

Research on Implementation Challenges and Countermeasures for China's Sports Arbitration Mechanism in the Post-Olympic Era

Yuntong Liu

People's Public Security University of China, Beijing, 100038, China.

2024211357@stu.ppsuc.edu.cn

Abstract

Following the successful hosting of the 2022 Beijing Winter Olympics, China's sports industry has experienced rapid development, accompanied by continuous improvements in sports regulations. After the Winter Games concluded, the newly revised Sports Law introduced a dedicated chapter on sports arbitration, enabling the comprehensive implementation of the sports arbitration system. While the sports arbitration system provides a sound theoretical framework for resolving sports disputes, its practical application faces multiple challenges. These include ambiguities in defining the scope of accepted cases, insufficient independence of arbitration institutions, and poor coordination between sports arbitration and other sports dispute resolution mechanisms. There is an urgent need to clarify the scope of arbitration, enhance the independence of arbitration institutions, and optimize the linkage between sports arbitration and other mechanisms to provide solid legal support for the healthy development of China's sports industry.

Keywords

Post-Olympics, Sports Arbitration, Sports Law, Dispute Resolution.

1. Introduction

Following the 2008 Summer Olympics and the 2022 Winter Olympics, China's sports arbitration system has been comprehensively implemented. As a vital mechanism for resolving sports disputes, the effective operation of this system is crucial for ensuring fairness and impartiality in athletic activities. This study employs multiple research methods, including field investigations, literature analysis, and comparative research. The research framework comprises five sections: First, it reviews the current state of domestic research on sports arbitration, summarizing existing achievements and shortcomings; Second, it analyzes the current implementation status of China's sports arbitration system, specifically examining issues related to the scope of cases accepted, arbitration institutions, and arbitration procedures. Finally, drawing on international experience and China's actual conditions, it proposes recommendations for the post-Olympic era, including advocating a strategy prioritizing sports arbitration, strengthening the independence and professionalism of sports arbitration institutions and arbitrators, and optimizing the integration of diversified dispute resolution procedures. The feasibility of these proposals is also analyzed.

This research contributes to refining and effectively implementing China's sports arbitration system, providing legal safeguards for the healthy development of China's sports sector. Simultaneously, comparative studies drawing on international best practices will enhance China's voice and influence in international sports arbitration. This approach not only strengthens the development of China's sports arbitration system but also establishes the impartiality and authority of Chinese sports arbitration globally.

2. Organization of the Text

2.1. The Refinement of China's Sports Law in the Post-Olympic Era

The 2022 Beijing Winter Olympics significantly boosted the development of China's winter sports industry. Since the successful bid in 2015, approximately 346 million people nationwide have participated in ice and snow sports. Against this backdrop, China has further refined its sports legal system by introducing and revising a series of regulations (table one) to meet the needs of sports development. The most important initiative was the revision of the Sports Law, particularly the addition of a dedicated chapter on Sports Arbitration. To implement this system, the General Administration of Sport issued the Sports Arbitration Rules, the Organizational Rules of the China Sports Arbitration Commission, and the Charter of the China Sports Arbitration Commission, which standardize arbitration practices, safeguard procedural legality and fairness, and provide institutional support for resolving sports disputes [1].

Additionally, the General Administration of Sport revised the Measures for the Administration of Sports Events, refining processes for event approval, filing, and supervision, with an emphasis on safety, integrity, and fairness to ensure standardized event organization. At the local level, sports legislation has also been actively advanced. For example, Shandong Province promulgated the Measures for the Administration of Sports Competitions in Shandong Province in April 2022, while provinces such as Shanxi and Guizhou are formulating sports development regulations to improve local sports regulatory systems.

Table 1 Sports Laws and Regulations Overview

| Regulation Name | Hierarchy of Legal Effect | Effective Date |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Sports Law | Law | January 1, 2023 |
| Charter of the China Sports Arbitration Commission | Departmental Rule | February 11, 2023 |
| Sports Arbitration Rules | Departmental Rule | January 1, 2023 |
| Measures for the Administration of Sports Events | Departmental Rule | January 1, 2023 |
| Organizational Rules of the China Sports Arbitration Commission | Departmental Rule | January 1, 2023 |
| Measures for the Administration of Sports Competitions in Shandong Province | Local Regulation | April 25, 2022 |

2.2. Development of Sports Arbitration in China in the Post-Olympic Era

2.2.1. Establishment of the China Sports Arbitration Commission and Professionalization Efforts

The successful hosting of the 2022 Beijing Winter Olympics directly catalyzed the establishment of China's sports arbitration system. As the core institution of this system, the China Sports Arbitration Commission (CSAC) was officially established on February 11, 2023, marking the entry of sports dispute resolution into a specialized track. By handling disputes concerning eligibility, contract fulfillment, and disciplinary penalties according to the law, impartially, and efficiently, the Commission has effectively safeguarded the rights and interests of all parties involved. By the end of 2024, the number of applications received had reached 173. To enhance decision-making efficiency, the Commission has flexibly utilized online hearings, document-based reviews, and special procedures for events.

The professionalism and credibility of arbitration work rely on a highly qualified arbitrator team. The Commission strictly selects arbitrators according to the Sports Arbitration Rules,

requiring them to possess not only a profound legal background but also familiarity with sports practices. By the end of 2024, 103 arbitrators had been appointed. Their professional capabilities have been continuously enhanced through systematic training, accumulating 1,171 trainee participations, providing solid talent support for the development of the sports arbitration system [2].

2.2.2. Scope of Sports Arbitration and Procedural Rules

The scope of sports arbitration and its procedural rules together form the core framework of China's sports arbitration system. This framework aims to provide a specialized pathway for resolving sports disputes by clearly defining the types of arbitrable cases and establishing fair and efficient arbitration procedures.

Regarding the scope of arbitration, the Sports Law adopts an approach of "inclusive listing plus exclusion" to define its jurisdiction. It explicitly includes disputes arising from dissatisfaction with decisions concerning doping management penalties (such as disqualification from competition, cancellation of competition results, and suspension), disputes related to athlete registration and transfer, and other disputes arising in competitive sports activities. Simultaneously, it excludes matters falling under general commercial arbitration and labor disputes[3]. The basis for a party to apply for arbitration primarily includes an arbitration agreement, relevant provisions in the statutes of sports organizations, and clauses within sports event rules.

In terms of procedural rules, a party may apply for arbitration within 15 days from the date of receiving the relevant decision or becoming aware of the infringement of their rights. The arbitration commission shall decide whether to accept the case within 5 days. The arbitral tribunal may consist of either one or three arbitrators, and the parties have the right to select the arbitrators within the specified time limit[4]. For arbitrations related to anti-doping, the tribunal must include at least one arbitrator from the Anti-Doping List of Arbitrators who possesses a legal background or professional legal experience. Sports arbitration proceedings are generally conducted in private, with final awards rendered within three months of the panel's formation. To ensure timely resolution of competition disputes, a special expedited procedure for awards within 24 hours has also been established. Through this institutional framework, sports arbitration provides a professional, efficient, and enforceable channel for resolving various sports-related disputes.

2.3. Implementation Challenges of China's Sports Arbitration System in the Post-Olympic Era

2.3.1. Ambiguity in the Scope of Acceptable Cases for Sports Arbitration

The scope of cases acceptable for sports arbitration, as defined in the Sports Law, is limited to disputes characterized by their distinct sports-specific nature and high professionalism. This includes management-type disputes unique to the sports domain, disputes concerning athlete registration and transfers, and other disputes arising within competitive sports activities. While this approach aims to ensure that sports arbitration focuses on specialized issues closely related to sports, it simultaneously presents challenges in clearly identifying the precise boundaries of acceptable cases. This is particularly evident when disputes involve multiple legal interests, such as property rights or personal rights, and requires careful interpretation of the outer limits of sports arbitration.

So-called composite disputes refer to controversies that span multiple legal areas, for instance, involving elements of both labor and civil-commercial disputes. The complexity of such composite disputes lies in their entanglement not only with sports regulations but also with other legal domains, posing significant challenges to the jurisdictional delineation of the Sports Arbitration Commission. For example, a professional athlete's transfer contract might involve

aspects such as eligibility determination, transfer fees, and social insurance contributions[5]. If labor arbitration were applied to resolve such a dispute, it would require handling according to the "mediation followed by arbitration" model stipulated in the Labor Dispute Mediation and Arbitration Law, a process that could be time-consuming and ill-suited for rapid resolution, potentially undermining the protection of the parties' rights and interests. Furthermore, the unique characteristics and tight timelines inherent in professional athlete transfers make eligibility determination a specific legal issue within the sports field. Arbitrators lacking relevant expertise could directly impact the accuracy of the case outcome. Attempting to split the dispute, addressing labor aspects through labor arbitration and eligibility through sports arbitration, would not only increase the burden on the parties but also risk contradictory rulings[6]. Therefore, accurately defining the jurisdictional authority for dispute resolution is crucial for safeguarding the legitimate rights and interests of the involved parties.

The connotation of the phrase "other disputes occurring in competitive sports activities" also presents ambiguity in China's sports arbitration practice. This category is intended to cover disputes not explicitly listed in the scope of acceptable cases for sports arbitration, providing flexibility to accommodate various unforeseen controversies that may arise in sports activities. However, its broad definition leads to challenges, particularly in determining which specific disputes fall under this category.

This ambiguity can lead to arbitrary interpretations, resulting in disagreements about the appropriate jurisdictional authority for a dispute. For instance, in the case involving Peng Ruijian and the Urumqi Junqing Yunxiang Racing Pigeon Club, a dispute arose over whether a racing pigeon competition constituted a "competitive sport," further leading to controversy over whether the dispute should fall under the jurisdiction of sports arbitration, thereby delaying the resolution process. Consequently, to ensure the effectiveness and fairness of sports arbitration, it is necessary to specify and clarify the meaning of "competitive sports." This clarification would not only enhance the efficiency of arbitration institutions but also strengthen the trust and satisfaction of the parties involved in the sports arbitration process.

2.3.2. Challenges to the Independence and Authority of Sports Arbitration Institutions

In the sports arbitration system, the independence of the arbitration institution is a core characteristic. However, China's current sports arbitration system faces prominent issues concerning the close relationship between the sports arbitration institution and the administrative department. Furthermore, while the compulsory panel system for sports arbitrators plays a role in ensuring the quality and professionalism of arbitrators, it also presents challenges such as potentially limiting arbitrator diversity, reducing flexibility, and raising doubts about the authority of the arbitration process.

The independence of sports arbitration is one of its fundamental features and a key element ensuring impartial rulings. In practice, however, the National Sports Administration is responsible not only for establishing the Sports Arbitration Commission but also for formulating the Sports Arbitration Rules that govern its operations. This institutional setup may make it difficult for the Commission to operate entirely free from administrative influence in practice. Additionally, the Commission's financial support and personnel appointments may rely on the National Sports Administration. Such dependencies could further weaken the Commission's operational autonomy. Although the Sports Law explicitly prohibits interference from administrative organs in the outcome of rulings, the Commission's relational and administrative affiliations may still pose a threat to its independence. This could not only affect the perceived fairness of the rulings but also lead to widespread external questioning of the independence and impartiality of sports arbitration in China. Therefore, to enhance the independence and public trust in sports arbitration, a careful review and necessary reforms of the current system are urgently needed.

The compulsory panel system for sports arbitrators refers to the practice where the sports arbitration institution creates a specific list of arbitrators based on pre-set standards and procedures. Parties involved in sports arbitration must select their arbitrators from this designated list. This system plays a significant role in guaranteeing the quality of arbitrators and ensuring the professionalism and impartiality of the arbitration process. However, the compulsory panel system also reveals certain limitations in practice. It may restrict the diversity of arbitrators and the parties' freedom of choice, potentially preventing them from selecting the most suitable arbitrator based on the specific needs of the case, which could impact the professionalism and fairness of the arbitration outcome. Furthermore, the compulsory panel system might reduce the flexibility of the arbitration process, as all arbitrators must be chosen from a fixed list. This could hinder the inclusion of arbitrators with specific professional backgrounds or unique expertise required for particular disputes.

In light of these limitations, some scholars suggest exploring the introduction of an open panel system. Under an open panel system, the arbitrator list would serve primarily for recommendations, allowing parties to choose arbitrators not on the official list. This would significantly enhance the parties' autonomy in the selection process and reduce the arbitration institution's interference in arbitrator choice. However, implementing an open panel system would require careful consideration of how to assess the competence of arbitrators chosen by the parties outside the official list and would necessitate a re-evaluation of the role undertaken by the Sports Arbitration Commission during the process. Therefore, deciding whether to maintain the compulsory panel system or transition towards an open panel system requires in-depth analysis and a balanced consideration of the respective advantages and disadvantages.

2.3.3. Articulation of Sports Arbitration with Other Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

The design and implementation of sports dispute resolution mechanisms are crucial for ensuring fairness and justice in sports activities. As a primary means of resolving sports disputes, the effectiveness of sports arbitration depends not only on the soundness of the arbitration mechanism itself but also on its effective articulation with other dispute resolution mechanisms. The coordination among sports arbitration, internal dispute resolution mechanisms within domestic sports organizations, sports litigation, and international arbitration forms a complex network for sports dispute resolution. The smooth operation of this network is essential for ensuring that sports disputes are resolved efficiently and fairly.

According to the *Sports Law*, parties may apply for sports arbitration when a sports organization has not established an internal dispute resolution mechanism, when such a mechanism fails to handle a dispute promptly, or when a party is dissatisfied with the outcome of the internal mechanism. This provision highlights the supplementary role of sports arbitration but does not explicitly specify whether it entails a mandatory priority order[7]. While the statutes of some sports organizations may stipulate a compulsory preemptive order for internal mechanisms—for instance, *Article 65 of the Articles of Association of the Chinese Basketball Association* stipulates that disputes falling under the jurisdiction of sports arbitration as prescribed by the *Sports Law* must first be submitted to the association's own Dispute Resolution Committee, and only if a party is dissatisfied with the Committee's outcome or it fails to act promptly can they apply for sports arbitration according to law—such internal statutory provisions are only binding within that specific sports organization and lack universal legal binding force on all parties[8]. Consequently, current legislation has not clearly defined whether parties can bypass internal mechanisms to apply directly for sports arbitration, indicating that the legal status of internal dispute resolution mechanisms within sports organizations requires further clarification and standardization.

Sports litigation accepted by Chinese courts primarily involves two types: first, lawsuits initiated directly by parties to a competent court regarding sports disputes; and second,

lawsuits where parties apply to set aside an arbitral award rendered by the Sports Arbitration Commission based on specific objections, the latter being referred to as judicial review by the court.

The issue of priority between sports litigation and sports arbitration in application often leads to controversies in practice. Inconsistent court rulings regarding their priority have occurred even in similar cases. For example, in the case involving *Peng Ruijian and the Urumqi Junqing Yunxiang Racing Pigeon Club*, the court held that disputes within the sports domain should be handled by sports arbitration institutions and thus declined to accept the case. In contrast, in other cases, such as *Shanghai Shenxin Football Club Co., Ltd. v. Shanghai Shenhua Football Club Co., Ltd.*, the court determined that there was no priority between arbitration and litigation, and parties could agree to choose litigation to resolve their dispute. Such divergent rulings may negatively impact the protection of parties' rights.

Secondly, judicial review of sports arbitral awards by courts is necessary. While sports arbitration offers confidentiality advantages over litigation, court supervision and review can better protect parties' rights when objections concern procedural issues in the award, thereby preventing unjust outcomes. Although the finality of arbitral awards is widely recognized legislatively, judicial review and supervision of such awards are common practice. According to China's *Sports Law*, parties have the right to apply to the People's Court to set aside a sports arbitral award on specific grounds. This intervention of judicial review authority inevitably creates some tension with the finality principle of "arbitration being final" in sports arbitration. Thus, while the finality of sports arbitral awards is legally guaranteed, courts also possess the authority to review certain aspects of these awards to ensure correct application of the law and the legality of the award. Striking a balance between these reflects respect for both the sports arbitration system and the proper exercise of judicial power by courts.

Although the establishment of a domestic sports arbitration institution aims to resolve domestic sports disputes, Article 92 of the newly revised *Sports Law* and Article 2 of the *Sports Arbitration Rules* do not exclude the acceptance of international sports disputes when defining the scope of arbitration. Conversely, the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) does not exclude its jurisdiction over domestic sports disputes. Indeed, there are precedents in China where domestic sports disputes were submitted to CAS for adjudication. For instance, in the case concerning the recognition and enforcement of a foreign arbitral award involving *Wei Mou and Tianjin Football Club Co., Ltd.*, the court held that an award rendered by CAS required confirmation of its validity by a Chinese court before enforcement could be sought. Furthermore, the presence of numerous foreign athletes in various domestic professional leagues raises questions about the jurisdiction of domestic sports arbitration and how to resolve situations of overlapping jurisdiction. These issues present significant challenges in the implementation of China's sports arbitration system. Therefore, there is a need to further develop standards to minimize jurisdictional conflicts.

2.4. Recommendations for Improving China's Sports Arbitration System in the Post-Olympic Era

2.4.1. Clarifying the Scope of Sports Arbitration in Practice

Sports disputes encompass not only legal issues but also matters unique to the sports domain, requiring a higher degree of specialization. In terms of complexity, disputes may involve dual conflicts between sports and labor or sports and commercial matters, or even multiple disputes spanning sports, labor, and commercial areas. Regardless of the scenario, sports arbitration is the preferred method for resolving such disputes.

The establishment of the National Sports Arbitration Commission aims to fill the gap by providing an authoritative, specialized national-level arbitration body capable of swiftly and professionally resolving disputes within the sports sector. Given the strong time-sensitive

nature of resolving sports disputes, sports arbitration offers greater speed advantages compared to civil/commercial arbitration and labor arbitration. Therefore, parties should be encouraged to prioritize sports arbitration for dispute resolution, while retaining the option to waive time-sensitive considerations and choose civil/commercial arbitration or labor arbitration. Simultaneously, to increase the likelihood of parties with complex disputes choosing sports arbitration, the National Sports Arbitration Commission should cultivate arbitrators capable of handling such disputes, thereby enhancing its expertise in managing complex cases.

Sports disputes involve not only legal issues but also matters unique to the sports domain, demanding a high level of specialization[9]. Regarding dispute complexity, cases may involve intersections between sports and labor or sports and commercial matters, or even encompass multiple dimensions of sports, labor, and commercial disputes. In any scenario, sports arbitration is recommended as the preferred resolution method.

Furthermore, clearly defining the scope of disputes arising from competitive sports activities is crucial for determining the responsibilities and authority of sports arbitration bodies. This plays a vital role in effectively resolving disputes within the sports sector and promoting the sustained, healthy development of sports. To achieve this objective, the most effective measures include: - Deepening the understanding of competitive sports definitions based on Chapter 4 of the newly revised Sports Law; - Prompting the State Council's sports administrative department to formulate and implement a graded classification management system for sports events and activities, as required by Article 50 of the Sports Law. Clear classification criteria enable precise identification of activities falling under competitive sports, ensuring sports arbitration bodies effectively perform their duties within their jurisdiction. This not only enhances arbitration efficiency but also facilitates timely and fair resolution of disputes within the sports sector.

2.4.2. Enhancing the Independence and Authority of Sports Arbitration Bodies

To strengthen the independence of sports arbitration bodies, comprehensive reforms must be implemented across multiple dimensions, including organizational structure, financial autonomy, and personnel allocation. Sports arbitration bodies should be structurally independent from any administrative department, ensuring autonomy in funding sources and expenditure to fundamentally safeguard the fairness and objectivity of the arbitration process[10]. Additionally, establishing and refining the legal framework for sports arbitration is crucial for enhancing independence. When conditions permit, sports regulations should be legislated by the National People's Congress to clarify the status and functions of sports arbitration, providing robust legal support for the independent operation of sports arbitration bodies.

The tendency for parties to select arbitrators outside the roster typically stems from doubts about the professional competence of rostered arbitrators. To enhance the expertise of rostered arbitrators, mechanisms for their selection, training, and evaluation must be strengthened to ensure they possess the capability and specialized knowledge to handle complex cases. Concurrently, the number of mediators on the roster should be expanded to offer greater choice, increasing the roster's diversity and coverage.

Furthermore, to enhance the flexibility and adaptability of sports arbitration, parties should be permitted to select arbitrators outside the roster, provided such selection is subject to rigorous vetting. Parties should submit detailed information on their selected arbitrators to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) for qualification review[11]. Arbitrators who pass the review may participate in case adjudication, with the entire arbitration process conducted under CAS's strict organization and supervision. By further enhancing the professionalism of roster arbitrators and permitting an open roster system, not only can the professionalism and

impartiality of the arbitration process be ensured, but also the necessary flexibility to address the specific needs of particular cases.

2.4.3. Optimizing Coordination Between Sports Arbitration and Other Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

The establishment of the National Sports Arbitration Commission aims to expand avenues for redress, not to replace the self-dispute resolution functions within sports organizations. However, to maintain the consistency and integrity of the legal system, it is necessary to establish clear and unified criteria for the jurisdiction of sports arbitration. Guided by the fundamental principles of Article 92 of the Sports Law, a systematic interpretation should be applied to the jurisdiction of internal dispute resolution bodies within sports organizations. This approach encourages earlier intervention in conflict resolution, combining internal mediation with external remedies. Such flexibility facilitates the handling of internal disputes, promotes fair resolutions for a greater number of sports-related conflicts, and enhances the standardization and proceduralization of internal dispute resolution mechanisms[12].

Therefore, sports organizations should establish corresponding rules and refine detailed procedures internally, incorporating guidance on subsequent avenues for relief such as sports arbitration or litigation to safeguard the legitimate rights of parties involved. Specifically, in accordance with Article 95 of the Sports Law, domestic sports organizations should expedite the establishment and improvement of internal dispute resolution mechanisms, setting up specialized arbitration committees or dispute resolution committees to ensure the effective implementation of pre-arbitration procedures[13]. For sports organizations that have already established internal dispute resolution mechanisms, efforts should focus on further enhancing the quality of internal dispute resolution, prioritizing internal dispute resolution, and improving the orderly connection with sports law. The functionality of the internal dispute resolution mechanism should be fully leveraged by expanding the scope of cases accepted.

Both litigation and arbitration are dispute resolution methods, and neither has priority over the other. While parties are encouraged to resolve sports-related disputes through sports arbitration, this does not preclude parties from mutually agreeing to resolve disputes through litigation. When parties have doubts about the resolution method, courts should make rulings based on uniform standards; courts should accept lawsuits filed by parties concerning sports-related matters.

Regarding judicial review, while clarifying the finality of arbitral awards under the “one-arbitration finality” principle, reasonable remedies should also be established. Sports arbitration does not absolutely exclude judicial intervention; judicial review helps safeguard the fairness of sports arbitration. The judiciary should respect sports arbitration while prudently intervening in special matters. Treating the judicial review system as the final safeguard for arbitration procedural rules can better supplement and correct sports arbitration, ensuring athletes' fundamental rights remain protected. Judicial review must be grounded in respect for sports arbitration awards[14], adhering to arbitration agreements, sports organization statutes, and sporting event rules to unify review standards. Appropriately incorporating the “principle of reasonableness” while upholding the principle of limited review—by delineating boundaries for judicial intervention—can better balance all parties' interests and achieve mutual benefit.

Clarifying jurisdictional standards for sports arbitration bodies is paramount. Guided by the principle of facilitating dispute resolution, international sports arbitration institutions should handle disputes involving international events or international sports organizations when such bodies are conveniently located. Conversely, domestic arbitration institutions should adjudicate matters pertaining to domestic events or international events hosted within a country. Second, when the sports organization standard is unclear, the nationality of the parties

may be considered. If all or the majority of parties are Chinese nationals or Chinese sports organizations, the dispute should fall under the jurisdiction of domestic arbitration institutions. Finally, in cases of overlapping jurisdiction, priority should be given to the institution that first accepts the case. In practice, FIFA recognized this approach in the dispute between the Chinese Football Association and Bruno, the head coach of the Chinese women's national football team. The ruling indicates that FIFA retains jurisdiction over the dispute between Bruno and the CFA because FIFA exercised jurisdiction first. Had Chinese judicial authorities accepted the case first, FIFA might have lost its jurisdiction. Therefore, when a relevant international sports organization or arbitration body exercises jurisdiction over the same dispute first, domestic arbitration institutions should decline to accept it.

3. Conclusion

Against the backdrop of the post-Olympic era, the refinement and implementation of China's sports arbitration system have become particularly crucial. This study, through an in-depth analysis of the current implementation status and challenges faced by China's sports arbitration system, reveals key issues in practice. These include the ambiguous definition of the scope of cases accepted for arbitration, the need to strengthen the independence of arbitration institutions, the coordination between sports arbitration and other dispute resolution mechanisms, and the level of judicial oversight intervention. These issues not only undermine the effectiveness and fairness of the sports arbitration system but also pose challenges to the refinement of China's sports legal framework and the healthy development of its sports sector. To address these challenges, this paper proposes a series of countermeasures and recommendations. First, clarify the scope of arbitration jurisdiction by defining the caseload of sports arbitration institutions based on legal provisions and arbitration practices, thereby reducing legal uncertainty. Second, strengthen the independence of arbitration institutions by improving their organizational structures and operational mechanisms to ensure the independence and objectivity of arbitration decisions. Finally, optimize the interface between sports arbitration and other dispute resolution mechanisms by establishing efficient coordination mechanisms to promote the complementarity and effective linkage of various dispute resolution methods.

References

- [1] H.G. Song: Research on the Contemporary Chinese Sports Normative System Based on Order Formation, *Journal of Chengdu Sport University*, Vol. 51 (2025) No.3, p.95.
- [2] Information on http://tyj.zj.gov.cn/art/2025/4/2/art_1347212_59138115.html
- [3] Y.Z. Xiong and Z.Y. Hu: China's Sports Arbitration System: Features and Improvement Strategies from a Comparative Legal View, *China Sport Science*, Vol. 45 (2025) No.7, p.93.
- [4] S.W. Xu: *Sports Disputes and the Construction of Legal Settlement Mechanism* (Law Press, China 2019), p.163.
- [5] T. Zhu: On the Scope of Sports Arbitration Stipulated in the Newly Revised Sports Law, *Tiyu Kexue*, Vol. 42 (2022) No.9, p.6.
- [6] H.T. Wu: On the Structure of Chinese Sports Arbitration System—Take the New Revision of the Sports Law as an opportunity, *Journal of Anhui Sports Science*, Vol. 44 (2023) No.6, p.8.
- [7] Y.F. Zhai, H.M. Sheng and Y.M. Chen: The Justification Controversy over Mandatory Sports Arbitration Agreements and China's Response, *Journal of Beijing Sport University*, Vol. 46 (2023) No.12, p.49.
- [8] J.H. Wang: Legal Standing of Sports Organizations and Coordination of Award Effect in Interface Between Sports Arbitration and Internal Dispute Resolution Mechanisms of Sports Organizations, *Journal of Wuhan Sports University*, Vol. 59 (2025) No.8, p.52.

- [9] Y.P. Xiao and K.J. Zhu: On the Arbitration Solution of Sports Labor Concurrence Dispute, *Sports & Science*, Vol. 46 (2025) No.2, p.4.
- [10] Y. Zhu: Autonomy and Efficiency: Autonomy and Efficiency: Research on Implementation Approach to System of Open Panel of Arbitrators-Also on Perfection of Panel of Arbitrators, *Western Law Review*, Vol. 2020 (2020) No.3, p.70.
- [11] W.K. Xu: On the content characteristics and implementation prospect for the sports arbitration system in China, *Journal of Physical Education*, Vol. 30 (2023) No.6, p.25.
- [12] S. Gao: *Sports Disputes and Resolution Mechanism from the Perspective of Interest Conflict*(Anhui Normal University Press, China 2016), p.72.
- [13] L.Y. Huang: Construction of a Multiple Resolution Mechanism for Sports Disputes, *Sport Science Research*, *Sport Science Research*, Vol. 45 (2024) No.2, p.44.
- [14] Z. Li: Establishment of Independent Sports Arbitration in China Under the Background of Amendment, *Legal Science*, Vol. 2022 (2022) No.2, p.172.