

**SPORT DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE OF CANADA (SDRCC)
CENTRE DE RÈGLEMENT DES DIFFÉRENDS SPORTIFS DU CANADA (CRDSC)**

Citation: Dallaire v. Sport Integrity Canada, 2026 CASDRC 26

No.: SDRCC ST 26-0071

Date: 2026-05-26

(SAFEGUARDING TRIBUNAL)

BETWEEN:

Vincent Dallaire (Claimant)

AND

Sport Integrity Canada (Respondent)

Correction Notice:

Decision corrected on September 9, 2026 pursuant to Subsection 5.7(j)
of the 2025 Canadian Sport Dispute Resolution Code.

Translation Notice:

This version is a translation of the decision originally rendered in French.

ARBITRATOR:

Janie Soublière

Representing the parties:

Claimant: Maude Bordeleau (counsel)

Respondent: Lisa Henderson, Joanna Birenbaum (counsel)

DECISION WITH REASONS

I. Introduction

1. On February 4, 2026, the Claimant filed a request for a hearing to challenge a sanction imposed under the Canadian Safe Sport Program (CSSP), pursuant to Section 8.4 of the 2025 Canadian Sport Dispute Resolution Code (the “Code”), before the SDRCC Safeguarding Tribunal, as defined in Article 1 of the Code.
2. The Claimant challenges the sanctions imposed on him by Sport Integrity Canada in its Notice of Decision (the “Decision”), bearing file number R 2528007, of which the Parties were notified on January 14, 2026.
3. The Claimant submits that the sanction imposed by Sport Integrity Canada is unreasonable in light of the objectives of the sanction, for the following reasons:
 - Sport Integrity Canada failed to consider applicable mitigating factors and to weigh those factors in light of the circumstances;
 - Sport Integrity Canada failed to sufficiently justify the reasonableness of the length of the suspension period;
 - The suspension period imposed is manifestly disproportionate and unreasonable in the circumstances.

II. Procedure and Jurisdiction of the Tribunal

4. On February 23, 2026, Janie Soublière was selected by consent of all Parties and agreed to act as Arbitrator in the matter.
5. On February 24, 2026, the Parties agreed that the hearing would proceed by documentary review, as provided for in the Code and the CSSP, and established a procedural timetable for the filing of their written submissions.
6. The procedural timetable proposed by the Parties was subsequently accepted by the Arbitrator, subject to confirmation by Sport Integrity Canada that the Affected Parties had chosen not to participate in the matter.
7. Sport Integrity Canada confirmed that neither of the Affected Parties (identified as IP1 and IP2) wished to participate in the process before the SDRCC Tribunal.
8. Following the filing of the Parties’ respective submissions, the Arbitrator hereby issued her reasoned decision.

III. The Decision Under Challenge

9. Following an investigation undertaken by Sport Integrity Canada, which included testimony from both the individuals involved and corroborating witnesses, the Claimant was found to have committed Sexual Maltreatment by sending unsolicited nude photographs and sexual messages to two adult women (IP1 and IP2), including a request for nude photographs in exchange for money, from 2020 to 2025.
10. According to the Decision, the Claimant's conduct violated Section 5.5 of the Universal Code of Conduct to Prevent and Address Maltreatment in Sport (UCCMS).
11. During the investigation, the Claimant admitted to sending inappropriate messages and acknowledged his actions as showing "poor judgment."
12. As consequences for these established violations of the UCCMS, the Decision imposed an 18-month suspension on the Claimant and mandatory ethics coaching, as follows:
 1. *The Respondent shall be suspended from participation in sport for a period of 18 months, commencing at 12:01am on January 17, 2026, and ending on July 16, 2027, at 11:59pm.*
 2. *The Respondent shall attend 1:1 coaching, with a counsellor selected by Sport Integrity Canada, focused on consent and ethics in communications. The first ethics coaching session shall occur no later than February 17, 2026. The cost of the sessions shall be paid by the Respondent and shall not exceed 10 sessions. The ethics coaching is completed when the counsellor confirms with Sport Integrity Canada that the Respondent has demonstrated: his knowledge that the sexual photos and communications sent to IP1 and IP2 were Prohibited Behaviour; his knowledge and insights as to why this conduct is prohibited under the UCCMS and the Criminal Code; and that he has developed strategies to prevent this behaviour from occurring in the future.*

IV. Applicable Law

13. The Claimant challenges the sanction imposed by Sport Integrity Canada. In this regard, Subsection 8.4.4(c) of the Code provides, in particular:
 - (c) *A review of the findings of fact or credibility by the investigator or the decision by [Sport Integrity Canada] that a Party did or did not violate the UCCMS and/or the CSSP Rules, as applicable, may only be made on the following grounds:*

(i) Error of law that has a material impact on the findings and/or decisions made. For greater clarity, an error of law includes without limitation:

(1) a misinterpretation of a section of the UCCMS and /or the CSSP;

(2) a misapplication of an applicable principle of general law;

(3) acting without any evidence;

*(4) acting on a view of the facts which could not reasonably be entertained;
or*

(5) failing to consider all the evidence that is material to the decision being challenged.

V. The Judicial Review Provided for in the Code

14. Pursuant to Subsection 8.2(a) of the Code:

The Safeguarding Tribunal has jurisdiction to:

1. hear reviews of decisions made by [Sport Integrity Canada], where a review is available in accordance with CSSP Rule 16.1...

15. With respect to the applicable procedure and standard of proof, Subsection 8.4.4(b) of the Code provides, in particular:

(b) The Safeguarding Panel shall not conduct a hearing de novo and the hearing is not a redetermination of the investigation. The findings of fact and credibility made in the investigation report shall be accepted by the Safeguarding Panel, except where the findings are successfully challenged by a Party in accordance with Subsection 8.4.4(c).

16. This challenge before the Safeguarding Tribunal is therefore not *de novo*, and the standard of reasonableness applies in this case.

17. It should be noted that, under this standard, Sport Integrity Canada's decision need not be correct or beyond reproach. It need only be reasonable. Accordingly, the Claimant must establish, on a balance of probabilities, that the decision and sanctions imposed by Sport Integrity Canada in its Decision, following a reading and interpretation of the UCCMS and of the complete file, including the facts and findings of the investigator, are unreasonable.

18. Conversely, if, in light of all the evidence before her, the Arbitrator concludes that Sport Integrity Canada's Decision is reasonable and that the imposed sanctions represent plausible, reasonable options that are proportionate to the violations committed, the Claimant's challenge must be dismissed.

19. The decision in *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 (hereinafter “Vavilov”), often cited as the leading authority on this issue, provides a detailed explanation of the application of the reasonableness standard of review.
20. At paragraph 100 of Vavilov, it was determined, among other things, that in order to conclude that a decision is unreasonable, one must be satisfied “*that there are sufficiently serious shortcomings in the decision such that it cannot be said to exhibit the requisite degree of justification, intelligibility and transparency.*”

VI. Admissibility and Jurisdiction of the Tribunal

21. Pursuant to Section 8.1 of the Code, the Safeguarding Tribunal has jurisdiction over sports-related disputes arising from the application of the UCCMS. Section 8.2 grants it jurisdiction to “hear reviews of decisions made by [Sport Integrity Canada], where a review is available in accordance with CSSP Rule 16.1.”
22. It is undisputed that the Claimant’s challenge was filed within the time limits prescribed by the Code.
23. It is undisputed that the undersigned Arbitrator was selected by agreement of the Parties.
24. It is undisputed that the Tribunal has jurisdiction to decide this dispute.

VII. Submissions of the Parties

25. The Arbitrator carefully considered all of the Parties’ submissions, as well as the documents on file. For the sake of brevity, the Arbitrator summarizes the Parties’ submissions as follows and addresses other arguments where necessary to explain her reasoning.

Submissions of the Claimant

26. The Claimant challenges the sanctions imposed by Sport Integrity Canada for misconduct related to allegations of sexual misconduct and seeks a reduction of the suspension period imposed on him in the Decision.
27. The Claimant acknowledges that he engaged in conduct considered to be Sexual Maltreatment under the UCCMS but challenges the severity and justification of the 18-month suspension imposed by Sport Integrity Canada.
28. He asks the Tribunal to reduce the suspension to three months, arguing that the initial sanction is unreasonable, disproportionate, and insufficiently justified.
29. The Claimant submits that the sanction imposed by Sport Integrity Canada is unreasonable in light of the objectives of the sanction, for the following reasons:

- Sport Integrity Canada failed to consider applicable mitigating factors and to weigh those factors in light of the circumstances.
- Sport Integrity Canada failed to sufficiently justify the reasonableness of the length of the suspension period.
- The suspension period imposed is manifestly disproportionate and unreasonable in the circumstances.

30. In support of this position, the Claimant submits that:

- Sport Integrity Canada failed to take into account mitigating factors, such as the limited number of incidents (only four events over five years) and the absence of any disciplinary history, which should be considered factors mitigating the severity of the sanction.
- Sport Integrity Canada erred in characterizing the relationship he had with one of the Affected Parties as being long-term (five years) which is inaccurate; only four isolated incidents occurred, making the characterization of the length of the relationship exaggerated.
- The conclusion that the conduct at issue presented a risk of recurrence is not supported by any evidence and is based on a mere possibility, rather than an established risk.
- His acknowledgement of fault and cooperation should be considered mitigating circumstances, thereby reducing the proportionality of a lengthy suspension.

31. In short, the suspension period imposed is manifestly disproportionate and unreasonable.

32. The Claimant further submits that Sport Integrity Canada's Decision lacks reasons, particularly in justifying an 18-month suspension, especially in light of comparable cases that resulted in shorter sanctions. He relies on relevant case law in which shorter suspensions were found to be appropriate for similar, or even more serious, misconduct. He refers to the case law of the Safeguarding Tribunal to illustrate that sanctions must be proportionate and reasonable, taking into account factors such as the nature of the misconduct, the relationship dynamics, prior history, and the seriousness of the acts.

33. The cases he cites include cases in which shorter suspensions (two to three months) were upheld for comparable misconduct, and others in which disproportionate sanctions (such as permanent ineligibility) were found to be excessive. In this case, he refers to:

34. *Ontario Volleyball Association v. Deputy Director of Sanctions and Outcomes*¹:

- According to the Claimant, the facts of that decision differ from the present case in that the claimant had no physical contact of any kind with the persons involved, there was no power imbalance or position of authority, both persons involved were adults, and the claimant admitted that he had made mistakes.
- In his view, there is therefore a marked and unreasonable discrepancy between the 18-month suspension period imposed on the Claimant and the two-month period, found to be reasonable, imposed in the Ontario Volleyball Association case.

35. *AB v. Hockey Canada*².

- A sanction of permanent ineligibility was reduced to a three-year suspension.
- The Claimant summarizes the Arbitrator's reasons as follows: [translation] *"It is hard to imagine more severe sanctions, while one can easily imagine much worse misconduct that would warrant sanctions that were much more severe than those imposed in this case, and [the arbitrator] concludes that the sanction is neither proportionate nor reasonable."*
- By analogy to the AB matter, the Claimant submits that one can easily imagine much worse misconduct that would justify the imposition of sanctions far more severe than those imposed in this case.

36. The Claimant argues that the two above-mentioned cases demonstrate that the facts supporting the Decision of January 14, 2026, call for a much shorter suspension period than the one imposed on him.

37. In his view, the absence of aggravating circumstances, such as the involvement of minors or an abuse of authority, supports a shorter suspension. Although prior SDRCC decisions are not binding, they are nevertheless relevant to the analysis and assessment of the reasonableness of the sanction.

38. In addition, the Claimant criticizes Sport Integrity Canada, among other things, for:

- Relying on its submissions before this Tribunal on unfounded findings of fact, including hypothetical and unsupported findings in light of the facts set out in the Notice of Decision.

¹ Ontario Volleyball Association v. Deputy Director of Sanctions and Outcomes, 2025 CASDRC 8, SDRCC ST 24-0017.

² AB v. Hockey Canada, 2025 CASDRC 27.

- Alleging that his argument is intended only to [translation] “propose a different interpretation or attribute a different weight to the factors,” while specifying that he is entitled at law to challenge the application of the various factors in order to demonstrate that the sanction is unreasonable.
- Raising new aggravating factors, such as a pre-existing relationship, if that factor was not taken into account in the initial analysis and determination of the sanction.
- Concluding that the Sexual Maltreatment committed against two (2) Affected Parties over a five (5)-year period constitutes both an aggravating factor and prior history, which amounts to double punishment for the Claimant. According to the Claimant, in order for prior history to exist, he must have been found guilty and sanctioned for prohibited behaviour prior to the facts alleged in this case.
- Suggesting and implying that the length of a sanction should be the same as, or proportionate to, the duration of the reprehensible conduct.
- Claiming that the Claimant's conduct impacted the entire sport community.
- Asking the Tribunal to take into account the long-term effects on the mental health and well-being of others, since these “effects” are entirely hypothetical.
- Inferring underlying motives for the Claimant's conduct or attributing personal characteristics to him, even though no sexological or psychological assessment was conducted.

39. He submits that the sanction imposed by Sport Integrity Canada is unjustified, disproportionate, and insufficiently reasoned, and argues in favour of a significantly reduced suspension based on mitigating factors, case law, and the principles of fairness and proportionality.

Conclusion and Relief Sought

40. The Claimant submits that a three-month suspension, retroactive to January 17, 2026, is proportionate, reasonable, and appropriate in the circumstances.

Submissions of the Respondent/Sport Integrity Canada

41. In general, Sport Integrity Canada submits that the 18-month suspension imposed on the Claimant for Sexual Maltreatment is reasonable, proportionate, and consistent with the objectives of sanctions set out in Sections 7.3 and 7.4 of the UCCMS. Sport Integrity Canada therefore asks the Tribunal to dismiss the Claimant's request for review and challenge.

42. Sport Integrity Canada first refers to the context and nature of the conduct alleged against the Claimant:

- The Claimant committed acts of Sexual Maltreatment against two adult female athletes (IP1 and IP2) over a five-year period.
- The acts include the unsolicited sending of nude photographs, including photographs of his penis, and requests to IP2 for nude photographs in exchange for money.

43. Sport Integrity Canada secondly refers to the impact of the Claimant's conduct on the victims:

- IP1 was sufficiently upset to speak about it with teammates; two of them confronted the Claimant.
- IP2 blocked him on all platforms after he sent further sexual messages, despite her having clearly told him that she no longer wanted contact.

44. Sport Integrity Canada criticizes the Claimant for his complete lack of understanding of the principle of consent. In particular, Sport Integrity Canada notes that the Claimant stated: *"I don't think anyone said it had to stop or that anyone complained."* Sport Integrity Canada submits that this demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding of consent, which requires an explicit yes, not the absence of refusal.

45. With respect to the legal framework for the review, Sport Integrity Canada submits that this appeal is not a hearing *de novo*. The Tribunal must therefore accept the investigator's factual findings, as they were not challenged, and because it is called upon only to determine whether the sanction imposed on the Claimant by Sport Integrity Canada is *reasonable*, not whether the Arbitrator would have imposed a different sanction.

Response to the Claimant's Arguments

46. Sport Integrity Canada rejects the Claimant's attempt to present the facts as "four isolated incidents." The Respondent states that:

- The facts established by the investigator cannot be recharacterized.
- Prior SDRCC decisions are not binding.
- The Claimant's age and the remaining length of his career are not relevant factors.

47. In response to the Claimant's arguments that Sport Integrity Canada did not duly consider the mitigating factors set out in section 7.4 of the UCCMS, Sport Integrity

Canada refers directly to its Decision and submits that it did indeed consider all of the mitigating and aggravating factors set out in Section 7.4 of the UCCMS.

48. Inter alia, among the aggravating factors considered, Sport Integrity Canada lists the following:

- The conduct was repeated over five years.
- The Claimant's conduct had an impact on two victims, IP1 and IP2.
- The explicit nature of the photographs (including a photograph of his penis).
- The continuation of the behaviour despite warnings and despite having been blocked.
- The real risk to the safety of other participants.

49. Inter alia, among the mitigating factors identified, which it alleges are limited, Sport Integrity Canada lists the following:

- The Claimant's partial cooperation.
- The partial acknowledgment of the facts and expression of remorse.

50. With respect to neutral factors, Sport Integrity Canada lists the following:

- Absence of minors (not mitigating).
- Absence of a power imbalance (neutral).
- No disciplinary history. However, this factor carries limited weight because of the repeated nature of the Claimant's conduct.

The Sanction Is Reasonable

51. According to Sport Integrity Canada, the 18-month sanction is reasonable and proportionate because:

- The conduct lasted five years, whereas the suspension is 18 months (less than one-third of the period of impact).
- The behaviour created a toxic and unsafe sport environment.
- The sanction promotes:
 - deterrence;
 - the protection of the sport environment;
 - public confidence in the sport system.
- The Claimant's remorse was taken into account, which avoided a more severe sanction.

Conclusion

52. Sport Integrity Canada concludes that:

- Under Section 7.3.1(b) of the UCCMS, Sexual Maltreatment of an adult results in a presumptive sanction of suspension or eligibility restrictions.
- The 18-month sanction imposed is reasonable, proportionate, and necessary to protect the sport environment.
- The Claimant's challenge and request for review must be dismissed.

VIII. Deliberation

The Judicial Review

53. Sport Integrity Canada's role is to interpret the findings of the investigation, as well as the UCCMS and the related policies and procedures, in order to determine whether a violation of the UCCMS occurred and, in the event of a violation or violations, to determine the appropriate consequences. The role of the Safeguarding Tribunal when a request for review is submitted, is to determine whether the decision imposed by Sport Integrity Canada can withstand a judicial review.
54. Rule 16.6 of the CSSP and section 8.4.5 of the Code specifically address the grounds justifying the review of a sanction:

16.6 Grounds to Review a Sanction

A Reporting Person, Impacted Person or Respondent may seek a review of sanction imposed by [Sport Integrity Canada] on the basis that it is unreasonable having regard to the purposes of sanction under UCCMS Sections 7.3 and 7.4.

8.4.5 Review of a Sanction under the CSSP

(a) A review of a sanction imposed by [Sport Integrity Canada] may be made on the basis that the sanction is unreasonable having regard to the purposes of sanction under UCCMS Sections 7.3 and 7.4.

55. The Parties agree that the applicable standard is reasonableness, not correctness. In this case, the Arbitrator is therefore tasked with determining whether, in light of the facts and circumstances, Sport Integrity Canada's decision is reasonable.
56. For the reasons below, the Arbitrator sees no serious shortcoming that would indicate that Sport Integrity Canada's decision is unreasonable.
57. In light of Sport Integrity Canada's submissions, the review of the file, the Investigation Report, and the Notice of Decision, "*in relation to the constellation of law and facts that are relevant*" (see Vavilov, para. 105), the reasoning underlying

Sport Integrity Canada's Decision and the sanctions imposed therein appear logical, reasonable, and proportionate to the violation. The Arbitrator is satisfied that the Decision and the sanctions imposed by Sport Integrity Canada meet the requirements of justification, intelligibility, and transparency required under Vavilov in order to conclude that a decision is reasonable.

58. Sport Integrity Canada duly considered the facts established by the investigation, concluded that a violation of the UCCMS had occurred, and imposed sanctions that included an 18-month suspension.

Established Facts

59. It is not for this Tribunal to re-examine the facts and the investigation. Rule 16.3 of the CSSP and Subsection 8.3(a) of the Code both provide that the Safeguarding Tribunal shall accept the findings of fact and credibility assessments presented by the investigator, unless they are successfully challenged by the Claimant.

16.3 Safeguarding Tribunal Hearing is not a hearing De Novo, Investigation Report Admitted as Fact

A review by the Safeguarding Tribunal is not a hearing de novo and is not a redetermination of the investigation. The findings of fact and credibility made in the Investigation Report shall be accepted by the Safeguarding Tribunal, except where the findings are successfully challenged by the Reporting Person and/or Impacted Person or the Respondent in accordance with Rule 16.4.

60. In any event, no challenge of this kind was made in this case by the Claimant. The Arbitrator therefore accepts that the investigator's findings must be admitted as accurate.
61. Sport Integrity Canada's sanctions are considered by the Claimant to be too severe and disproportionate. However, the Arbitrator concludes that the sanctions imposed by Sport Integrity Canada are entirely reasonable and proportionate to the investigator's findings with respect to the established violations. These are factual findings which, it should be noted, are generally not challenged by the Claimant.

Review Under Sections 7.3 and 7.4 of the UCCMS

62. The Claimant maintains that the imposed sanction is too severe and that Sport Integrity Canada did not sufficiently take into account the factors that could mitigate the sanction, as provided for in Section 7 of the UCCMS. However, the Tribunal cannot assign the weight suggested by the Claimant to these factors unless it concludes, in its assessment, that Sport Integrity Canada reached unreasonable conclusions, which the Arbitrator is unable to do in this case.

63. On reviewing the file, the Arbitrator is of the view that Sport Integrity Canada did indeed take into account both the aggravating and mitigating factors set out in Section 7.4 of the UCCMS and issued a decision structured around those factors and the principles inherent in the UCCMS. Indeed, in its Notice of Decision, as reiterated in its submissions before the Tribunal, Sport Integrity Canada took into account each of the considerations set out in Section 7.4 of the UCCMS, in the general order in which they are presented.
64. The Arbitrator therefore finds that all of the mitigating factors listed in Section 7.4 of the UCCMS were duly considered, both by the investigator and by Sport Integrity Canada. Moreover, the aggravating factors raised by the investigator and Sport Integrity Canada, also listed in Section 7.4 of the UCCMS, including, inter alia, conduct that took place over a long period of time, repeated conduct and established prior history, the commission of Sexual Maltreatment in the context of a pre-existing relationship, and the risk of recurrence, were considerably more significant in the determination of the sanction. In short, the Arbitrator accepts Sport Integrity Canada's findings that this was not an isolated incident or an aberrant and unusual act. These were repeated acts of Sexual Maltreatment. The mitigating factors identified simply do not counterbalance the aggravating factors.
65. In addition, still with respect to the aggravating factors, on reviewing the file, the Arbitrator shares Sport Integrity Canada's view that the Claimant demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding of the concept of consent and of the UCCMS. In this case, the Claimant's repeated conduct toward the Affected Parties (sending unsolicited nude photographs of his penis on multiple occasions without their consent, as well as soliciting IP2 by offering to pay her to send nude photographs of herself) demonstrates wholly inappropriate conduct. The fact that some of these exchanges, messages, and incidents occurred after two independent witnesses had spoken with the Claimant about sending inappropriate messages, and that he ignored them, is all the more problematic and does not assist him in his challenge.
66. It is true that some of the precedents cited by the Claimant refer to findings that were favourable to the claimants in those cases. However, although the Tribunal may be guided by prior decisions involving similar prohibited behaviour and may draw upon the reasons in cases with similar facts, Subsection 5.13(e) of the Code expressly provides that each case must be decided on its own facts, and that the Panel is not bound by any previous award or decision, including those of the SDRCC. In any event, the factual circumstances of all of the cited cases bear little or no similarity to this case, certainly not sufficiently to render Sport Integrity Canada's decision unreasonable or subject to review.
67. It is also true, as raised by the Claimant in his reply submissions, that the arguments submitted by Sport Integrity Canada refer to certain facts and findings

that are not present in the Decision. The Arbitrator confirms that she gave no weight to those facts and findings; her judicial review is limited to the substantive merits of the Decision.

68. Despite certain persuasive arguments by the Claimant, citing *Gorsline v. Director of Sanctions and Outcomes*, 2026 CASDRC 8, the Arbitrator recalls that:

To be clear, unanimous satisfaction and agreement with the decision is not required to arrive at a finding that said decision was reasonable. As noted above, Vavilov expressly provides that the Tribunal must indeed “focus on the decision of the administrative decision maker actually made, including the justification offered for it, and not on the conclusion the court itself would have reached in the administrative decision maker’s place.” A reasonableness review does not include a re-argument of the merits of a challenged decision. So long as the decision is logical, intelligible, and transparent, it will be deemed reasonable.

69. Having considered the Parties’ submissions, following a review of Sport Integrity Canada’s Decision and the logical, intelligible, and transparent findings made therein through a direct and thorough application of the UCCMS, the Arbitrator is of the view that the 18-month sanction imposed on the Claimant for repeated prohibited acts of Sexual Maltreatment contrary to the UCCMS against two different Affected Parties over an extended period of time (even if not continuous) is neither unreasonable nor disproportionate, and falls within the range of reasonable sanctions having regard to the facts, circumstances, and applicable law.

Order

70. For the foregoing reasons, the Claimant’s challenge is dismissed.
71. This decision may be appealed only in accordance with the procedures set out in the Code.

Decision rendered in Beaconsfield, Quebec, on this 26th day of May 2026.

Janie Soublière, Arbitrator