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How the tool could help the National Sport Organizations to improve the adoption of good governance practices?

The best way to get organizations involved is to recognize and reward those which work better and not to punish those which do not.

This competitive environment will motivate NSO officials and managers to seek better results and, consequently, they will adopt good governance practices without feeling obliged to do so.
DIMENSIONS

INITIAL REFERENCES (2015)
- Action for Good Governance in International Sport Organizations.
- UK Sport Good Governance Guide for National Governing Bodies.
- Guide – Brazilian Institute for Corporate Governance.
- Brazilian Sport Legislation.

TRANSPARENCY
Organizations must have procedures that ensure transparency and flows of information. Transparency should not only be limited to mandatory documents or restricted to economic and financial reports.

Assessed Items:
- Publication of Financial Documents;
- Official Notice;
- Internal Controls (Minutes);
- Access to Information and Files.
DIMENSIONS

DEMOCRACY AND EQUITY
Fairness in the manner of proceeding electoral process. Impartiality and respect for equal rights.
Assessed Items:
- One Associate = One Vote (Share or Quota);
- Member Voting and Registration Rules;
- Conflicts of Interest;
- Electoral Process;
- Project Distribution.

ACCOUNTABILITY
Those responsible for managing an entity should always be accountable for its performance, fully assuming the consequences as solely responsible for its acts and omissions.
Assessed Items:
- Approval Format (i.e. quorum);
- Independent Audit;
- Financial Statements;
- Role of the Audit Committee;
- Internal Controls.
INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY
Assessing the level of responsibility within an entity involves identifying whether there are clear and transparent lines of action that enable internal staff to operate within objective limits and demonstrate to all stakeholders how the processes and procedures are followed and executed.

Assessed Items:
- Relationship with Stakeholders;
- Code of Conduct;
- Anti-Corruption Practices;
- Sustainability in Projects;
- Economic Dimension.

MODERNIZATION
The analysis of the modernization broader than just analyzing its internal professionalization. The aim was to identify the level of evolution of its constitutive acts (statutes and bylaws) and its organizational structure, in the search for internal power controls.

Assessed Items:
- Separation of Political / Institutional Environment from Executive;
- Board of Directors;
- Advisory Board;
- Management Compensation.
METHOD

INSTRUMENTS
- Composed by 105 (2015); 111 (2016); 135 (2017); 156 (2018-2019) items divided through five dimensions: Transparency; Democracy; Accountability; Integrity; Modernization.

STEP 1 (PROCEDURES)
- Data were collected online (only public documents) in 29 NSO’s;
- Data were collected during 2 months per year (September until November);
- Two researchers accessed the NSO website with aim to collect and analyses the documents
- Was used a dichotomic classification for the items: ‘Yes’ (if the item was identified) or ‘No’ (if the item wasn’t identified).

STEP 2 (DATA ANALYSIS)
- The index was calculated by: items values are multiplied for number of items of each dimension, after that, the values is divide for the total number of the items;
- For this study was considered:
  1. Data collected during four years (2015 – 2018);
  2. In an exploratory perspective, were used descriptive statistics to characterize dimensions (means, standard deviations, absolute and relative frequencies).
RESULTS
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2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBRu</th>
<th>CBHb</th>
<th>CBV</th>
<th>CBTM</th>
<th>CBAt</th>
<th>CBTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBRu</th>
<th>CBHb</th>
<th>CBV</th>
<th>CBTM</th>
<th>CBAt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBRu</th>
<th>CBAAt</th>
<th>CBTM</th>
<th>CBV</th>
<th>CBVela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBVela</th>
<th>CBTMesa</th>
<th>CBAAt</th>
<th>CBVolei</th>
<th>CBRu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS

**Evolution of the dimensions**

### Transparency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>7,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>7,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>8,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During these years the Brazilians laws impact on evolution of NSO transparency.

### Democracy and Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>9,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>8,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>8,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>7,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, the NSO’s statutes considered indicators as: voting rules, electoral process, conflicts of interest, but in the certain point, the complexity of the NSO constitutions are impact on democracy settings.

### Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>9,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>8,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>8,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Brazilian laws reinforced the needs of NSO’s to established independent external audits, shared their statements, constitute fiscal council and improve internal controls about their finances.
RESULTS

Evolution of the dimensions

Over these years, the NSO’s perceptions to enhance their relationship with stakeholders and society impacts, for example, on the development of anticorruption practices and projects sustainability,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modernization

During these years, the began discussion about sports governance in Brazilian context, reinforced the NSO internal discussion about modernization of management, tools controls and share information channels, democracy and relationship among stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUTURE DIRECTIONS

THEORETICAL STANDPOINT - STUDIES

- To enhance the data analysis through inferential techniques.
- To compare specifics indicators among NSO, with aim to establish the differences between them over of the years.
- To establish a conceptual framework about sports governance from this settings.

PRACTICAL STANDPOINT - SDE AWARD

- Challenge of developing a sustainable model to ensure the maintenance of the project team.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

LUIZ HAAS
LUIZHAAS@FMH.ULISBOA.PT

LUIS FELIPE DE MONTEIRO DE BARROS
LUISFELIPE@SOUDOESPORTE.COM.BR