipicer[1]
Damjan Lajh[1]

MONITORING SYSTEMS OF GOVERNANCE IN SPORT: LOOKING FOR BEST PRACTICES FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION AND BEYOND

SISTEMI ZA SPREMLJANJE VLADANJA V ŠPORTU: ISKANJE DOBRIH PRAKS NA OBMOČJU EVROPSKE UNIJE IN IZVEN NJE

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to propose an analytical framework for monitoring public governance in sport. In the paper's literature review, we first discuss the key characteristics of monitoring systems and public governance approaches. We then benchmark them with already established practices of monitoring systems of governance in the European Union's open method of coordination and selected international organisations. A set of the potential elements needed for monitoring systems of governance in the field of sport is given as a result of the conducted analysis.

Keywords: public governance, monitoring, sport policy, European Union, international organisations

POVZETEK

Namen tega prispevka je predložiti analitični okvir za spremljanje javnega vladanja v športu. Na podlagi pregleda literature v prispevku najprej izpostavimo ključne značilnosti sistemov spremljanja in pristopov javnega vladanja. Le-te nato povežemo z že uveljavljenimi praksami sistemov spremljanja vladanja v kontekstu odprte metode koordinacije v Evropski uniji in v izbranih mednarodnih organizacijah. Izvedena analiza v zaključku ponudi nabor možnih elementov, potrebnih za spremljanje sistemov vladanja na področju športa.

Ključne besede: javno vladanje, spremljanje, športna politika, Evropska unija, mednarodne organizacije

[1]University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences

Corresponding Author:

Simona Kustec Lipicer, Associate Professor,
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences,
simona.kustec-lipicer@fdv.uni-lj.si
01 58 05 178 / 041 432 879 / 01 58 05 101 (fax)

INTRODUCTION

The term "governance" has a very long and, in a way, stable tradition. Etymologically, its bases can be found in the verb "to govern", derived from the Latin word *gubernare,* which means "to steer" something (e.g. a ship, according to the usage of that time). The Latin word is a translation of the Greek words *kybernân* or *kybernetes,* which have similar meaning. "Kybernetes" was first used by Plato in the context of "the art of steering" or "the art of government". During later periods, the term also became common in Western Middle English and Old French political traditions (Bevir, ed., 2010). Especially in contemporary times, the use of the term has expanded to the extent that it can be found in the usage of almost all spheres of societal life, be it in reference to the work of private firms (corporate governance), public administrations (public governance) or international institutions and their policies (global governance).

In this paper, the central focus of attention will be given to providing an understanding of the concept of public governance and its strong interconnection, especially with the idea of global governance as one that is, according to its main characteristics, very close to the essential understanding and meaning of sport. So, is it possible and relevant to also apply those governance concepts to further understand and monitor the roles of public authorities' (e.g. governmental institutions) and their practices when they coincide with sport-related issues?

In an attempt to answer this question, the main aim of this paper will be to describe and then interconnect varieties of possible understanding of governance in different fields of academic research, as well as practices, into a single yet complex concept that potentially could be applied toward the understanding of governance in the field of sport.

Based on a comprehensive literature review on the concept of governance, with a focus on public governance (i.e. governance in which an important role is undertaken by the institutions and activities of public [governmental] authorities), we employed multiple perceptions of the roles and forms of understanding what is known as "public governance". Thus, we deliberately chose to monitor the implementation of governmental activities as a decisive opportunity (one among many) to examine the "real-life" image of public-related understanding of governance in any field of social and economic life in which governments intervene. The analytical procedure of monitoring governmental implementation and the already established determinants of measuring governance in the phase of governmental implementation were also used, with the aim to give insight into the prevailing mode of understanding the concept of governance in the field of sport.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The aims of this article are: 1) to describe the understanding and possible measurement of the concept of (in particular, public-related) governance which places the role of public

governments, their institutions and activities (e.g. performance) at the heart of the idea; 2) on this basis, to propose a conceptual framework for monitoring governance practices in the field of sport.

In so doing, we will provide a general understanding of the idea of governance and its monitoring, which will then be narrowed to the perspective of the state authority's role in sport, i.e. "sport governance". In this respect, we will, on the basis of the literature review, present a general theoretical understanding of the concept of governance, the role of monitoring and monitoring systems used in the work of government and give insights into the possible understanding of public governance in sport.

As a result of the theoretical review, we will first analyse some existing practices of monitoring governance in selected international organisations, which are recognised as examples of good monitoring practices and which can, according to their contents, be applied to the specifics of governance in the field of sport (Alm, ed., 2013; Chappelet & Mrkonjic, 2013).[1] By doing so, the so-called "soft-law tool" of the European Union (EU), called the "open method of coordination (OMC)", in which monitoring-like approaches can be traced in practice, and the overview of three already established global systems for monitoring governance-related aspects developed by Transparency International, Global Reporting Initiative, and Global Governance Index, are analysed with a further aim to recognise their possible potential for understanding the monitoring practices of governance in sport. On this basis, a list of conceptual elements for monitoring sport governance will be proposed in the conclusion of the paper.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Public governance

Most frequently, the term "public governance" (from here on: governance) is used to describe a change in the nature of the state and its making. Governance takes into account a change in the actor constellation, both during the formulation and during the implementation of governmental activities (e.g. policies) and in the method of political steering (Treib, Bähr & Falkner, 2007).

When it comes to understanding the concept[2] of governance *in* and *of* public authorities, either academic-related concepts to describe the various systems of setting rules and norms operating within the countries and public organisations; or strategies for action; or patterns of managing mutual relationships are put forward (Cram, 2001, p. 599; Pierre

---

[1]Initial idea for this paper is based on the results of the final project paper, prepared for the research project *Action for Good Governance in International Sport (AGGIS)* (Kustec Lipicer et. al., 2013).

[2]The concepts fulfil the central function of ordering and structuring our perception of the world. They are not as solid and firm as theories are, but this is not even their main aim. As a result, concepts help us, among other things, to make judgments about the relevance and significance of information, to analyse specific situations, or to create new ideas (Bélanger, 2003).

& Peters, 2000, pp. 24–7; Paraskevopoulos, 2002; Considine & Lewis, 2003; Rhodes, 2003, pp. 47–57). In this regard, many authors introduce various possible approaches in understanding the governance phenomena, with the belief that the term is tightly connected with either wider "macro" system processes of the contemporary state's socio-economic and value aspects; with the intermediate or "meso" level of mutual cooperation between state and non-state stakeholders' relevant issues or with the very narrow and specific "micro-related" topics about concrete tools and forms of governmental interventions. In this sense, we can recognise the following approaches to governance as seen through the existing studies (ibid): 1) as a renewed special form of state structure (e.g. minimal state); 2) as renewed forms, or even functions, of state governing (e.g. corporate, procedural, market, self-organising, network governance); 3) introducing new tools in the work of government (e.g. socio-cybernetic systems); 4) reformed approaches to the administration of government (e.g. new public management) 5) or as a symbolic shift in the perception of state government (e.g. good governance).

In general, the contemporary concept of governance of the state implies every mode of political steering involving public and private actors, including the traditional modes of government making and different types of steering from hierarchical imposition to sheer information measures. In a more restricted sense, the idea of governance can also only comprises types of political steering in which non-hierarchical modes of guidance, such as persuasion and negotiation, are employed, and/or where public and private actors are engaged in policy formulation (Héritier, 2002, p. 2). Kooiman (2003) believes that, according to such understanding of governance, this concept undertakes a new pattern of structure, resulting in the rearranged understanding of the whole public system behaving as a result of a common interaction between all stakeholders that want to be involved, regardless of their state or non-state jurisdictions. This pattern cannot be reduced to a single actor or group of actors. Indeed, none of the individual actors, whether public or private, possesses all the knowledge and information needed to solve complex, dynamic and diversified problems, nor have enough potential to dominate in a particular model of governance. This becomes particularly true in the cases of democratic regimes at the (sub) national levels, as well as in supranational political contexts, like the EU (Jachtenfuchs, 1995; Marks et al., 1996; Kohler-Koch, 2003; Jachtenfuchs & Kohler-Koch, 2004).

Indeed, the EU (as well as also other international institutions; authors' note) is, more so than in other political systems, functionally dependent on a well-developed system of cooperation and communication, both in terms of the instrument for the collection and processing of information and the tools for the creation and dissemination of consensus and common views[3] (Kohler-Koch, 2002). Through such a perspective, the concept of

---

[3]The EU is usually defined by institutional fragmentation of multilevel governance. In this respect, with the aim of the successful policymaking and implementation of common European policies, the European Commission should consult a number of policy actors to obtain the necessary expertise, resources and information.

global governance (Roseanu, 1995; Dingwerth & Pattberg, 2006) is complementarily attached to the typical understanding of governance at the national level. Global governance, being essentially defined as "the systems of rule at all levels of human activity— from the family to the international organization" (Rosenau, 1995, p. 13), thus, from the governmental interventions' perspective, refers to the interaction between actors in complex networks of bargaining, making and implementing governmental interventions (like networks, bargaining between the involved state and non-state actors, implementation) in the society through individual public policies (Eising & Kohler-Koch, 1999). Often, one of the final and most important goals of this global governance approaches is also to advocate and recommend examples of good practices, through benchmarks, back to the level of member states at the national level (ibid).

In the European context, new modes of governance and policy innovations are thereby frequently operationalised through the selection of new policy instruments, i.e. the concrete mechanisms with which the public authorities are trying to achieve the set goals of their intervention. It may be that new policy instruments are sought when other mechanisms of coordination or governance have failed (Kassim & Le Galles, 2010, p. 7). In the context of the EU, the most systematic visible and original way to present the White Paper on European Governance[4], through description of principles, suggests what new, public-related modes of governance should look like. Although the White Paper itself had a limited impact (Kassim & Le Gales, 2010, p. 6), new policy instruments carried the promise of making the EU more transparent, as well as a participatory policymaking arena.

Sport governance

Not surprisingly, governance has also become "the issue" in the field of sport. When referring to governance in sport we refer to the understanding of governance within the sporting context (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007). As in general governance understandings, sport governance, as well, can be approached via different "points of departure", be it from the viewpoints of real-life practices or theatrically bounded ones, from private, (non)profit settings to public ones, or from wider, macro systems to narrow, individual micro perspectives.

If we want to understand the role that governmental authorities are nowadays undertaking in the field of sport, the understanding of the concept of public-related governance

---

[4]Many analysts have expected this paper to give a considerable boost to new modes of governance (Eberlein & Krewer, 2002, p. 3), which is usually defined in a broad manner as "any major departure from the classical Community method" (Scott & Trubek, 2002). On the other hand, however, there can be various critiques recognized: that the White Paper reflects the institutional political self-interest of the Commission and the lack of a new vision (Scharpf, 2001, p. 2). In addition, Treib, Bähr and Falkner (2007) argue that the classification of modes of governance as "old" or "new" is of little analytical value.

can be of significant help. Different types of governmental-initiated activities in the field of sport extend far back into history and involve various forms (see, for example, Houlihan & White, 2002), where governmental intervention in the field is most frequently justified with the notion of public interest (Henry, 2004). With the aim to achieve goals, like better health conditions of the citizens, a higher participation in social life, higher social integration and equality, quality well-being, support of economic development and even the strengthening of a national identity, governments have been creating special institutional bodies, policies, programmes and measures which they have incorporated into the world of sport (Kustec Lipicer et. al, 2012). In so doing, they have not only tried to foster and support the field, but have potentially also intervened directly in the heart of the autonomous sport association's life and sport governance.

For the reasons stated, the decision to monitor public-related governance practices in sport is of very high importance in any democratic, transparent and accountable social and political order. The discussions about sport governance and/or governance in sport closely connected with the monitoring orientations have been presented in the field of sport since the late 1990s. They first appeared in practice via the Council of Europe study on the "studies of national sports legislation and later good governance in sport" (Chacker, 1999; 2004; see also UK Sport, 2004), followed by a wide array of works related to different governance perspectives in the academic arena (Henry & Lee, 2004; Groeneveld & Houlihan, 2006; Sobry, 2011; 2012).

From the public governance perspective, one of the best known and, at the same time, initial comparative examples of combining theoretical governance considerations with empirical findings on national sport governance systems was prepared by Chaker (1999; 2004).[5] In the first governance study, public governance in sport was applied from the macro-system level and was based on legal foundations, paralleling the understanding of governance with various types of legal-based regulations and accountability by statutory provisions. After this first public governance attempt in the field of sport, there have been many international, and even global, attempts at regulating sport through common governmental and sport institution initiatives, such as those of the Council of Europe (2013), the World Anti-Doping Agency (2013) and the European Union´s White Paper on Sport (2007). The common point of all these supra-national interventions today lies in the concept of "sport governance", mainly referring to a complex network of the co-operation between sport institutions and public authorities, policy measures and private regulations used to promote integrity in management of the core values of sport, such as democratic, ethical, efficient and accountable sports activities (Council of Europe, 2013, White Paper on Sport, 2007).

---

[5]Although the title of the study refers to the idea of governance, the criteria employed in comparison are not so directly oriented to the aspects of governance as in classical elements of governmental (in)activities or levels of intervention in sport.

Similarly, as in other social science approaches to public governance, we can say that governance in the field of sport can be understood from three prevailing perspectives:[6]

– macro system one: relating to the role of sport and its understanding within a society; the broader socio-political historical overview of state presence in sport with a special emphasis on sport's legal frameworks; the institutional and instrumental jurisdictions and relations of the state and society in sport;

– meso one: relating to the cooperation and networks of sport's governmental and non-governmental representatives, and concrete policies and measures undertaken as a result;

– micro one: referring to the performance of individual sport-related public authority and its concrete performance in the frameworks of the individual sport-related activities.

RESULTS

Monitoring

Monitoring is a special analytical procedure used to produce information about the modes and, consequently, the results of the implementation of the work (i.e. performance) of the institutions and/or policies. As such, monitoring is regarded as one of the crucial procedures with which it is possible to audit the work of public authorities, be it from the perspective of the institutional settings and jurisdictions, resources and processes (actions and activities), as well as the perceptions of the wider environment in which the audited institutions of public authorities operate. Since each institution is, according to the democratic governance standards, on one side subjected to the control and accountability of its making, and on the other side, strives to get feedback, the monitoring of its implementation (or making, performance) is one of the crucial tasks. This feedback represents the basis for the future attitudes and orientations of the monitored institution and its activities, as well as for the assessments, attitudes and orientations of the environment towards it. These reasons are the crucial ones for why public pursuit of the already existing and implemented practices and patterns in democratic societies and institutions is of fundamental importance.

Based on the described broader mission, monitoring of the implementation performs four major functions: explanation, accounting, auditing and compliance (Dunn, 2004, pp. 355–356). Explanatory function of monitoring yields information about the outcomes of the implementation, and it can help to explain why the outcomes differ or are such as

[6]Here we have especially in mind the approaches of governance sport organisations (Slack and Hinings, 1992; Hoye & Inglis, 2004) and sport marketing theory and literature (Shilbury, 2000). If the former set of literature is mostly focused on the dynamics of sport organisations' structure, processes and strategies, the latter addresses the issues of (shared) leadership, board structures, roles and motivation in the field of sport.

they are. The accounting function of the monitoring process is important for delivering the information that can help in the accounting of various changes that follow the implementation of a process or policy (e.g. social, economic, environmental). The auditing function of monitoring enables one to determine whether resources and services that have been targeted to the beneficiaries or certain target groups have actually reached them. Finally, monitoring in the case of the function of compliance helps to determine if the processes, activities and resources, staff and others involved are in compliance with the standards and procedures that are defined in advance, either by the institution itself or by the external environment.[7]

Due to the functions described, a set of specific aims and expectations for monitoring the implementation of the work of institutions and their policies can vary and, as such, can be a result of either a) internal needs, b) external environmental expectations or c) both. But, regardless of that, monitoring concerns a very concrete, operational type of governance perspective, enabling the provision of a kind of *operational, managerial procedure* type of information and evidence about the selected aspects of performance of the institutions and their activities, as well as potentially a preliminary *assessment* of the impacts of implementation for the past and future work. Although it seems that monitoring is predominantly concerned with the micro, or specific type, of individual and concrete aspects of governance, it can also serve a broader function as a platform for policy learning and the potential introduction of policy changes on the basis of monitored data, and, in the long run, as a sort of evidence-based foundation (Pawson, 2006) for system-wide re-considerations of general norms and values, such as democracy, transparency, cooperation, human rights and well-being.

Parallel to what has been described here, it is important to note that a set of fundamental issues, which need to be covered and monitored on the basis of the defined goals, motives, expectations, mission and applied procedures for data gathering, must be clearly set. Today, a number of monitoring sources (i.e. contexts of the data) are already defined in practice through the "codes of conducts", as institutional/policy guidance, guidelines, standards etc. of governance (see for example IFAC at http://www.ifac.org/). To measure them, some data already exist and can simply be extracted from the existing data sets, even already calculated indexes (like Transparency International, the World Governance Index and the Global Reporting Initiative), while other data are either being gathered for internal institutional purposes, are not publically available or do not yet exist.

In other cases, especially those which have not yet established governance measurement practices and where data are not yet gathered, there is a need to conceptualise and further

---

[7]Here we need to differentiate between policy and legal compliance, where the former relates to the question of how extensively the normative standards are being considered in the actual, day-to-day policy implementation, while the latter relates most often to the question of the formal acceptance of the agreements/standards.

collect the data from scratch. In this regard, the data need to be conducted mostly by applying methods such as conducting a review of relevant existing documentation and data that have been primarily gathered for other purposes (e.g. statistics, financial, policy documents) and conducting surveys and interviews, as well as employing focus groups, panels and similar methods for gathering information on the perceptions of implementation practices. On this basis, new data sets can be designed and applied.

Global benchmarking approaches

This section of the paper provides a synthesis of the selected world-wide referred public monitoring systems with a further aim to outline the proposal for the possible monitoring of sport public governance on their basis. The main aims of this part of the paper are twofold: 1) to apply the usefulness and sensitiveness of the above presented approaches of possible approaching and aims of monitoring governmental-related practices to concrete cases of monitoring systems of a) EU´s OMC, b) Transparency International, c) the World Governance Index and d) the Global Reporting Initiative; 2) to select those aspects that could be potentially used, either directly or indirectly, for the purposes of understanding and further developing the guidelines for monitoring public-related modes of governance in sport.

The case of the open method of coordination (OMC) as the selected monitoring practice of the EU

Within the EU, the OMC was introduced as a part of a broader movement toward "new governance" and democratic experimentalism in the EU, directly related to the monitoring of the already implemented governmental interventions in individual policy fields. For advocates of the OMC and other "new governance" approaches, traditional forms of "command and control governance" are viewed as exclusive, incapable of addressing societal complexity, static and unable to adapt well to changing circumstances and limited in their production of the knowledge needed to solve problems. These advocates cite the need to move from a centralised command and control regulation consisting of rigid and uniform rules and hard law, toward a system of governance that promotes flexibility and learning through the use of soft law[8] (Trubek et al., 2006, p. 12). One of the claims put forward by policymakers and academics who support and promote the use of the OMC is the claim that it represents the "architecture of policy learning" (Ferrera et al., 2002; Knill & Lenschow, 2003; Eberlein & Kerwer, 2004). The OMC is seen as an institutional arrangement that aims to organise policy-learning processes among member states, based on their good practices. The process of policy learning, with its elements—policy

---

[8]The term "soft law" characterises texts which are, on the one hand, not legally binding in an ordinary sense, but which are, on the other hand, not completely devoid of legal effects (Peters & Pagotto, 2006). In the EU context, specifically, soft law refers to action rules which are not legally binding but which are intended to influence member state policies, such as recommendations, resolutions or codes of conduct (Snyder, 1993; Kenner, 1995).

diffusion, transfer, change and convergence, is thus often used for describing new modes of governance like the OMC. The OMC operates through iterative processes in which, on the basis of the monitoring data best practices among the authorities should be shared, peer learning/reviews organised and benchmarks set.

The two most prominent policy fields in which the OMC had been introduced so far are employment and education. In relation to employment, the OMC was introduced to encourage the exchange of information and joint discussion between member states, and to attempt to find joint solutions and best practices for creating a greater number of better jobs in all member states (Casey & Gold, 2004; Nedergaard, 2006). In the case of education policy, then, every second year, the ministers of education from the member states publish a joint report with the European Commission on the overall situation of education and training across the EU, and assess what progress has been made towards common objectives. This report uses data from the EC's annual progress reports, but adopts a strategic view, delivering a series of key messages and recommendations for future approaches.

The OMC approaches to monitoring are thus predominantly narrower, micro-system-oriented into a collection of data about individual public institutions and their performances. Some clear meso-monitoring characters can also be traced through the collection of the data that directly relate to the implementation of concrete policies, as well as their aims and measures. The overall governance monitoring function of the OMC reminds us of compliance, and to some extent, accounting. From the perspective of individual member states, the OMC governance system could have many more advantages than described, while also enabling the manifestation of auditing and explanatory functions.

International public governance systems of monitoring

This part of the paper discusses three different, yet at the same time very similar, monitoring practices, based on the idea of global governance. The main aim of all of them is to monitor the governance practices of governmental, as well as non-governmental, institutions, from the perspective of various key global democracy values, such as transparency, sustainability, integrity, well-being and human rights. On the basis of the gathered data, an assessment and a comparison are provided.

Transparency International (2012) is the global civil society institution leading the fight against corruption. A key element of the work of this institution is the analysis and diagnosis of corruption and measuring its scope, frequency and manifestations through surveys and indices, as well as other research. With this aim in mind, particular indexes and other measurements to measure and assess corruption at a macro level of its potential appearance have been developed.

The Global Reporting Initiative, founded in 1997 in Boston, is an international not-for-profit organisation with a network-based structure. Its activity involves thousands of professionals and organisations from many sectors, constituencies and regions. The framework was developed collaboratively, with expert input from international working groups, and from stakeholder engagement and due process (2013). The concept of governance builds on the values of greater organisational transparency and accountability, while the monitoring system is composed of a reporting system that provides metrics and methods for measuring and reporting sustainability impacts and performance. As such, it contains general and sector-specific content relating to what has been agreed by a wide range of stakeholders around the world to be generally applicable for reporting an organisation's sustainability performance. The key monitored contents refer to economic, environmental and social performance at a mostly general, prevailingly system level.

The World Governance Index was launched in 2008 by the Forum for a New World Governance, with a central purpose to:

> *"develop a "tool" that would allow the players in charge of governance to be aware of the emerging issues and problems, and to help them to find the necessary solutions"*

> (Blin and Marin, 2008).

The paper, "Rethinking Global Governance" (Blin and Marin, 2008), which states the backgrounds and main reasons for the establishment of the index, also defines reduction of inequalities, establishment of sustainable development and building of peace in a world of diversity, as well as framing some proposals for laying the new foundations of governance as the main goals of the index and monitoring as such (ibid). The following domains, in the form of indicators and composite indexes, were selected for monitoring the achievement of the world governance (World Governance Index, 2013): peace and security, rule of law, human rights and participation and sustainable and human development. Stated broad and general contents are further structured to sub-categories that comprise individual indicators. The domain of peace and security is, for example, separated into two sub-categories—the National Security (which is composed from data on conflicts, refugees, asylum seekers and displaced persons) and the Public Security (employing data on political climate, trust, violent crime and homicides per 100,000 inhabitants); the rest of the key stated groups of indicators are similarly structured. Each of the indicators is broken down into several sub-indicators—a total of 13 sub-indicators are used—and each of these sub-indicators is the result of the aggregation of several indexes (41 in all). Finally, the data used to calculate the indexes and determine the WGI is taken from the databases published annually by the main international organisations and by NGOs specialising in the area of governance (ibid).

Discussion

The practices and approaches to governance by the selected international organisations discussed in this paper can be identified as examples of monitoring governances, of which the aim is to tackle the system-wide values and norms of democracy and transparency. In so doing, the main emphasis is given to system-wide environmental characteristics, such as the rule of law, equality, freedom, governmental transparency and accountability. Data that relate to the nature of authorities, electoral rules, economic status and the role of society are being gathered, while, very rarely, specific, micro-relevant data, focused on concrete events or institutional performance, is sought. A combination of the already existing internal and external institutional data and data sets, together with additional expert assessments, are being applied for the purposes of monitoring data gathering. As a result of these data, the most frequently seen methodological indicators and indexes are being defined and calculated, and many works offering guidance, codes of conduct and good practices have been published.

Based on the conducted overview of the three selected examples of global public governance and EU OMC construction, we find that all of them are still predominantly macro-, or in the OMC case, at most, meso-oriented monitoring systems. Their monitoring governance function is mostly accounting- and compliance-related.

CONCLUSIONS

Synthesising the above gathered findings, we can confirm the ongoing interest in understanding and analysing the governance concept, be it in the academic or practical arenas. As was revealed from the approach in this paper, the combination of attempts and knowledge of governance in both contexts can be of significant value and should be considered.

With regard to the discussion of general public governance, the image of sport public governance can be threefold: 1) It can be macro-system-oriented, to see how a sport subsystem is working in the general system-wide environment, what kind of support it has and how close (or distant) it is to (or from) general system characteristics and orientations. 2) A sport public-governance approach can also be meso-system-oriented. In this regard, the leading motive, the characteristics of its own subsystem, is the crucial one. The questions about the characteristics of the motives, set goals, measures and networks of governmental intervention in sport policy-making in relation to the independent, non-governmental sport arena are being brought to the forefront. 3) From the third perspective, the micro-, or individual interest-oriented understanding of public sport governance, mainly the issues about the institutional characteristics, resources and performances of individual activities conducted by individual public authority institutions in the field of sport, are of the central interest and need to be clearly stated.

Any of the functions of monitoring governance practices considered in this paper can be categorised as wide, in terms of compliance and accountability functions, to the narrow, such as auditing and explanatory.

Based on comparisons with other systems of monitoring global public governance practices, we can also say that, in the field of sport, similar motives and needs can be found. These similarities can be mainly seen as a need to review and/or to assess the role of sport governance in the wider or individual system, to introduce changes, to learn and to fulfil obligations.

When it comes to the set of concrete monitoring data, with which it would be possible to recognise the sport public governance practice, various sets of information should be looked for in relation to the prevailing mode of public governance (see Table 1).

Despite some already established national accounting systems (Grujic & Jeraj, 2011) global monitoring attempts (see Council of Europe's 2013 and Wada's, 2013 yearly reports) and early comparative attempts to gather data in the field of sport (see European Commission, 2013), the data that would allow us to obtain information about the above-stated aims still need to be gathered. However, the question of how, and with what preliminary motives, is a task to be answered in another paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Table 1: Modes of (public) governance in sports

Macro-system mode	Meso-system mode	Micro-system/individual mode
– relation to external environmental and regime structure characteristics (e.g. the characteristics of the state or institution in which the sport policies take place)	– sport policy own environment	– performance of individual institution inside sport
– *type of authority:* type of political system, government structures and division of powers, membership in world key international institutions (e.g. the state, UN, OECD, EU)	– *institutional-related specifics:* which governmental and non-governmental institutions create sport public policy arena, their jurisdictions and mutual cooperation's forms (networks)	– *institution-related:* type of institution; governance structures of institution and their members (e.g. by gender, geographic coverage), no. of institutional units (institutional charter); membership: no. of members, institution's membership in other institutions; employed: no. of all employees; gender balance, positions by gender; no. of employed internal/external experts, field of expertise; elections: electoral rules and procedures, mandates; regulation: no. and type of basic institutional rules; economy: yearly GDP, its structure, growth, incomes and outcomes, final yearly accounts
– *elections:* electoral rules and procedures, mandates	– *process-related specifics:* contextual; the main interests and aims of governmental intervention and how they are regarded by the other involved actors; which and how many measures are being used for implementing policy goals, how many finances and for whom are devoted, how the processes are working	
– *economy:* yearly GDP, its structure, growth, incomes and outcomes, TI corruption index		
– *society:* size of population, poverty rate		– *performance-related:* policy-making procedures: who is allowed to initiate what inside the institution (and how and when); available resources: finances/individual institution project and program: yearly amount of finances, share of financial sources, final account; staff/individual institution project and program: no. of employees; gender balance, type of positions by gender; knowledge and expertise/individual institution project and program: no. of employed internal/external experts, field of expertise; other resources /individual institution projects and programs

REFERENCES

Alms, J. (ed.) (2013). *Action for Good Governance in International Sport (AGGIS).* Copenhagen: Play the Game/Danish Institute for Sports Studies.

Bélanger, C. (2003). *Concepts in Social Science and History,* available at www2.marianopolis.edu/quebechistory/events/concepts.htm (accessed 15 October 2003).

Bevir, Mark, ed. (2010). *The Sage Handbook of Governance.* London: Sage.

Blin, A. & Marin, G. (2008). *Rethinking Global Governance.* Available from: http://www.world-governance.org/spip.php?rubrique35 (September 20, 2013)

Casey, B. H. & Gold, M. (2004). *Peer review of labour market policies in the European Union: what can countries really learn from one another?* Online. Available HTTP: <http://eucenter.wisc.edu/OMC/Papers/EES/caseyGold.pdf> (accessed 8 May 2008).

Chaker, A.-N. (1999). *Study of National Sports Legislation in Europe.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Chaker, A.-N. (2004). *Good Governance in Sport. A European Survey.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Chappelet, J.L. & Mrkonjic, M. (2013). Basic Indicators for Better. Governance in International. Sport (BIBGIS): An assessment tool for international sport. IDHEAP Working Paper 1/2013. Lausanne: IDHEAP Institut de hautes études en administration publique. Swiss Graduate School of Public Administration.

Considine, M. & Lewis, J.M. (2003). Bureaucracy, Network, or Enterprise? Comparing Models of Governance in Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zealand. *Public Administration Review, 63*(2), 131-140.

Council of Europe (2013). *Monitoring Reports.* Available HTTP: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/sport/Doping/Antidoping_database/Default_en.asp (Accessed 23 September 2013).

Cram, L. (2001). Governance 'to Go': Domestic Actors, Institutions and the Boundaries of the Possible. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 39*(4), 595–618.

Dingwerth, K. & Pattberg, P. (2006). Global Governance as a Perspective on World

Politics. *Global Governance. A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations,* 12 (2), 185-203.

Dunn, W. (2004). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction.* Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Eberlein, B. & Kerwer, D. (2002). Theorising the New Modes of European Union Governance. *European Integration online Papers, 6*(5), 1–16.

Eising, R. & Kohler-Koch, B. (1999): Introduction: Network Governance in the European Union. In Kohler-Koch, B. & Eising, R. (eds.). *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union (3–13).* London, Routledge.

European Commission (2007). *The White Paper on Sport.* COM, 2007/0391.

European Commission (2013). *Sport Statistics.* Available http://ec.europa.eu/sport/what-we-do/sport-statistics_en.htm (Accessed 23 September 2013).

Ferrera, M., Manos, M. & Saccchi, S. (2002). Open Co-ordination Against Poverty: The New EU "Social inclusion process". Journal of European Social Policy, 12(3), 227–239.

Global Reporting Initiative (2012). Homepage. Available at: https://www.globalreporting.org/Pages/default.aspx, March, 2012

Groeneveld, M. & Houlihan, B.M.J., eds. (2010). Social capital and sport governance in Europe. Routledge.

Grujić, S. & Jeraj, J. (2011). Šport v številkah. Ljubljana: Zavod za šport Republike Slovenije Planica.

Henry, I. & Lee, P.C. (2004). Governance and ethics in sport. In J. Beech, J. & S. Chadwick (eds.) The Business of Sport Management, London: Prentice-Hall.

Henry, P. I. (2004). The Politics of Leisure Policy. Houndmills: Macmillan.

Héritier, A. (2002). Common Goods. Reinventing European and International Governance. Boston: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Hogwood, W. B. & Gunn, A. L. (1984). Policy Analysis for the Real world. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Houlihan, B. & White, A. (2002). The Politics of Sports Development. The Development of Sport or Development through *Sport?* London: Routledge.

Hoye, R. & Inglis, S. (2004). Governance of nonprofit leisure organizations. *Society and Leisure, 26*(2), 369-387.

Hoye, R., & Cuskelly, G. (2007). *Sport governance.* Sydney: Elsevier.

Jachtenfuchs, M. (1995): Theoretical Perspectives on European Governance. *European Law Journal,* 1(2), 115–33.

Jachtenfuchs, M. & Kohler-Koch, B. (2004): Governance and Institutional Development. In Wiener, A. & Diez, T. (eds.): *European Integration Theory (97–115).* Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Kassim, H. & Le Galès, P (2010). Exploring Governance in a Multi-Level Polity: A Policy Instruments Approach. *West European Politics, 33*(1), 1–21.

Kenner, J. (1995). EC Labour Law: The Softly, Softly Approach. *The International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations, 1*(4), 307–326.

Knill, C. & Lenschow, A. (1998). Coping with Europe: The Impact of British and German Administration on the Implementation of EU Environmental Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy,* (5)4: 595–614.

Kohler-Koch, Beate (2002): European Networks and Ideas: Changing National Policies?. European Integration online Papers (EioP), 6(6).

Kohler-Koch, Beate, ed. (2003): Linking EU and National Governance. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kooiman , J. (2003). *Governing as Governance.* London: Sage .

Kustec Lipicer, S., Erker, R. & Bartolj, T. (2012). Javnopolitični ukrepi in modeli športne politike v Sloveniji. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.

Kustec Lipicer, S., Lajh, D. & Grgic, I. (2013). Monitoring systems of good governance. In Alm, J. (ed.). *Action for Good Governance in International Sport (AGGIS) (67-83).* Copenhagen: Play the Game/Danish Institute for Sports Studies.

Marks, G., Scharpf, W. F., Schmitter, P. C. & Streeck, W., eds. (1996): *Governance in the European Union.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Nedergaard, P. (2006). Policy Learning in the European Union: The Case of the European Employment Strategy. *Policy Studies, 27*(4), 311–323.

Paraskevopoulos, J. C. (2002): EU Enlargement and Multi-Level Governance in European Public Policy-Making: Actors, Institutions and Policy Learning. *Liuc Papers,* 116.

Pawson, R. (2006). *Evidence Based Policy: A Realist Perspective.* London: Sage.

Peters, A. & Pagotto, I. (2006). *Soft Law as a New Mode of Governance: A Legal Perspective.* Online. Available HTTP: <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1668531> (10 July 2010).

Pierre, J. & Peters, G. B. (2000): *Governance, Politics and the State.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003): *Understanding Governance. Policy Networks, Reflexivity and Accountability.* Maidenhead, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Rosenau, J. N. (1995). Governance in the Twenty-first Century. *Global Governance, 1*(1).

Scharpf, F. W. (2001) European Governance: Common Concerns vs. the challenge of Diversity. *Jean Monnet Working Paper No. 07/01.* New York: University of Law.

Scott, J. & Trubek, D. M. (2002) Mind the Gap: Law and New Approaches to Governance in the European Union, *European Law Journal, 8*(1), 1–18.

Shilbury, D. (2000). Considering future sport delivery systems. *Sport Management Review, 3,* 199-221.

Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1992). Understanding change in national sport organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management, 6,* 114-132.

Snyder, F. (1993). Soft law and Institutional Practice in the European Community in Steve M. (ed). *The Construction of Europe – Essays in honour of Emile Noel* (pp. 197-225). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sobry, C (eds). (2011). *Sport Governance in the World: a socio-historic approach.* Paris: Le Manuscrit.

Sobry, C. (eds). (2012). *Sports Governance in the World: a socio-historic approach. Volume II. The Transition in Central and Eastern European Sport.* Paris: Le Manuscrit.

Transparency International (2012). *Homepage.* Available at: http://www.transparency.org/, March, 2012.

Treib, O., Holger, B. & Falkner, G (2007). Modes of Governance: Towards a Conceptual Clarification. *Journal of European Public Policy 14*(1), 1–20.

Trubek, D. M., Cottrell, P. & Nance, M. (2005). *"Soft Law", "Hard Law", and European Integration: Toward a Theory of Hybridity.'* Online. Available HTTP: <http://law.wisc.edu/facstaff/trubek/hybriditypaperapril2005.pdf> (accessed 8 May 2011).

UK Sport (2004). *Good Governance: A Guide for National Governing Bodies of Sport,* London: Institute of Chartered Secretaries and Administrators.

WADA (2013). *Monitoring Program.* Available HTTP: http://www.wada-ama.org/en/world-anti-doping-program/sports-and-anti-doping-organizations/international-standards/prohibited-list/monitoring-program/ (Accessed 3 October 2013).

World Governance Index (2012). *Homepage of the Forum for a New World Governance.* Available at: http://www.world-governance.org/, March ,2012.