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

Citation: ***A.B. v. Sport Integrity Canada*****, 2026 CASDRC 38.**
File No: SDRCC ST 26-0075
Date: 2026-08-18

BETWEEN:

A.B.

(CLAIMANT)

AND

SPORT INTEGRITY CANADA

(RESPONDENT)

AND

C.D.

(AFFECTED PARTY)

Appearances:

On behalf of the Claimant:	Appearing on her own behalf
On behalf of Sport Integrity Canada:	Lisa Henderson, Counsel
On behalf of C.D.:	Daniel Martz, Counsel

Before:

Carol Roberts, Arbitrator

DECISION ON JURISDICTION

1. On July 25, 2026, I was selected under Subsection 5.3(b) of the *Canadian Sport Dispute Resolution Code* (the "*Code"*) to decide the Claimant's request for a review of a decision of Sport Integrity Canada issued April 16, 2026 (the "Decision").

OVERVIEW

2. Sport Integrity Canada is Canada's independent body mandated to administer and enforce the Universal Code of Conduct to Prevent and Address Maltreatment in Sport (the "UCCMS"). Sport organizations that have adopted the UCCMS are committed to creating a sport environment that is free from all forms of Maltreatment and treats all Participants with dignity and respect.
3. The UCCMS applies to individual participants of organizations that have agreed to be bound, including board members, employees, athletes and athlete support personnel.
4. The Canadian Safe Sport Program (the "CSSP") and the CSSP Rules (the "Rules") address the adoption of the UCCMS by Sport Organizations and the process by which Reports of Prohibited Behaviour in sport will be administered and enforced by Sport Integrity Canada. It also describes the role of the SDRCC in reviewing decisions made by Sport Integrity Canada.
5. The Affected Party ("C.D.", referred to as the *Respondent* in the Decision) is a National Coach with a National Sport Organization (the "NSO") which has agreed to be bound by the UCCMS.
6. The Claimant (referred to as the *Reporting Person* in the Decision) is the parent of a minor female athlete (referred to as the *Impacted Person* in the Decision) who was coached by C.D. beginning in July 2025.
7. The Claimant seeks a review of the April 16, 2026, decision and requests a "full investigation." She asserts that C.D. was able to submit emails and WhatsApp messages in response to the Report, and that she expected a similar opportunity to be given to her. She says that she was told that she would have "an unbiased, thorough review" of the allegations identified in her Report.
8. The Claimant says that, when she submitted her Report, she was informed there would be follow up, and that someone would get back to her and request additional information. She says that she did not have a full opportunity to submit documents in support of the allegations.

Preliminary Issues

Bifurcating the Request

9. At the Preliminary meeting on July 10, 2026, I observed that the Claimant was self-represented, and that the other parties had counsel. I identified specific sections of the *Code* and the UCCMS that were, in my view, relevant to her request. Given the initial responses to the request, I also sought the views of the parties on whether the

matter should be bifurcated; that is, whether I should decide the question of whether I had jurisdiction over the matter as a preliminary matter before proceeding to consider the merits of the request. Although the parties initially agreed that, in the interest of time, the hearing should not be bifurcated, Sport Integrity Canada subsequently took the view that, based on the particular facts of this case, I ought to decide the issue of jurisdiction in advance of the merits.

10. I agreed to separate the review request into two parts and address the question of jurisdiction first. In arriving at this conclusion, I considered that bifurcating the proceedings would avoid the necessity for Sport Integrity Canada to disclose over 100 pages of documents that include WhatsApp messages and email exchanges reviewed by Sport Integrity Canada at this stage of the proceedings. Those exchanges involved third parties that are not parties to this request and whose privacy rights Sport Integrity Canada would have to address. I informed the parties as follows:

> *I propose that the dates agreed upon in the preliminary hearing be amended as suggested by counsel for Sport Integrity Canada; that is, Sport Integrity Canda file submission the issue of jurisdiction by July 20, 2026, the Claimant will file her response to those submissions by August 4, 2026 and the Affected Party have until August 11, 2026 to file submissions.*
>
> *If I determine that I have jurisdiction, I will convene a second "preliminary" hearing to establish a schedule for submission relating to the reasonableness of the Decision.*

Anonymization Request

11. On August 10, 2026, C.D. made a request to have this decision anonymized to prevent the identification of the parties. Counsel for C.D. notes that while SDRCC decisions on jurisdiction must be made public, the *Code* contains provisions for redacting the names of parties who have not expressly consented to be publicly identified prior to the publication of the award. C.D. does not consent to be identified and believes that it would be unjust that they be identified in the absence of any finding of violation. They also note that publication of their name would have the effect of indirectly disclosing the Impacted Person's identity.

12. The Claimant opposed the request, contending that the Impacted Person's "dignity, well-being, safety and ability to heal must remain the primary consideration" in this decision, and that can only be achieved through transparency, which, in her view, is the publication of her name, her child's name, and the names of other individuals involved in the decision-making process.

13. Sport Integrity Canada agrees that the name of the Affected Party may only be published with their consent, and their submissions make it clear they do not consent to publication.

14. The CSSP Rules contain provisions regarding requests not to disclose personal identifying information and making anonymous Reports (Rules 6.4 and 6.5), and

maintaining confidentiality and privacy, including confidentiality obligations of parties and witnesses in a CSSP Process (Rule 9). Specifically, Rule 9.6.3 provides that:

> *Documents created in the course of a CSSP Process and their contents, such as an Investigation Report…Letters of Concern… and notices or decision letters issued by Sport Integrity Canada are confidential and must not be disclosed outside of the CSSP Process or the SDRCC, except as required by law or authorized by Sport Integrity Canada, the Safeguarding Panel or Appeal Panel of the SDRCC or as permitted by Rule 9.6.2.*

15. These confidentiality requirements continue following the completion of a CSSP investigation, "including and in particular, confidentiality with respect to the identity of the Impacted Person and/or Reporting Person" (Rule 9.6.5).

16. Rule 16.11 establishes the rules for anonymization of decisions of the Safeguarding Tribunal:

> *…*
>
> *16.11.2 The names and identifying information of the Reporting Person and Impacted Person will be anonymized or redacted in any Safeguarding Panel decision.*
>
> *16.11.3 The name and identifying information of the Respondent in any Safeguarding panel decision shall be made public (unless otherwise determined by the Safeguarding Tribunal) except in decisions where the Respondent is not found to have violated the UCCMS/CSSP Rules.*
>
> *16.11.4 The names and identifying information of the Reporting Person and/or Impacted Person (and Respondent in cases where no finding of violation of the UCCMS/CSSP Rules is made) may be published by the SDRCC with the individual's consent.*

17. SDRCC has the authority to review decisions of Sport Integrity Canada. In doing so, it is my view that the confidentiality and privacy concerns and obligations set out in the UCCMS and CSSP should be respected as far as possible, given the purpose and objectives of the UCCMS, even in jurisdictional decisions.

18. Subsection 8.11(c) of the *Code* provides that, subject to CSSP Rule 16.11, all awards of the Safeguarding Panel shall be made public provided that:

> *(i) the name and identifying information of a Party who has been found to have violated the UCCMS or, as applicable, the CSSP shall be made public, unless otherwise determined by the Safeguarding Panel; and*
>
> *(ii) best efforts are made to prevent the identification of:*
>
> *(1) any person who was, at the time of the alleged or confirmed UCCMS or CSSP violation, a Minor or Vulnerable Person as determined by the*

Safeguarding Panel, including a Minor or Vulnerable Person who has been found to have violated the UCCMS or, as applicable, the CSSP, and

(2) any other party or witness who has not expressly consented to be publicly identified prior to the publication of the award.

19. The Claimant seeks "transparency" through the publication of the names of all the parties. Despite the lack of harmonization between the CSSP Rules and the *Code*, I find that I am required to anonymize the names of both Claimant and her daughter (Impacted Person) by CSSP Rule 16.11.2.

20. C.D. does not consent to the publication of their name.

21. Sport Integrity Canada found no violation of the UCCMS in the behaviour outlined in the Claimant's report. For the reasons set out below, I have concluded that I have no jurisdiction to address that part of the Decision that is challenged by the Claimant. Given the nature and purposes of the UCCMS and the CSSP Rules, and pursuant to Section 8.11 (c) of the *Code*, I find that C.D.'s name and identifying information as well as the identification of the National Sport Organization should not be publicly identified in this jurisdictional award.

BACKGROUND

22. On February 17, 2026, the CSSP received a report from the Claimant alleging that C.D. engaged in behaviour that could constitute "Psychological Maltreatment" which is a *Prohibited Behaviour* under section 5.2 of the UCCMS. Specifically, the Claimant alleged that C.D. "engaged in a pattern of behaviour which embarrassed, intimidated and slandered at least one minor athlete" between November 2025 through to January 2026.

23. Sport Integrity Canada served C.D. with a Notice of Report (the "Report") on March 16, 2026. C.D.'s response to the Notice consisted of over 100 pages of attachments including WhatsApp and email exchanges with the Claimant, other officials and coaches with the NSO and the minor female athlete, all of which related to the reported events.

24. The April 16, 2026 Decision contained the heading: "Notice of Decision — Letter of Concern." The Decision read, in part, as follows:

In determining the appropriate resolution method, Sport Integrity Canada has considered that the majority of the behaviour outlined in the [Report] involved a complicated situation where the Impacted Person was, by admission of the Reporting Person herself, in breach of the policy and rules of [the NSO] and was subjected to the imposition of consequences by the Respondent, after consultation with other coaches or administrative personnel from [the NSO]. Whether or not some of the matters could have been handled in a different way, overall, based on the information provided, [the NSO], the Respondent, the Reporting Person and the Impacted Person were all trying to deal with legitimate issues and act in the best interests of the Impacted Person while adhering to the National Sport Organization's policies and rules. As a result, Sport Integrity Canada is of the view

there is no basis to take further steps in relation to a concern of Psychological Maltreatment.

25. The April 16, 2026 document continued:

> *In terms of the direct communication with a minor, Sport Integrity Canada has also considered that the Respondent has no history of any prior reports involving [them] as a Respondent with Abuse-Free-Sport or the CSSP, that the content of the communications were not inappropriate, and that the Respondent was clearly consulting with other members of [the NSO] with respect to the Impacted Person.*
>
> *For the above reasons, Sport Integrity Canada has decided to resolve the Report by issuing a Letter of Concern under CSSP Rule 13.1. A Letter of Concern does not constitute a finding of violation by Sport Integrity Canada or an admission of a violation of the UCCMS or CSSP Rules by the Respondent.*

26. On July 14, 2026, I expressed a preliminary view of the request, observing that the Decision involved two distinct determinations; the first related to the original complaint or allegations of Psychological Maltreatment; and the second related to concerns that arose during the investigation of that complaint. The Claimant confirmed that she only disputed the first determination.

Argument

Sport Integrity Canada

27. Sport Integrity Canada contends that the SDRCC does not have jurisdiction to review Sport Integrity Canada's decision in this matter.

28. Sport Integrity Canada says that, after reviewing the Respondent's communications, it made the decision to take no further steps in relation to the allegations of Psychological Maltreatment. Sport Integrity Canada contends that under Rule 5.2.3 of the CSSP, once a decision is made to stop processing the Report, Sport Integrity Canada is to "notify the Reporting Person in writing with the reasons for the decision" and that the "decision is final and binding and cannot be reviewed or appealed to the SDRCC."

29. Sport Integrity Canada says that, during the investigation of the original allegations, it identified other conduct potentially engaging the UCCMS "in a manner distinct in nature and substance" from the original allegations. Specifically, Sport Integrity Canada determined that, in communicating privately with the minor female athlete through social media or text, C.D. engaged in the Prohibited Behaviour of Boundary Transgressions contrary to section 5.7.4 (c) of the UCCMS. Sport Integrity Canada determined that while the content of the messages were appropriate communications between a coach and an athlete, the UCCMS prohibited private communications between a coach and a minor athlete.

30. Sport Integrity Canada submits that it issued the April 16, 2026 Decision as a Letter of Concern, and chose to do so, as a matter of efficiency, in the same letter in which it notified the Claimant that it had determined that it did not have jurisdiction to continue investigating her original allegations.

31. Sport Integrity Canada contends that the "essential nature or character" of the Claimant's request for review is Sport Integrity Canada's decision that it does not have jurisdiction over her Report. Sport Integrity Canada says that the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to consider the Claimant's request for, in effect, an Order compelling Sport Integrity Canada to proceed to an investigation of her initial report.

Affected Party

32. C.D. agrees with Sport Integrity Canada's submissions and adds the following.

33. C.D. contends that, while the SDRCC has jurisdiction to review Sport Integrity Canada's decision to issue Letters of Concern on the grounds that the decision was unreasonable, it does not have jurisdiction to hear challenges based on the grounds of procedural fairness under Subsection 8.4.3 (a) of the *Code*.

34. C.D. argues that the sole basis for the Claimant's argument is that her allegations were not properly investigated, which are procedural fairness concerns, rather than the unreasonableness of the Decision.

Claimant

35. Despite Sport Integrity Canada's submissions on its jurisdictional argument, the Claimant's submissions did not address this question. Rather, her submissions focused entirely on the merits of the Decision. I have not found her submissions helpful to my decision in the matter.

ANALYSIS

The CSSP Rules

36. Rule 5.2 identifies the grounds on which Sport Integrity Canada will not assume jurisdiction over a Report. Those grounds include:

> *a) the Report does not contain allegations relating to a Participant or Sport Organization;*
>
> *b) the Report does not contain allegations of Prohibited Behaviour:*
>
> *c) the allegations were already addressed and resolved by another domestic or international sport organization, court, tribunal or other comparable forum and Sport Integrity Canada determines no further action is warranted;*
>
> *d) the Report involves alleged conduct due to circumstances outside of the control of Sport Integrity Canada, such as the passage of time, Sport Integrity Canada determines that it is not able to address or investigate the Report; and/or*
>
> *e) the Report does not fall within the scope of the CSSP's application, as outlined in Rule 3.*

37. Rule 5.2.3 provides that:

Where Sport Integrity Canada determines that it does not have jurisdiction or will not exercise jurisdiction, Sport Integrity Canada will notify the Reporting Person in writing with the reasons for the decision. This decision is final and binding and cannot be reviewed or appealed to the SDRCC.

Is the Decision insulated from review by Rule 5.2 of the CSSP?

38. I do not agree with Sport Integrity Canada's submission that the SDRCC has no jurisdiction to consider this request under CSSP Rule 5.2. There is nothing in either the body of the Decision or the submissions to suggest that any of the grounds identified in Rule 5.2 exist. Furthermore, in a March 6, 2026, letter to the Claimant, Sport Integrity Canada stated: *"*Based on the information we currently have, we believe Sport Integrity Canada has jurisdiction to move forward with your report*."*

39. There is also nothing in the Decision itself to indicate that Sport Integrity Canada determined that it had no jurisdiction to deal with the Report. Within the body of the Decision is the heading: "Sport Integrity Canada's Decision to Issue a Letter of Concern" in bold letters. Both the behaviour outlined in the Report as well as the subsequent concerns that arose from the response to the Report were identified under that heading.

40. Under the CSSP Rules, Sport Integrity Canada has the power to resolve Reports in several ways (Rule 13).

41. Rule 13.1.1 provides that "at any time, Sport Integrity Canada may, in its sole discretion, determine that the appropriate resolution of a *Report* is the issuance of a *Letter of Concern*."

42. The Decision referred to "appropriate resolution methods" when Sport Integrity Canada determined that there was no basis to take further steps. I find that Sport Integrity Canada assumed jurisdiction over the Report and decided to resolve it by way of a *Letter of Concern* under Rule 13.

43. Rule 16.1 of the CSSP Rules provide that a Reporting Person may request a review of a Sport Integrity Canada decision to the Safeguarding Tribunal under Rule 13.1.

44. I conclude that the Decision is not insulated from review by Rule 5.2.3

Is the Decision reviewable under Subsection 8.4.3 of the Code?

45. Section 8.2 of the *Code* provides that the Safeguarding Tribunal has jurisdiction to hear reviews of decisions of [Sport Integrity Canada], where a review is available in accordance with CSSP Rule 16.1. That Rule provides that a review of Sport Integrity Canada decisions by the Safeguarding Tribunal is available where the Reporting Person (the Claimant) requests a review under Rule 13.1, which refers to *Letters of Concern.*

46. While the Claimant has the right to request a review of the Decision under CSSP Rules, the basis for the scope of the request is limited by Subsection 8.4.3(a) of the *Code* which provides that:

> *a review of a [Sport Integrity Canada's] decision to issue a Letter of Concern … may be made on the sole ground that the [Sport Integrity Canada] resolution was unreasonable, having regard to the purposes and goals of the UCCMS and CSSP Rules, including the role of education and remediation in achieving safe sport.*
>
> *…*

47. The Claimant does not argue that the Decision was unreasonable. Rather, she contends that Sport Integrity Canada failed to properly investigate her Report, that she was not contacted to provide additional information while the Affected Party was, and that she was told that someone would contact her to obtain additional information.

48. While I acknowledge that the Claimant is self-represented, she had substantial time in which to seek assistance with her arguments. Furthermore, during the Preliminary meeting, I informed her that I understood she believed the decision was not fair but cautioned her that a layperson's concept of fairness was not the same as what the law regarded as fair. Fairness in law, often referred to as principles of natural justice, affords procedural rights to parties. The components of natural justice include the right to know the case a party is to meet, the right to a fair hearing before an unbiased decision maker and the right to intelligible reasons for a decision. These are the issues raised by the Claimant.

49. The *Code* expressly limits the grounds for a review of a *Letter of Concern* to the reasonableness of the Decision, not fairness considerations. Given that the Claimant's arguments do not address whether the Decision is reasonable, (see *Canada* (*Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65.) I have no jurisdiction to decide this matter.

50. However, even if I had jurisdiction to review the Decision on grounds of procedural fairness, I would find no basis to conclude that the Claimant was denied natural justice.

51. The Claimant attached a March 6, 2026 letter from Sport Integrity Canada to her in support of her argument. In the letter, Sport Integrity Canada acknowledged receipt of the Report, as well as the information provided by the Claimant during phone calls on February 23, 2026, and March 4, 2026. The letter also contained the contact information for the Claimant's case manager, and an overview of the process. The letter advised the Claimant to contact the Case Manager if she wanted to correct, supplement or amend the information. I find that the Claimant was informed about the process, spoke with Sport Integrity Canada on two occasions after filing the Report, and was invited to provide additional information should she wish. She was then provided with written reasons (the Decision).

CONCLUSION

52. I find that, pursuant to Subsection 8.4.3 of the *Code*, I do not have jurisdiction to review Sport Integrity Canada's decision.

DATED: August 18, 2026, Vancouver, British Columbia

_____
Carol Roberts, Arbitrator