

ARBITRATION IN SLOVENIAN SPORTS

KATJA DRNOVŠEK

University of Maribor, Faculty of Law, Maribor, Slovenia
katja.drnovsek@um.si

Due to its undeniable advantages, international sports arbitration has become a central mechanism for resolving sports disputes. In Slovenia, however, the legal framework remains limited and fragmented: national legislation regulates arbitration in general terms and sport as a sector, but does not integrate the two, whereas several Slovenian sports federations have recently created or reformed their arbitration mechanisms. The article studies sports arbitration as a multi-layered regime shaped by statutory minimum standards, the regulatory autonomy of sports organisations, and the influence of international federations. It outlines the statutory framework of sports arbitration, analyses the organisational and procedural features of emerging national mechanisms, and highlights practical shortcomings that currently limit the impact of out-of-court mechanisms in sports. It concludes by outlining some conditions under which national sports arbitration could evolve into a credible and effective alternative to ordinary courts while maintaining the legitimate autonomy of sport.

DOI

[https://doi.org/
10.18690/um.pf.1.2026.10](https://doi.org/10.18690/um.pf.1.2026.10)

ISBN

978-961-299-176-0

Keywords:

sports arbitration tribunals,
dispute resolution
mechanisms,
autonomy of sports,
Court of Arbitration for
Sport (CAS), national
sports federations,
lex sportiva,
procedural safeguards,
arbitral award



University of Maribor Press

1 Introduction

Sports organisations have a long tradition of resolving internal disputes autonomously, outside the ordinary court systems. Most of them are private, voluntary associations and are not governed by public authorities exercising statutory powers. As a result, the majority of disputes involving sports organisations are governed by contractual principles, meaning that different legal systems and principles may apply to different sports and athletes.¹ Several reasons explain the preference for a less formal approach in such circumstances. Most importantly, avoiding court often allows for a faster, more cost-effective resolution in matters that can be very time-sensitive and tied to a competition schedule or a relatively short duration of the athlete's career.² Furthermore, out-of-court dispute resolution entrusts decision-making to experts familiar with sports regulations, practices, and institutional relationships, thereby facilitating a more uniform application of sports rules and reducing the risk of unfair or arbitrary treatment of participants from different jurisdictions.³ In recent years, sports arbitration has emerged as the most widely used mechanism for resolving sports disputes, as it enables the issuance of legally binding decisions while ensuring compliance with specific sports norms and rules.⁴

Several international arbitration forums handle disputes with a sporting dimension, including specialised bodies such as the International Basketball Federation (FIBA),⁵ the International Association Football Federation (FIFA),⁶ and the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Centre.⁷ However, the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), established in Lausanne (Switzerland) in 1984, is now widely recognised as the most important, established and active forum for resolving sports-related disputes. It functions as a *de facto* supreme court for sport, as it is recognised by all international sports federations and organisations within the Olympic movement, and by several non-Olympic federations, as the competent adjudicatory body and the final instance of appeal for international disputes (to the exclusion of national courts).⁸ Its founding purpose was to take international sports disputes out of

¹ McLaren, 2011, pp. 380-381.

² See, for example, Reilly, 2012, pp. 71-74; Kastratović, 2025, p. 33; or Cavalieros & Kim, 2015, p. 239.

³ For more, see Cavalieros & Kim, 2015, pp. 246-250.

⁴ Kastratović, 2025, p. 28.

⁵ For more, see FIBA (n.d.).

⁶ For more, see FIFA (n.d.).

⁷ For more, see WIPO (n.d.).

⁸ Bergant Rakočević, 2020, p. 375; Reilly, 2012, p. 67. See also Cavalieros & Kim, 2015, p. 237.

national courts and provide a highly specialised forum where they could be heard and decided quickly and inexpensively, according to a flexible procedure.⁹ Since its inception, it has registered more than 12,000 cases, averaging 900 cases per year.¹⁰ The CAS operates as an independent tribunal that considers two types of disputes: those that arise out of an arbitration clause contained in a contract or regulations or a later arbitration agreement¹¹ (ordinary arbitration proceedings) and those involving an appeal against a decision rendered by a federation, association or sports-related body where the statutes or regulations of such bodies or a specific agreement provide for an appeal to CAS¹² (appeal arbitration proceedings).¹³ During international sports events, the CAS also creates *ad hoc* divisions with the purpose of settling disputes within a very short period of time (e.g., within 24 hours at the Olympic Games).¹⁴ As a single, independent, and accomplished sports adjudication body capable of consistently applying the rules of different sports organisations, minimising the influence of national courts, and preventing legal uncertainty in sports, the CAS is said to be developing universal principles of the so-called *lex sportiva*.¹⁵

Although the importance and prevalence of sports arbitration are also on the rise in Slovenian sports, its significance is not reflected in the national regulatory framework, which notably lacks integrated, directly applicable solutions. The few relevant statutes operate in parallel and have no explicit overlaps. Arbitration as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism is regulated in general terms by the Arbitration Act (*Zakon o arbitraži* – ZArbit),¹⁶ which does not consider the structural particularities of sport, while the Sports Act (*Zakon o športu* – ZŠpo-1)¹⁷ establishes the organisational framework of the Slovenian sports system but contains no references to arbitration. Thus, the approach to sports arbitration in Slovenia is not

⁹ Reilly, 2012, p. 63. See also Kastratović, 2025, p. 29.

¹⁰ CAS (n.d.-a).

¹¹ Contractual disputes usually involve issues such as employment contracts between players, coaches, clubs and national federations, sponsorship, selling television rights, organising sports events and player transfers, while disciplinary disputes involve alleged violations of sporting regulations, such as doping violations, on-field violence, match fixing, violation of ethics rules, corruption and safe sport issues. CAS (n.d.-b).

¹² Disciplinary disputes are usually under appeal, with decisions first handled by a federation or sports body. CAS then acts as a court of last instance to examine the matter and render a final decision. CAS (n.d.-b).

¹³ *Code of Sports-related Arbitration*, Article R27. For more, see also Bergant Rakočević, 2020, pp. 384-388; Coccia, 2013; and Burger, 2000, p. 124.

¹⁴ CAS (n.d.-b). For more, see Bergant Rakočević, 2020, pp. 390-391; Coccia, 2013, p. 34.

¹⁵ E.g., McLaren, 2011, p. 381; Kastratović, 2025, p. 38.

¹⁶ Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 45/08 and 100/25 – ZS-1.

¹⁷ Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 29/17, 21/18 – ZNOrg, 82/20, 3/22 – ZDeb and 37/24 – ZMat-B.

a matter of directly applying general arbitration rules to sports disputes, but a complex interplay between statutory mechanisms that set minimum procedural standards for arbitration on the one hand and the regulatory autonomy of sports organisations, which establish their own normative frameworks and arbitration procedures, on the other. For Slovenian athletes and clubs participating in international competitions, these instruments frequently determine the competent forum and all aspects of procedural rules, standards, and guarantees in matters concerning transfers, registration, qualifications, disciplinary sanctions, doping, remuneration, and other related issues. Rather than serving as the primary source of regulation, Slovenian legislation retains the purpose of determining the minimum procedural requirements and the limits of autonomy in sports, while jurisdiction over sports disputes is ceded to extrajudicial tribunals. However, this does not imply that no institutional solutions exist at a national level to address these issues. Under the influence of international federations, Slovenian national federations have recently begun adopting their own rules on dispute resolution and establishing arbitral tribunals with jurisdiction over disputes arising within a particular sector or sport. These developments are both recent and ongoing, which is why they have received only limited academic attention so far, even though they have the potential to significantly affect access to remedies and procedural protection for athletes and sports organisations involved in sports disputes.

To shed some light on these issues, the article analyses the normative framework and practical considerations of sports arbitration in Slovenia, taking into account the complexity of a multi-layered regime comprising national regulatory schemes, transnational institutional structures, and newly established national forums for dispute resolution. It first analyses the limited but still relevant roles of ZArbit and ZŠpo-1 in facilitating and promoting the use of arbitration in resolving sports disputes. It then examines the organisational aspects of arbitration tribunals and similar mechanisms established by national sports organisations, as well as early cases adjudicated by these authorities. In that regard, the article deliberately focuses on national aspects and largely refrains from discussing the CAS regime, except where attempting to place Slovenian mechanisms within the broader transnational framework. Finally, it evaluates the impact of the emerging trend of national sports organisations establishing their own arbitration tribunals and outlines some normative and practical challenges facing Slovenian stakeholders involved in sports. Due to very modest research efforts and limited academic contributions in this area, the article largely draws from regulatory solutions and publicly available information.

2 Legal Framework for Sports Arbitration in Slovenia

2.1 General Arbitration Framework

The general procedural framework for sports arbitration is provided by the ZArbit, which governs all types of arbitration conducted in the Republic of Slovenia, regardless of whether the parties are Slovenian or foreign citizens or organisations (para. 1 of Article 1 of the ZArbit).¹⁸ Under Article 4 of ZArbit, any pecuniary claim or other claim that is capable of settlement between the parties can be decided in an arbitration procedure, and any natural or legal person, including the Republic of Slovenia and other persons governed by public law, may conclude an arbitration agreement. An arbitration agreement – defined as an agreement by which the parties submit to arbitration all or certain disputes that have arisen or may arise between them in respect of a defined contractual or non-contractual legal relationship – must be made in writing, either as an arbitration clause in a contract or as a separate agreement (Article 10 of the ZArbit). By agreeing to arbitration, the parties renounce the judicial protection that state courts would otherwise provide, while arbitrators obtain their authority to resolve disputes based on mutual consent, and not on the basis of state authority.¹⁹

Even though the parties' consent is the basic prerequisite for arbitration, sports arbitration agreements are rarely the product of free negotiation or true party autonomy in practice. Arbitration clauses are typically pre-drafted and integrated into federation statutes, membership rules, competition regulations or standard contracts. They are therefore generally unavoidable for athletes and other stakeholders who participate in organised sport. For example, the arbitration clause conferring jurisdiction on the CAS most often appears either in a written contract concluded in advance between the participants of a sports event and the sports organisation that organises that event,²⁰ or in the general acts of sports organisations, compliance with which is a condition for membership within the organised structure of sport.²¹ In either case, signing the arbitration agreement is

¹⁸ The rules governing arbitration procedure under the ZArbit are based on the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration, and the uniform application of the latter is promoted in interpreting its provisions, alongside the principle of good faith (Article 2 of the ZArbit).

¹⁹ Kastratović, 2025, pp. 36-37. See also Higher Court in Koper order I Cp 64/2022 of 24 February 2022.

²⁰ All contracts that the International Olympic Committee (IOC) now enters contain a clause that disputes will be referred to the CAS for final decision. For more, see Burger, 2000, p. 124.

²¹ Kastratović, 2025, pp. 36-37. See also Bergant Rakočević, 2020, pp. 379-381.

mandatory for all athletes wishing to participate in international competitions sanctioned by international federations, which raises questions as to whether consent is really validly given when the athlete's only alternative is to refuse to sign and consequently bar him- or herself from competing in the relevant sports event. The Swiss Federal Tribunal²² has consistently held that the need for a quick and uniform dispute-resolution system in international sport prevails over an athlete's right to have his or her case adjudicated by ordinary courts, provided that the dispute-resolution system observes the fundamental requirements of due process.²³ More critically, the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) emphasised in its judgements that compulsory arbitration clauses are not prohibited, but the arbitral tribunal must afford the safeguards under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR),²⁴ in particular those of independence and impartiality.²⁵ At the same time, a judicial review (by the Swiss Federal Tribunal) must satisfy the requirement of a "particularly rigorous examination".²⁶ Another restraint on mandatory arbitration was recently established by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) in the case of *RFC Seraing v. FIFA*. Where the dispute is linked to the pursuit of a sport as an economic activity within the territory of the European Union (EU), the Member State must not confer the authority of *res judicata* on a CAS award, unless a court in that Member State has first carried out an effective review of whether the award complies with the principles and provisions of EU law which form part of EU public policy, and that court is authorised to make a reference to the CJEU for a preliminary ruling.²⁷ Put differently, every individual – including an athlete – must have the right to effective judicial protection before the ordinary courts of the EU Member States when their fundamental rights and freedoms within the EU legal order are at stake, even if the CAS has already ruled on the matter. While the CAS remains the central body for resolving sports disputes, its authority is expressly conditional on compliance with EU public policy when EU law is engaged.²⁸

²² The Swiss Federal Tribunal is the competent court for appeals against a CAS award.

²³ Reilly, 2012, p. 67.

²⁴ Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia – MP, No. 7/94.

²⁵ *Muti and Pechstein v. Switzerland*, 2018. See also Bergant Rakočević, 2018, pp. 16-18.

²⁶ *Semenya v. Switzerland*, 2025.

²⁷ *RFC Seraing v. FIFA*, 2025.

²⁸ Živić, 2025, pp. 17-18.

Against this backdrop, ZArbit follows the logic of civil procedural law: an arbitral award has the same effect as a final court judgment and is enforceable under the rules on enforcement and security (Article 38 of the ZArbit).²⁹ It may be challenged before a court only by an action for setting aside the arbitral award, which must be brought within three months of receiving the award (Article 40 of the ZArbit).³⁰ In general, courts may act only in a very limited capacity in matters governed by the ZArbit,³¹ reflecting the purpose of the arbitration procedure: to resolve a dispute without court intervention. An arbitral award rendered by a domestic arbitral tribunal may be enforced once the court declares it enforceable (Article 41 of the ZArbit), while an arbitral award rendered by a foreign arbitral tribunal – including those rendered by the CAS – has effect once it is recognised by the court in accordance with the terms of the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of International Arbitral Awards from 1958, i.e. New York Convention (Article 42 of ZArbit).³²

ZArbit also provides general procedural rules that apply to the arbitration procedure if the parties have not agreed otherwise, e.g., on the number of arbitrators (Article 13 of ZArbit), the requirements and procedure for their appointment and exclusion (Articles 14-18 of the ZArbit), the conduct of the proceedings, the seat of arbitration, the language (Article 21 to 31 of the ZArbit), the applicable law (Article 32 of the ZArbit), etc. In the context of sports arbitration, however, these provisions are of limited practical relevance, as most institutions, athletes and other participants are

²⁹ The act regulating enforcement and security in the Republic of Slovenia is the Enforcement and Security Act (*Zakon o izvršbi in zavarovanju* – ZIZ), Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 3/07 – official consolidated text, 93/07, 37/08 – ZST-1, 45/08 – ZArbit, 28/09, 51/10, 26/11, 17/13 – odl. US, 45/14 – odl. US, 53/14, 58/14 – odl. US, 54/15, 76/15 – odl. US, 11/18, 53/19 – odl. US, 66/19 – ZDavP-2M, 23/20 – SPZ-B, 36/21, 81/22 – odl. US, 81/22 – odl. US and 100/25 – ZS-1.

³⁰ The court may set aside an arbitral award only if: one of the parties lacked capacity to conclude the arbitration agreement or the agreement is not valid under the applicable law; the party was not properly notified of the appointment of an arbitrator or the arbitral proceedings, or was otherwise deprived of the opportunity to present its case before the arbitral tribunal; the award concerns a dispute not falling within the terms of the arbitration agreement; the composition of the arbitral tribunal or the arbitral procedure was not in accordance with the agreement of the parties or with the ZArbit; the subject matter of the dispute is not capable of settlement by arbitration; or the arbitral award is contrary to the public policy of the Republic of Slovenia (para. 2 of Article 40 of the ZArbit). See also the Supreme Court of the RS judgement Cp 27/2024 of 19 February 2025.

³¹ Court jurisdiction is stipulated for decisions on the admissibility of arbitration proceedings, the appointment or challenge of an arbitrator, the termination of an arbitrator's mandate, the jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal, the setting aside of an arbitral award, the declaration of enforceability of domestic arbitral awards and the recognition of foreign arbitral awards. Appeals against the court's decisions in these matters are decided by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia, while extraordinary legal remedies are not permitted (Articles 8 and 9 of the ZArbit).

³² Official Gazette of the SFRJ - MP, No. 11/81. See Article 42 of the ZArbit and Kastratović, 2025, p. 34. For more on recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards in Slovenia, see also Galič, 2013.

typically bound by special rules established by sports organisations or, in many cases, by the procedural framework under the CAS regime.

Even though ZArbit provides no explicit rules governing sports arbitration, its importance in this area lies in establishing the legal basis for the formal validity of arbitration agreements, the subject matter of arbitration, minimum procedural guarantees, the effect and enforceability of arbitral awards and the (limited) possibility of judicial review. It recognises sports arbitration as a legitimate mechanism for dispute resolution under national law and provides normative solutions when sports rules fail to address particular issues.

2.2 Statutory Framework of Slovenian Sport

ZŠpo-1, which entered into force in 2017, contains no provisions that would directly regulate sports arbitration. Its purpose is to define the public interest in the field of sport, the mechanisms for its implementation, the competent bodies, the conditions for performing professional work in sport, the rights of athletes, public sports facilities and areas for outdoor sport, sporting events, data collections and supervision in the field of sport (Article 1 of the ZŠpo-1). However, it is still worth underscoring its role in improving the institutional protection of athletes and sports professionals by establishing the position of the Athlete's Rights Ombudsman (Article 66 of the ZŠpo-1). When drafting ZŠpo-1, the government recognised that sport can, through inappropriate approaches, lead to inhumane treatment of athletes, such as competing despite injuries, overtraining, unsuitable training methods for young competitors, coercion or incitement to dishonest sporting conduct, physical violence against athletes during training or competition, humiliation or verbal abuse, sexual exploitation, and similar conduct. Because every athlete and every sports professional is entitled to enjoy all the rights and freedoms defined by international treaties and domestic legislation, the Athletes' Rights Ombudsman was charged with the responsibility to protect those rights.³³

The Athletes' Rights Ombudsman considers complaints, comments, proposals and initiatives submitted by athletes or their legal representatives, sports professionals, providers of sports programmes, and, where applicable, by authorities. They also publish examples of good and bad practices in sport on their website and inform the

³³ Proposal for a Sports Act, 2016, p. 68.

public (para. 1 of Article 66 of the ZŠpo-1). Most importantly for this paper, the Ombudsman advises athletes in dispute cases and presents them with options to protect their rights. Depending on the disputing parties' wishes, they can also help them resolve a particular dispute through alternative dispute resolution, especially mediation. The guiding principles of the Ombudsman's work and of the conduct of proceedings are informality, orality, speed, and confidentiality, provided that the nature of the matter allows for this. All proceedings and counselling are free of charge for athletes and sports professionals.³⁴ Otherwise, the Ombudsman does not have decision-making powers. They are appointed by the government for a period of five years and perform their duties on a non-professional basis. In performing these duties, the Ombudsman is independent and autonomous and is required to act honourably, fairly and in good faith (para. 5 and 6 of Article 66 of the ZŠpo-1).³⁵

In 2023,³⁶ the Ombudsman handled 42 different cases concerning various areas of sport. In most instances, these involved providing legal guidance and advice regarding athletes' rights (for example, contractual obligations, transfer compensation, or funding issues), obtaining and forwarding information (primarily concerning entries in the public register of registered and categorised athletes), providing assistance and guidance, as well as considering and issuing initiatives, and similar activities.³⁷ Among the problems identified, the Ombudsman highlighted as the most significant issue the fact that, in Slovenian sport, apart from protection before ordinary courts, no system of alternative dispute resolution is in place. As a result, most disputes are not resolved at all but are instead suppressed or swept under the carpet. He also emphasised that sports organisations resolve disputes from a position of power, derived from their status and financial resources, which are in principle supported by the ZŠpo-1 and the State. Although the Ombudsman has in the past assisted in resolving disputes through mediation techniques, in cases of more serious or complex disputes – particularly those involving financial claims – such methods are often ineffective. The reason is that leading sports officials are aware that proceedings before ordinary courts are lengthy, and the outcome of litigation is highly uncertain due to the lack of expertise in sports matters, the absence of specialised courts for sports disputes, and the scarcity of relevant case

³⁴ GOV.SI (n.d.).

³⁵ See also Rules on the Operation and Financing of the Athletes' Rights Ombudsman (*Pravilnik o delovanju in financiranju varuha športnikovih pravic*), Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 69/17, 94/23 and 53/25.

³⁶ The last published annual report of the Athletes' Rights Ombudsman refers to the year 2023.

³⁷ For more, see Athletes' Rights Ombudsman, 2023, pp. 14-20.

law. In cases involving non-payment of contractual amounts by a sports organisation, there is also little likelihood that an athlete or a sports professional will bring a lawsuit against the federation or the club.³⁸ The Ombudsman's recommendation to establish an independent arbitration body for the resolution of disputes in sport in Slovenia is not a new one, as he has reiterated the need for such a forum in several annual reports since 2018.³⁹

While the ZŠpo-1 failed to regulate arbitration or other alternative methods of dispute resolution, their importance is mentioned in the new Resolution on the National Programme for Sport in the Republic of Slovenia for the Period 2026–2035 (*Resolucija o nacionalnem programu športa v Republiki Sloveniji za obdobje 2026–2035* - ReNPŠ26–35),⁴⁰ which was adopted in July 2025.⁴¹ The National Programme for Sport is a strategic document for the developmental planning of sports policy, which is adopted for a ten-year period. Among other things, it specifies tasks of national and local importance aimed at providing conditions for Slovenian residents to participate more frequently and more effectively in sports and physical activities for the preservation of health (Chapter 1 of ReNPŠ26–35). The chapter on social and environmental responsibility in sport underscores the importance of alternative dispute resolution in sports, emphasising that these are well-established methods of resolving sports disputes, as they allow conflicts to be settled more quickly, suitably, and effectively for sport than proceedings before ordinary courts. It further states that, although various institutional forms of alternative dispute resolution exist worldwide, a public discussion should determine which model is most suitable for Slovenia. The strategic objectives identified are safeguarding the autonomy of sport and the European model of sport, and ensuring an effective system for resolving sports disputes. To this end, the ReNPŠ26–35 proposes the following measures: a public consultation on suitable forms of alternative dispute resolution in sport; conferences and awareness-raising campaigns on the importance of out-of-court dispute resolution for preserving the autonomy of sports organisations; support for the autonomous sports sector in developing a general arbitration clause (Chapter 3.6.5 of ReNPŠ26–35). However, until these measures are realised and pending any

³⁸ Ibid., p. 21.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 23–28.

⁴⁰ Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 55/25.

⁴¹ Succeeding the previous Resolution on the National Programme for Sport in the Republic of Slovenia for the Period 2014–2023.

statutory reform, national sports organisations continue to develop their own mechanisms within the scope of their organisational autonomy.

3 Institutional Landscape

3.1 Sports Arbitration Tribunal at the Slovenian Olympic Committee

The Ombudsman's observation that most sports-related disputes are not resolved in arbitration, but internally within sports federations, if at all, is justified. There is an extreme disproportionality between the number of cases brought before the Ombudsman and the comparatively negligible number of cases initiated before institutional mechanisms. Most sectoral sports federations do not have their own permanent arbitral tribunal and although the Olympic Committee of Slovenia – Association of Sports Federations (OKS-ZŠZ) operates a permanent Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ for Sport, the tribunal has adjudicated only a small number of cases despite the fact the OKS-ZŠZ serves as an umbrella organisation for national sport federations, local sports associations, and other sports associations in Slovenia.⁴²

The Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ for Sport is an independent and impartial arbitration tribunal responsible for providing dispute resolution in the fields of sports between national and municipal sports federations, their clubs and athletes, and for deciding on the rights the parties may exercise (the concept of *razpolagati* in Slovene), if the parties agree to its competence (Article 3 of Rules on the Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ for Sport).⁴³ The OKZ-ZŠZ members are obliged to submit all of their internal disputes (disputes between an OKZ-ZŠZ member and an athlete; disputes between sports clubs that are members of an OKZ-ZŠZ member; disputes between sports clubs that are members of an OKZ-ZŠZ member and athletes), as well as disputes among members and disputes with OKZ-ZŠZ, to the Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ, but only after exhausting their internal dispute-resolution procedures and, in any event, before initiating proceedings before the ordinary courts. Arbitrators, who must hold a legal qualification and have experience in the field of sport, are appointed for a four-year term and may be reappointed (Article 77

⁴² See Rules of the Olympic Committee of Slovenia – Association of Sports Federations (*Pravila olimpijskega komiteja Slovenije – Združenja športnih zvez*), Article 1 and the following.

⁴³ The latest version of Rules on the Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ for Sport (*Pravilnik o arbitražnem razsodišču za šport pri Olimpijskem komiteju Slovenije – Združenju športnih zvez*) was adopted in 2014.

of the Rules of the Olympic Committee of Slovenia – Association of Sports Federations). Arbitral awards granted by the Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ have the effect of final judgments and are thus binding on the parties. They can only be appealed before the CAS (Article 49 of the Rules on the Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ for Sport).

In theory, the Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ for Sport serves as a forum for resolving disputes among national or municipal sports federations, clubs, and athletes. In practice, however, only a small number of cases have ever been brought before it, which shows that this mechanism is notably underused.

3.2 Football Association of Slovenia Dispute Resolution Chamber

In recent years, some sectoral sports federations in Slovenia have established their own permanent arbitration tribunals. Arguably, the most important example, given the popularity of football, is the Dispute Resolution Chamber at the Football Association of Slovenia (*Nogometna zveza Slovenije* – NZS). FIFA had long encouraged national football associations to establish independent arbitration bodies,⁴⁴ and in December 2018, the constitutive session of the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber finally took place.⁴⁵ The NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber is set up as an independent and impartial permanent tribunal within the football association, competent to resolve certain types of disputes between football stakeholders, such as contractual disputes between football clubs and players, trainers and football agents, claims for compensation arising from unjustified termination of contracts, and claims for training and development compensation between football clubs (Articles 3 and 5 of Regulations on Dispute Resolution Chamber).⁴⁶

The tribunal operates as a single-instance body, meaning that the arbitral award is deemed final immediately upon communication to the parties and no appeal is allowed within the NZS system (Article 37 of the Regulations on the Dispute Resolution Chamber). The NZS, football clubs, players, trainers, football agents and FIFA match agents are all bound by the arbitration clause, meaning that they must resolve disputes exclusively before the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber and

⁴⁴ See, for example, FIFA, 2005.

⁴⁵ NZS, 2018.

⁴⁶ The latest version of Regulations on Dispute Resolution Chamber (*Pravilnik o nogometni arbitraži*) entered into force on 1 October 2025.

comply with its decisions, instead of turning to ordinary courts (Article 7 of the Regulations on Dispute Resolution Chamber). Under Article 15 of the NZS Statutes,⁴⁷ the NZS members have the duty to submit disputes relating to the application of the NZS Statutes, regulations, instructions, and decisions to an independent and impartial arbitral tribunal, which shall decide the dispute with final effect, rather than to the ordinary courts, where this is permitted by the legal order of the Republic of Slovenia, and ensure through statutory provisions that their members do the same.⁴⁸ Football clubs must recognise the jurisdiction of such an independent and impartial arbitral tribunal and comply with its decisions (Article 45 of the NZS Statutes).⁴⁹ According to the Higher Court in Koper, an NZS member who voluntarily accedes to an agreement conferring exclusive jurisdiction on the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber to resolve disputes has, with respect to such disputes, simultaneously and voluntarily waived the right to seek judicial protection before the courts. If they initiate court proceedings nonetheless, the court must – upon the defendant’s objection – decline jurisdiction, set aside the procedural steps taken, and dismiss the action (Article 11 of the ZArbit).⁵⁰

It should be noted that during its first term, the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber was not yet officially recognised by FIFA, as FIFA did not publish its official principles for the recognition of independent dispute resolution bodies within national associations (the so-called National Dispute Resolution Chambers, or NDRCs) until February 2024.⁵¹ In April and October 2025, the NZS Executive Committee adopted significant amendments to its arbitration rules – largely in response to FIFA’s requirements for national recognition. The amendments included equalising the status of representatives of players, coaches, and clubs, incorporating the principle of acting in good faith, and providing clearer rules on representation in proceedings. The aim was to ensure greater legal certainty and the

⁴⁷ NZS Statutes (*Statut Nogometne zveze Slovenije*).

⁴⁸ They must also recognise the jurisdiction of and the decisions of CAS, as defined in the FIFA Statutes and the UEFA Statutes, for any dispute relating to the application of the statutes, regulations, instructions, and decisions of FIFA and UEFA, and agree to the exclusion of the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts, where this is permitted by the legal order of the Republic of Slovenia, and ensure through statutory provisions that their members do the same; as well as ensure through statutory provisions that disputes in which they or their members are involved, which require resolution by arbitration and concern sporting competitive relationships, are resolved exclusively within the framework of the NZS, UEFA, and/or FIFA, and not before the ordinary courts, except in cases where Slovenian law provides otherwise.

⁴⁹ They must also recognise the jurisdiction of CAS and comply with its decisions, as well as ensure, through statutory provisions, that disputes relating to sporting competitive relationships are, as a first step, resolved within the framework of the NZS, UEFA, and/or FIFA.

⁵⁰ Higher Court in Koper order I Cp 64/2022 of 24 February 2022.

⁵¹ *National Dispute Resolution Chamber Recognition Principles*, 2024. See also SPINS, 2024a.

international recognition of decisions issued by the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber, thereby enhancing legal certainty in Slovenian football.⁵²

Under the new rules, the dispute resolution chamber consists of eleven permanent arbitrators, appointed as follows: four arbitrators are appointed by the Slovenian Professional Football Players' Union (SPINS), representing the interests of players and coaches; four arbitrators are appointed by football clubs through the NZS Professional Football Committee, representing the interests of clubs playing in the first division; and three arbitrators (the chairperson and two deputy chairpersons) are appointed by the NZS Executive Committee, with the prior consent of both the Professional Football Committee and SPINS (para. 2 of Article 8 of the Regulations on Dispute Resolution Chamber). Only someone with a university degree in law and the relevant language and experience in the field of sport may be appointed as an arbitrator (para. 1 of Article 10 of the Regulations on Dispute Resolution Chamber).

It should also be emphasised that the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber does not have jurisdiction over all categories of football-related disputes. The Regulations on the Dispute Resolution Chamber explicitly exclude it from deciding disciplinary disputes or those relating to violations of NZS competition rules and licensing regulations – such matters continue to be handled by NZS disciplinary bodies and commissions in accordance with sports rules. Likewise, the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber does not have jurisdiction over disputes of an international dimension in which parties belonging to various national football associations appear and where the body of final instance is the CAS, or on cases where FIFA rules stipulate the exclusive jurisdiction of the FIFA Tribunal (para. 4 of Article 5 of the Regulations on Dispute Resolution Chamber). In practice, this means, for example, that international transfer disputes or disputes between foreign players and Slovenian clubs fall under the jurisdiction of FIFA and CAS. The NZS Arbitration Tribunal is therefore primarily focused on domestic football disputes, while the international dimension is covered by supranational mechanisms. Finally, the arbitral tribunal lacks jurisdiction to resolve disputes arising from employment relationships. If a player or a club alleges that an employment contract has been concluded, Article 201 of the Employment Relationship Act (*Zakon o delovnih razmerjih* – ZDR-1)⁵³ applies,

⁵² NZS, 2025a and NZS, 2025b.

⁵³ Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 21/13, 78/13 – popr., 47/15 – ZZSDT, 33/16 – PZ-F, 52/16, 15/17 – odl. US, 22/19 – ZPosS, 81/19, 203/20 – ZIUPOPĐVE, 119/21 – ZČmIS-A, 202/21 – odl. US, 15/22, 54/22 – ZUPŠ-1, 114/23, 136/23 – ZIUZDS and 70/25 – ZUTD-I.

stipulating that employers and employees may agree on arbitration only if such a possibility is foreseen and set out in a collective agreement, which must also regulate, inter alia, the composition of the arbitral body, the procedure, and other issues relevant to the work of the arbitration. As there are currently no such provisions in applicable collective agreements, jurisdiction in the event of a dispute lies with the labour court.⁵⁴

Arbitration mechanisms in football were established in response to concrete problems faced by players and football clubs in Slovenia. One such problem concerned cases in which clubs isolated certain players from the team and forced them to train separately, with the apparent intention of pressuring them to terminate their contracts early and on unfavourable terms. The players' union SPINS described this as mobbing and has documented it at several first-division clubs, such as FC Olimpija, where several players were pressured to terminate their contracts prematurely in this manner. The affected players initiated arbitration proceedings against FC Olimpija, but SPINS noted that neither the complaint to the labour inspectorate nor the criminal charge filed against FC Olimpija had deterred similar practices from continuing at other clubs (FC Rogaška was mentioned in this regard).⁵⁵

Another recurring issue concerns clubs' failure to fulfil financial obligations to players following the termination of cooperation. A case in point is FC Rogaška, which lost its licence to compete in the Slovenian first division for the 2023/24 season due to organisational and financial irregularities and subsequently became involved in multiple disputes with players. One such dispute concerned a foreign player (Croatian), which is why the matter fell within FIFA's jurisdiction rather than the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber's. FIFA ordered the club to fulfil its outstanding obligations, but as it failed to comply within the prescribed time limit, FIFA arbitration imposed a ban on registering new players for three consecutive transfer periods, unless the debt is paid in full, which is an exceptionally severe sanction.⁵⁶ Disputes with several other players reportedly remain pending before the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ SPINS, 2025a.

⁵⁵ See, for example, SPINS, 2024b; SPINS, 2024c and SPINS, 2025b.

⁵⁶ SPINS, 2025c.

⁵⁷ SPINS, 2025d.

Although the dispute-resolution mechanisms are still at an early stage and facing a range of challenges, the establishment of an operational arbitration framework within the NZS, which is already hearing cases and delivering results, is a major step forward for the protection of the rights of players, coaches and clubs, and may encourage other sporting disciplines to follow suit. At the same time, however, the SPINS has already voiced concern about the excessive duration of proceedings before the NZS Dispute Resolution Chamber, with cases pending for more than a year. They noted that to ensure effective protection of the status-related rights of football players and coaches, procedures would need to be substantially faster or subject to clear time limits. In SPINS's opinion, this would require either an amendment to the Regulations on the Dispute Resolution Chamber or the establishment of a new and more efficient arbitration mechanism through a collective agreement.⁵⁸ Moreover, the accessibility and transparency of the arbitration system could be improved, as the section on the NZS website intended for publishing arbitration awards remains empty.⁵⁹

3.3 Other Arbitration Tribunals

Several other sports federations have also established their own mechanisms for extra-judicial dispute resolution, albeit with varying degrees of effectiveness. While operating on paper, most of these bodies have handled only a few cases, if any, and thus have had a very modest impact on resolving sports disputes within their respective disciplines.

In 2022, the Basketball Federation of Slovenia (*Košarkarska zveza Slovenije* – KZS) established the national Basketball Arbitration Tribunal (KAR), which was modelled after the international Basketball Arbitration Tribunal (BAT). The key difference lies in adaptation to domestic conditions, particularly in terms of financial accessibility, efficiency in resolving individual cases, and the fact that proceedings are conducted in Slovenian. Players, coaches, clubs, and agents may initiate proceedings before the Basketball Arbitration Tribunal (KAR), provided that their contract contains an appropriate arbitration clause.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ SPINS 2025a.

⁵⁹ As of 20 February 2026, no arbitration awards are published on a dedicated website (<https://www.nzs.si/NZS/Arbitraza/Odlocbe>).

⁶⁰ See, for example, KZS, 2022 and the Rules on the Basketball Arbitration Tribunal (*Pravila Košarkaškega arbitražnega razsodišča*).

Some other examples are the Mediation and Arbitration Commission established by the Athletics Federation of Slovenia (*Atletska zveza Slovenije* - AZS) to resolve sports disputes in athletics;⁶¹ the Arbitration Committee established by the Handball Federation of Slovenia (*Rokometna zveza Slovenije* – RZS) to decide matters specified in the legal acts of the RZS;⁶² and the Arbitration Commission established by the Cycling Federation of Slovenia (*Kolesarska zveza Slovenije*) as a second-instance tribunal to resolve disputes relating to the transfer of competitors from one club or association to another.⁶³

In addition to the dispute-resolution mechanisms established within sports federations, the European Centre for Dispute Resolution (ECDR), an independent arbitration institution, also operates in Ljubljana. Since 2018, ECDR has offered a Permanent Sports Arbitration service for contractual disputes involving players, clubs, coaches, and agents. Its arbitral awards have the same effect as court judgments. Where the parties are not bound by any federation's rules, they may include an ECDR arbitration clause in their contracts, thus opting for a neutral domestic forum rather than international arbitration.⁶⁴

4 Conclusions

Influenced by international models, especially the growing prominence of the CAS and the arbitral mechanisms established by leading international federations (such as FIFA and FIBA), Slovenia has witnessed a noticeable acceleration in the development of sports arbitration in recent years. Several national sports federations have established new arbitral mechanisms or updated existing regulatory frameworks that had previously governed these tribunals. Given the undeniable advantages of sports arbitration (e.g., cost efficiency, procedural speed, expertise of decision-makers, greater consistency in the application of sporting rules, more equal treatment of participants across jurisdictions, etc.), these developments represent an important step towards more effective protection of the rights of athletes, coaches, clubs, and other stakeholders in organised sport. This trend is particularly significant because Slovenian legislation does not provide integrated solutions adapted to the structural

⁶¹ For more, see the Rules on Mediation and Arbitration (*Pravilnik o mediaciji in arbitraži*).

⁶² For more, see the Rules of Procedure of the RZS Arbitration Committee (*Poslovnik o delu Odbora za arbitražo* RZS).

⁶³ For more, see the Cycling Federation of Slovenia Statutes (*Statut Kolesarske zveze Slovenije*).

⁶⁴ ECDC (n.d.). For more, see also the ECDC Rules on Permanent Sports Arbitration (*Pravila ECDC o stalni arbitraži v športu*).

specificities of sports arbitration. Instead, the legal regulation of sport and arbitration remains compartmentalised and generalised; while the ZArbit governs arbitration without considering the particularities of relationships in sport, sports legislation focuses on the organisational aspects of sport without addressing dispute resolution mechanisms. Moreover, although collective agreements could, in principle, be used to establish arbitration procedures in the sports sector, none currently do so. As a result, the establishment and operation of dispute-resolution mechanisms capable of delivering binding decisions largely depend on the autonomous initiatives of the national sports federation.

At the same time, it remains obvious that these federation-specific mechanisms are still in their early stages and, as such, face considerable challenges. Not all sports federations have created arbitral mechanisms, and even where such forums exist, they are often used rarely and inconsistently. Athletes especially appear to be insufficiently informed about their rights and available remedies and tend to turn to other institutions (e.g., the Athlete's Rights Ombudsman). SPINS has raised concerns about the excessive duration of certain arbitral proceedings, which undermines one of sports arbitration's main advantages – its promptness. Furthermore, existing arbitral mechanisms do not always cover the full range of disputes that arise in practice, so certain matters continue to be litigated before ordinary courts (e.g., labour disputes). The question of athletes' right to judicial protection and judicial review also persists, given that participation in organised sport usually depends on accepting pre-drafted arbitration clauses, which are thus *de facto* mandatory.

If domestic sports arbitration is to operate effectively in the future, these (and other) challenges will need to be addressed - either by the legislature or by autonomous regulations of sports organisations. In either case, the objective should be to move from fragmented, sporadically used arbitration mechanisms towards a coherent, standardised framework that can adequately protect the interests of stakeholders in sports while still complying with national legislation and international standards. If procedural fairness, reasonable time limits, institutional independence, accessibility and predictable legal protection are not properly guaranteed, national arbitration mechanisms will remain formally available but will also continue to have limited practical effect.

Legal Acts, Case-law

- Arbitration Act (Zakon o arbitraži – ZArbit), Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 45/08 and 100/25 – ZS-1.
- Code of Sports-related Arbitration, in force as from 1 July 2025. Retrieved from: [https://www.tas-cas.org/generated/assets/lists/08acedc-3a71-4ffe-80fa-77c5dd0260cb/CAS_Code_2025__EN_%20\(2\).pdf](https://www.tas-cas.org/generated/assets/lists/08acedc-3a71-4ffe-80fa-77c5dd0260cb/CAS_Code_2025__EN_%20(2).pdf) (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of International Arbitral Awards from 1958, Official Gazette of the SFRJ – MP, No. 11/81.
- Cycling Federation of Slovenia Statutes (Statut Kolesarske zveze Slovenije). Retrieved from: <https://kolesarska-zveza.si/wp-content/uploads/Statut.pdf> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- ECDR Rules on Permanent Sports Arbitration (Pravila ECDR o stalni arbitraži v športu). Retrieved from: <https://www.ecdr.si/index.php?id=364> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Employment Relationship Act (Zakon o delovnih razmerjih – ZDR-1), Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 21/13, 78/13 – popr., 47/15 – ZZSDT, 33/16 – PZ-F, 52/16, 15/17 – odl. US, 22/19 – ZPosS, 81/19, 203/20 – ZIUPOPDVE, 119/21 – ZČmIS-A, 202/21 – odl. US, 15/22, 54/22 – ZUPŠ-1, 114/23, 136/23 – ZIUZDS and 70/25 – ZUTD.
- Enforcement and Security Act (Zakon o izvršbi in zavarovanju – ZIZ), Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 3/07 – official consolidated text, 93/07, 37/08 – ZST-1, 45/08 – ZArbit, 28/09, 51/10, 26/11, 17/13 – odl. US, 45/14 – odl. US, 53/14, 58/14 – odl. US, 54/15, 76/15 – odl. US, 11/18, 53/19 – odl. US, 66/19 – ZDavP-2M, 23/20 – SPZ-B, 36/21, 81/22 – odl. US, 81/22 – odl. US and 100/25 – ZS-1.
- European Convention on Human Rights, Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia – MP, No. 7/94.
- Higher Court in Koper order I Cp 64/2022* of 24 February 2022. ECLI:SI:VSKP:2022:I.CP.64.2022.
- Mutu and Pechstein v. Switzerland*, case app. no. 40575/10 and 67474/10, ECLI:CE:ECHR:2018:1002JUD004057510.
- NZS Statutes (Statut Nogometne zveze Slovenije). Retrieved from: https://www.nzs.si/Doc/Info/2023/Statut%20NZS%20V4.0_24.4.2023.pdf (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Regulations on Dispute Resolution Chamber (Pravilnik o nogometni arbitraži). Retrieved from: https://www.nzs.si/NZS/Pravilnik_o_arbitrazi (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Resolution on the National Programme for Sport in the Republic of Slovenia for the Period 2026–2035 (Resolucija o nacionalnem programu športa v Republiki Sloveniji za obdobje 2026–2035 - ReNPŠ26–35)*, Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 55/25.
- Royal Football Club Seraing v. Fédération internationale de football association (FIFA) and Others*, case no. C-600/23, ECLI:EU:C:2025:617.
- Rules of Procedure of the RZS Arbitration Committee (Poslovnik o delu Odbora za arbitražo RZS). Retrieved from: <https://www.rokometna-zveza.si/si/info/splosni-akti> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Rules of the Olympic Committee of Slovenia – Association of Sports Federations (Pravila olimpijskega komiteja Slovenije – Združenja športnih zvez). Retrieved from: <https://cms.olympic.si/api/media/file/Pravila%20OKS-Z%20C5%A0Z%202025-POTRJENA%20na%20UE-VELJAVNA.pdf> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Rules on Mediation and Arbitration (Pravilnik o mediaciji in arbitraži). Retrieved from: https://slovenska-atletika.si/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/AKT-26_Pravilnik_o_mediaciji_in_arbitrazi_2017.pdf (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Rules on the Basketball Arbitration Tribunal (Pravila Košarkaškega arbitražnega razsodišča). Retrieved from: <https://api-page.kzs.si/storage/files/9f55577f-65c5-4aba-a167-7460552e676d.pdf> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Rules on the Arbitration Tribunal OKS-ZŠZ for Sport (Pravilnik o arbitražnem razsodišču za šport pri Olimpijskem komiteju Slovenije – Združenju športnih zvez). Retrieved from: <https://cms.olympic.si/api/media/file/Pravilnik%20o%20arbitra%20C5%BEEnem%20razsodi>

- %C5%A1%C4%8Du%20za%20%C5%A1port%20pri%20OKS-Z%C5%A0Z.pdf (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Rules on the Operation and Financing of the Ombudsperson for Athletes' Rights (Pravilnik o delovanju in financiranju varuha športnikovih pravic), Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 69/17, 94/23 and 53/25.
- Semenya v. Switzerland*, case app. no. 10934/21, ECLI:CE:ECHR:2025:0710JUD001093421.
- Sports Act (Zakon o športu – ZŠpo-1), Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 29/17, 21/18 – ZNORg, 82/20, 3/22 – ZDeb and 37/24 – ZMat-B.
- Supreme Court of the RS judgement Cp 27/2024* of 19 February 2025. ECLI:SI:VSRS:2025:CP.27.2024.

References

- Athletes' Rights Ombudsman (2023). *Letno poročilo varuha športnikovih pravic za leto 2023*. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.si/assets/ministrstva/MGTS/Dokumenti/Direktorat-za-sport/VARUH-SPORTNIKOVIH-PRAVIC/Letno-porocilo-Varuh-sportnikovih-pravic-za-leto-2023_-koncna-verzija_cistopis-dopolnitev-23.5.2024.docx (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Bergant Rakočević, V. (2020). Reševanje sporov pred Arbitražnim sodiščem za šport (CAS) in Bergant Rakočević, V. (ed.), *Šport in pravo*. Ljubljana: Inštitut za lokalno samoupravo; Pravna fakulteta; Društvo za športno pravo; Uradni list Republike Slovenije, 373-400.
- Bergant-Rakočević, V. (2018). Pravica športnikov do javne obravnave pred neodvisnim tribunalom. *Pravna praksa*, 37(41-42), 16-18.
- Burger, C. J. (2000). Taking Sports Out of the Courts: Alternative Dispute Resolution and the International Court of Arbitration for Sport. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 10(2), pp. 123-128. doi: 10.1123/jlas.10.2.123.
- CAS (n.d.-a). *The Court*. Retrieved from: <https://www.tas-cas.org/en/general-information/the-court> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- CAS (n.d.-b). *Sports disputes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.tas-cas.org/en/general-information/how-cas-works> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Cavalieros, P. & Kim, J. (2015). Can the arbitral community learn from sports arbitration?. *Journal of International Arbitration*, 32(2), 237-260. doi: 10.54648/joia2015010.
- Coccia, M. (2013). International Sports Justice: The Court of Arbitration for Sport' IN: Colucci, M. & Jones, K. L. (eds.). *International and Comparative Sports Justice*. The European Sports Law and Policy Bulletin, Issue 1-2013, 23-76.
- ECDR (n.d.). *Stalna arbitraža v športu - postopek športne arbitraže na ECDR*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ecdr.si/index.php?id=225> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- FIBA (n.d.). *Basketball Arbitral Tribunal*. Retrieved from: <https://about.fiba.basketball/en/services/basketball-arbitral-tribunal> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- FIFA (2005). *Circular no. 1010: Art. 60, par. 3 (c) of the FIFA Statutes – independent and duly constituted arbitration tribunal*. Retrieved from: http://goldengate-law.com/pdf/fifa_circular/fifa_circular_1010.pdf (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- FIFA (2024). *National Dispute Resolution Chamber Recognition Principles*. Retrieved from: <https://digitalhub.fifa.com/m/2021f639165fb13e/original/National-Dispute-Resolution-Chamber-Recognition-Principles-February-2024.pdf> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- FIFA (n.d.). *Football Tribunal*. Retrieved from: <https://inside.fifa.com/legal/football-tribunal> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Galič, A. (2013). Priznanje in izvršitev domačih in tujih arbitražnih odločb v Sloveniji. *Zbornik znanstvenih razprav - Ljubljana Law Review*, 73, 105-134 and 294-295.
- GOV.SI (n.d.). *Varuh športnikovih pravic*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.si/zbirke/delovna-telesa/varuh-sportnikovih-pravic/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Kastratović, M. (2025). Arbitration in Sports Dispute Resolution: The Role and Importance of International Sports Arbitration. *Kulturapolis*, 22(2), 26-41. doi: 10.51738/kpolis.2025.2r.003.

- KZS (2022). *Košarkarskim deležnikom v Sloveniji odslej pravno varstvo zagotavlja domače Košarkarsko arbitražno razsodišče*. Retrieved from: <https://stara.kzs.si/clanek/Kosarkarskim-deleznikom-v-Sloveniji-odslej-pravno-varstvo-zagotavlja-domace-Kosarkarsko-arbitrazno-razsodisce/id/3557/fcid/64> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- McLaren, R. H. (2011). The Court of Arbitration for Sport: An Independent Arena for the World's Sports Disputes. *V alparaiso University Law Review*, 35(2), 379-406. doi: 10.4337/9780857936301.00010.
- NZS (2018). *Konstitutivna seja Arbitraže NZS*. Retrieved from: https://www.nzs.si/novica/Konstitutivna_seja_Arbitraze_NZS?id=48123 (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- NZS (2025a). *3. seja IO NZS*. Retrieved from: https://www.nzs.si/novica/3_seja_IO_NZS_pomembne_odlocitve_in_poudarki_leta_2024?id=60747 (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- NZS (2025b). *8. seja IO NZS*. Retrieved from: https://www.nzs.si/novica/8_seja_IO_NZS_NZS_nadaljuje_s_financno_podporo_klubske_mu_nogometu?id=61904&id_landing=&id_objekta=1 (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Proposal for a Sports Act*, 2016, EVA: 2013-3330-0161. Retrieved from: [http://vrs-3.vlada.si/MANDAT14/VLADNAGRADIVA.NSF/18a6b9887c33a0bdc12570e50034eb54/ef143ae2a5c3fdd2c125808e004b9d90/\\$FILE/ZSpo-1_19_12.pdf](http://vrs-3.vlada.si/MANDAT14/VLADNAGRADIVA.NSF/18a6b9887c33a0bdc12570e50034eb54/ef143ae2a5c3fdd2c125808e004b9d90/$FILE/ZSpo-1_19_12.pdf) (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Reilly, L. (2012). An Introduction to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) & the Role of National Courts in International Sports Disputes. *Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 2012(1), 63-82. Retrieved from: <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1124&context=jdr> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- SPINS (2024a). *Nov mandat arbitraže NZS*. Retrieved from: <https://www.spins.si/nov-mandat-arbitraze-nzs/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- SPINS (2024b). *Sindikatski SPINS reagira na šikaniranje nogometašev in blatenje ugleda v javnosti*. Retrieved from: <https://www.spins.si/sindikatski-spins-reagira-na-sikaniranje-nogometasev-in-blatenje-ugleda-v-javnosti/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- SPINS (2024c). *Prijava IRSD zaradi izvajanja mobinga nad nogometašem*. Retrieved from: <https://www.spins.si/prijava-irsd-zaradi-izvajanja-mobinga-nad-nogometasem/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- SPINS (2025a). *Arbitražna NZS ni pristojna za reševanje delovnopравnih sporov*. Retrieved from: <https://www.spins.si/arbitraza-nzs-ni-pristojna-za-resevanje-delovno-pravnihi-sporov/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- SPINS (2025b). *Sindikatski SPINS za šikaniranje prvič zahteva tudi nepremoženjsko škodo*. Retrieved from: <https://www.spins.si/sindikatski-spins-za-sikaniranje-prvic-zahteva-tudi-nepremozenjsko-skodo/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- SPINS (2025c). *NK Rogaska kljub sankciji FIFA, nadaljuje prakso šikaniranja nogometašev*. Retrieved from: <https://www.spins.si/nk-rogaska-kljub-sankciji-fifa-nadaljuje-prakso-sikaniranja-nogometasev/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- SPINS (2025d). *Bivši nogometaši NK Rogaska bodo svoj dolg terjali preko Arbitraže pri NZS*. Retrieved from: <https://www.spins.si/bivsi-nogometasi-nk-rogaska-bodo-svoj-dolg-terjali-preko-arbitraze-pri-nzs/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- WIPO (n.d.). *WIPO Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) for Sports*. Retrieved from: <https://www.wipo.int/amc/en/center/specific-sectors/sports/> (accessed: February 20, 2026).
- Živić, L. (2025). Športna arbitraža in EU - nadaljnje omejevanje avtonomije športa?. *Pravna praksa*, 44(34), 17-18.

