

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the Review. The South Australian Government through the South Australian Office for Recreation and Sport (ORS) put forward the following positions in response to your request.

We have enjoyed a close and productive working relationship with the Australian Sports Commission (ASC) and the Australian Institute of Sport (AIS) for a number of years. Whilst committed to fostering this relationship, the South Australian Government, through the ORS has, and will continue to balance this with our own State priorities.

The South Australian ORS comprises:

- Industry Development and Participation Division – which also has responsibility for the coordination of the South Australian Government’s Physical Activity Framework.
- Venues, Infrastructure, Planning and Policy Division.
- The South Australian Sports Institute (SASI)

The ORS is a business unit of the Attorney General’s Department / Department of Justice. Our responses should be considered taking into account this structure, as the responsibilities and operations of the ORS differ from organisational models operating in other States, particularly in relation to SASI.

Definitions

The following acronyms are used in this paper:

AASC	Active After School Sport Centres – a Commonwealth government Program
ASC	Australian Sports Commission
AIS	Australian Institute of Sport
<i>be active</i>	The South Australian Governments physical activity initiative
<i>baFO</i>	be active Field Officers – a project to place an officer in regional areas to support the delivery of sport and physical activity in the community.
ISP	Indigenous Sport Program – a Commonwealth Government Program
NCAS	National Coach Accreditation Scheme – a Commonwealth Program
NESC	National Elite Sports Council
NSO	National Sporting Organisation
ORS	Office for Recreation and Sport
SASI	South Australian Sports Institute
SCORS	Standing Committee on Recreation and Sport

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

SIS/SAS	State Institutes of Sport/State Academies of Sport
SRO	State Recreation Organisation
SSO	State Sporting Organisation

This submission addresses all terms of reference and is structured accordingly.

1. Ensure Australia's continued elite sporting success.

- ***Identify any areas of duplication within Australia's sporting system and recommend ways to build a more efficient system:***

We have identified a number of areas of duplication.

A – Coach Education

Significant direct Commonwealth Government investment in programs at a local level has the potential to create duplication and confusion.

In the area of **coach education** there are currently three systems operating;

- Active After School Centres (AASC) delivers its own coaching program, 'Community Coach', but this is run separately from the;
- National Coach Accreditation Scheme (NCAS) even though both are ASC programs.
- There is a third coach education system run under the Vocational Education and Training (VET) system.

At the same time:

- The ASC supports each state to operate a State Coaching and Officiating Centre and requires that states allocate dedicated staff to that role, to work directly with SSO's to ensure the delivery of the NCAS program nationally.
- The Community Coach initiative works somewhat in isolation of the State Coaching and Officiating Centres and sporting organisations.
- The VET system is delivered by a third group of training providers and is not recognised by the NCAS or the ASSC.

B – Facility Development

Attention needs to be given to the development of a mechanism that better co-ordinates funding for the **development of facilities**.

There is currently no mechanism for co-ordination or communication between the two levels of Government to consider funding applications and funding arrangements hence the opportunity is sometimes missed to consider projects in a strategic context or to agree the prioritisation of projects

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

C - Resource Development.

Both Federal and State agencies are effective at producing resources that assist the sport and recreation industry to develop capacity.

These resources include information on governance, club development, disability and indigenous, etc.

Consideration should be given to developing a clearer process for sharing of information, identifying best practice resources and for co-badging resources where appropriate.

A best practice example of how co-ordination of resources can develop effectively is the Play by the Rules resource. This program, initially developed by South Australia, has been assessed as best practice and adopted as a national model of best practice by the ASC, who have then taken responsibility for the growth and development of the process 'Play by the Rules' www.playbytherules.net.au.

D - High Performance Programs

These have generally exhibited limited duplication across the Federal and State levels. The positioning of AIS and SIS/SAS programs are often complementary in the respective sports pathway. The SIS/SAS programs are feeders in to a number of AIS programs in the case of team and some individual sports. There is some duplication where the AIS and SASI and other SIS/SAS conduct competitive programs (with similar target groups). Domestic competition between states is at the cornerstone of Australia's sporting system and success. It provides the incentive and competition foundations throughout the sporting pathway and foundations for selection of national teams and preparation for international competition.

The points of contention arise in regard to the success, cost efficiency and sustainability of running some of the large centralised residential AIS programs where they directly and unnecessarily compete with SIS/SAS based programs. Ongoing monitoring and review of this is required to ensure the provision of the correct program models and investment at both the AIS and SIS/SAS to ensure sustained sporting success and best use of available recurrent and infrastructure resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Areas of duplication, particularly coach education and resource development need to be further investigated and where possible eliminated or linked to provide a co-ordinated and effective outcome, which will reduce confusion in the community.
2. Federal funding allocated to programs at the local level by the ASC would be better directed through the state government recreation and sport agencies to support the existing infrastructure and programs. This includes the creation and negotiation of new programs.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

3. An effective national mechanism should be established to enable transparent analysis and evaluation of national elite sport programs performances. In this process a determination of key stakeholder roles and responsibilities should occur.
- ***Examine the relationship between the Australian Sports Commission, Australian Institute of Sport, State and Territory Institutes, academies of sport and regional institutes and how this relationship could deliver better athlete pathways.***

Australia's national high performance system has had a priority focus on Summer Olympic, Commonwealth and Paralympic Games sports and disciplines and this should remain. The professional and mass participation sports are also important and the extent to which they are supported and interface with the high performance system needs to be resolved.

With a need for clearer sporting performance targets and priorities to be set, it is likely that a more targeted funding approach will be required. The development of targets needs to reflect not just medal targets, but sustained Australian team success at an international level in sports of cultural significance and priority.

The current systems and structures have achieved significant success for Australian sport and provide solid foundations for the future. The structures have a strong alignment with our federated structures in government and sport and support the logical and existing jurisdictional responsibilities at local, state and federal levels.

The ASC is the key and principle funder of national high performance sport programs and the AIS. The absence of clear performance targets by the Federal Government make it extremely difficult to determine the high performance strategy and funding policy throughout the system. A clear target is required to determine resource requirements and allocations. It is apparent that without resource and funding enhancements, performance expectation will need to be adjusted down.

The evolution of the system following the establishment of the AIS in 1981, SASI in 1982 and the remaining SIS/SAS subsequently, is now well established. The system has now matured to provide strong and critical foundations, resources and infrastructure for the implementation of NSO's national high performance strategies and plans across the nation. The SIS/SAS programs support and underpin the domestic interstate rivalry but work cooperatively and collaboratively to support national team and athlete preparation in the international phases.

Despite the widely varied governance arrangements of the various SIS/SAS, there is a high degree of consistency in their objectives and general modes of operation. These existing structures do not necessarily preclude the development of better national coordinating and servicing arrangements.

The National Elite Sports Council (NESC) was established in 1994 as a mechanism for greater communication and coordination between and across the national and state sports institute and academy network. NESC's influence and effectiveness over the last Olympic cycle has been compromised by a reduced engagement with it by the ASC and the AIS.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

It remains a key stakeholder forum of the major providers of the daily training environment for some 70% of the nation's Olympic athletes.

The level of national cooperation and coordination was greatly enhanced from 1995 with the unifying common goal and imperative of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. A critical component of this was the associated funding enhancement and hence increased system capacity under the Olympic Athlete Program. This funding enabled national frameworks and coordinating management systems for sport science and support servicing, but utilised delivery by relevant stakeholders principally the AIS and SIS/SAS.

Despite some tensions within the system, the SIS/SAS remain a critical deliverer of results and resources in the national system. They leverage significant State Government investment (exceeding \$40 million recurrent annually) and provide logical linkage and conduits to the respective state and national sporting organisations. The traditional intensive training centre partnership of joint funding of the program by the NSO and SIS/SAS has been a foundation of the system's success. Hybrid partnership arrangements have emerged over the past Olympic cycle, highlighting future potential for SIS/SAS to play alternate strategic partnership roles in supporting both AIS and national programs. In South Australia these have included partnership and hosting roles with AIS beach volleyball and the national trampoline programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That targeted Olympic, Commonwealth and Paralympic Games performance and success remain a priority focus for the national high performance sport system, with appropriate support and emphasis to ensure continued Australian success in professional and mass participation sports of major cultural significance.
2. That clear performance targets for the system and individual sports are set to enable funding policy and allocations to be finalised at all levels of the system.
3. There is significant efficiency and merit in utilising existing structures such as the AIS and SIS/SAS in refinement of the current system.
4. An enhanced NESC or a comparable mechanism should be established and mandated to provide clearer strategic leadership, policy and performance accountability across the system.
5. The continuation of joint funding and partnership arrangements is fundamental to the continued development of the system.
6. The system has demonstrated the capacity and should build on its ability to evolve hybrid program models that provide sustainable win-win solutions.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

- ***Recommend opportunities to ensure maximum returns from talent identification programs***

The recent National Talent Identification and Development (NTID) initiatives have been an important catalyst for innovation. Specifically, the separate and supplementary budget allocation provided, enhanced capacity to support new program initiatives.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Continued support of national talent identification initiatives is required, however this support must complement the existing talent pathways. Closer program alignment with existing SIS/SAS programs can provide synergies and efficiencies. Continued development of regional programs and initiatives is a priority.
2. Increased exploration and emphasis on talent transfer is required to optimise the yield from existing scholarship and elite stream athletes as well as those who exit from the elite stream football codes and women's sport. Talent identification and transfer programs also require complementary development and support of appropriate coaches to conduct these programs.

2. Better place sport and physical activity as a key component of the Government's preventative health approach.

- ***Examine Government frameworks to ensure an on-going focus on grassroots and community sport and physical activity***

It is imperative that Sport and Recreation are accorded higher status within the health portfolio, and feature prominently in COAG thinking.

A review of the Standing Committee on Recreation and Sport (SCORS) is recommended. Its fundamental charter is to provide advice and administrative support to the Sport and Recreation Ministers Council, and exchange views on the nationwide development and coordination of recreation and sport. Whilst it effectively shares information across states it is not focused strongly enough upon the development of national strategies and recommendations for Sport Ministers and other Ministers to consider as solutions to national issues.

The South Australian Government believes that there is a need to develop a national sport and physical activity framework that operates effectively and consistently at all levels – one that has as much meaning and relevance in local settings as it does in national contexts.

It is our position that such a framework must provide the opportunity for consistent and continued collaboration of the multiple government sectors (urban planning, transport, tourism, health, education, recreation and sport) that influence the provision of and participation in sport and physical activity.

Any such framework must be inherently and continually inclusive of government and non-government agendas.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

Such a framework must embrace the complexity of lifelong participation in sport and physical activity and go beyond basic program provision that often places too much reliance on individuals having the necessary capacity to sustain involvement over the life course. There should be much stronger focus on preventative health issues through the use of sport and recreation as a motivational tool to address endemic health issues that arise through lifestyles lacking in the above participation. At the same time the right of sport and recreation to exist in its own right should be recognised and respected.

In support of participation opportunities, dedicated resourcing needs to be simultaneously allocated to creating:

- Effective communication processes across Government.
- Interaction between agencies.
- Meaningful policy and legislative platforms.
- Urban, regional and open space planning that preserves appropriate places and spaces for future generations.

The South Australian Government would assert however that any new Federal framework needs to recognise, incorporate and complement the work undertaken within each state jurisdiction, rather than usurp it.

We believe that there is a need for active recreation, sport and physical activity to be represented at the Federal level.

The framework should promote a national system that supports consistent and complementary goals and objectives with the States and Territories.

As an example the framework would support the work at the national level the development of a national education curriculum to ensure that this includes opportunities for physical activity.

At the state level the framework should assist state departments/agencies of sport and recreation to achieve:

- Physical education and health and well being
- The implementation of the curriculum
- Stronger linkages between schools and state sport and recreation organisations
- Partnerships with Local Government to facilitate joint facility development and to create and maintain strong school-club linkages.

In contrast, within the ASC at present, there are alternative models of service provision ranging from direct federal program delivery to collaborative program delivery through State and Local Government.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

Model 1: Direct Delivery

The Active After Schools Centres (AASC) is a model that we believe has had a number of challenges because it has limited engagement with the State and Local Government, and with national, state or local sport and recreation providers. Instead it seeks to create and superimpose a new structure.

We do not see the AASC as a suitable model for the focus on grassroots and community sport and physical activity.

Model 2: Collaborative Delivery

In contrast the Sport Ethics unit at the ASC has brought together agencies at a Federal and State level.

The tool to achieve this has in this case been 'Child Protection'. The ASC in this case works across the Commonwealth Government agencies while the state governments' sport and recreation agencies, such as the ORS, work across relevant State Government agencies in order to ensure consistent, coordinated delivery at the local level.

It is our view that a collaborative model, as demonstrated by the Sport Ethics Unit, should be pursued as the best model for future delivery to grassroots and community sport and physical activity.

Coordination of Funding for Recreation and Sport

As state governments collectively contribute significant annual funding towards sport and physical activity, a framework that seeks to value add to this resourcing is preferable.

The recommended model for Government funding is one that reflects the "industry" in its broadest sense.

All levels of Government must work collaboratively to support a model where:

- Federal Government should provide support, leadership and coordination to national organisations (NSO's)
- State Government should be responsible for the provision of support, leadership and coordination to state based organisations (SSO's)
- Local Government should be responsible for the provision of support, leadership and coordination to community-based organisations (Clubs)
- NSO's should provide support, leadership and coordination to state based affiliates
- SSO's should provide support, leadership and coordination to regional and local based affiliates

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

Although in reality, this breaks down in some cases because of the lack of capacity of some NSO's, SSO's and Local Governments, it should remain the vision we aspire to and work towards.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A process that supports the traditional structure of sport should be paramount
 2. An inter-governmental structure that seeks to achieve outcomes through the state sport and recreation agencies rather than direct service provision by the Federal Government at the local level should be pursued
 3. At an inter government level we support a structure at which Federal, State and Local Government work in partnership, with respective responsibilities to achieve consistent and complementary outcomes
- ***Examine Government programs to increase participation rates in sport and physical activity, including analysis of existing programs:***

Active After School Centres (AASC)

The AASC has been a nationally implemented model and promoted as a highly successful program model for future delivery. At the local level it has created a new structure that has resulted in:

- Duplication of services, for example the 'Community Coach' program and has failed at the local level to generate school-club linkages
- The work they undertake with clubs is not consistent with the messages being provided by state sporting organisations or by state government agencies
- While the numbers of children involved are outwardly significant, there is no evidence that any sustainable outcomes are being achieved, certainly not consistent with the investment

The South Australian *be active* Physical Activity Framework has proven to be effective and would be a suitable model for the development of a national framework.

As we have already indicated, this works on the basis of the following:

- Effective communication processes
- Interaction between agencies
- Meaningful policy and legislative platforms
- Urban, regional and open space planning that preserves appropriate places and spaces for future generations;
- Consistent messaging and branding efforts that illustrate suitable opportunities and the multiple benefits of participation

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

- Providing tailored professional development opportunities that build and maintain capacity in the right places at the right time.

Moreover, a further example of effective program delivery is the *be active* Field Officers (baFO) program which is built around the above principles and could be expanded to the national level.

The common component in programs that have been successful is that they are negotiated at a state/local level.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The South Australian Government believes that nationally there is a need to develop a sport and physical activity framework that operates effectively and consistently at all levels – one that has as much meaning and relevance in local settings as it does in national contexts
 2. We support a process to increase participation in sport and physical activity that involves finding solutions to overcome the barriers, being negotiated at a local level
 3. We support a process that involves seeking out community partners and through these partners tailoring programs to meet the needs of each individual group or community
- ***Identify and recommend opportunities to break down barriers to participation at junior, adult and senior ages with a view to making it simpler and easier for Australians to participate in the sport or physical activity of their choice, including for women, the disabled and Indigenous people***

Specific Target Groups

The South Australian Government believes there are broad ranges of barriers impacting participation.

The diversity of these barriers necessitates a tailored approach to each, albeit, some strategies will no doubt form the basis upon which further programs could be developed.

Suggested areas of focus include:

- New arrivals and cultural and linguistically diverse (CALD)
- The elderly
- People with a disability
- Women and girls
- Indigenous population
- Homeless/ disadvantaged/disinclined/disengaged youth
- The habitually sedentary.

Work also needs to be undertaken with sports, to look at game modification to respond to the expectation of youth for fast paced, instant gratification results, e.g. Twenty/20 Cricket.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

Infrastructure

Facilities must be of a quality and quantity that makes participation attractive and convenient. ABS figures also show that the most significant barrier to participation is a lack of time. Time poor people most often live in areas where there are long commuting times to work such as the growing outer suburbs of major cities. The long commuting time combined with a lack of local facilities (therefore requiring families to commute to participate) create barriers to participation.

There is no nationally co-ordinated plan or investment strategy for recreation and sport facilities. As a consequence co-ordination, information sharing on priorities, infrastructure capacity to support pathways and elite development and gaps in local and community infrastructure is inadequately addressed.

All states and territories are promoting the benefits of physical activity and the importance of a healthy lifestyle, however, the success of such programs has exacerbated the current shortage of existing infrastructure, and highlighted in many instances, the poor condition and/or unsuitability of existing infrastructure. There are also facilities in schools which remain unavailable for community use for a range of reasons including the standard of maintenance and the development of school size rather than community (adult) sized facilities.

In addition, there is insufficient data on the supply of, and demand for, facilities. It is imperative that should any Federal funding program be considered for infrastructure funding, mechanisms should be established to plan and maximise such investment so that it supports both community and elite sport development.

Physical Education in Schools

A renewed focus on Physical Education in Schools is required. An inclusive, broad and skill/activity/fitness based PE curriculum is recommended from Pre-school through Secondary schooling. This would provide children with greater confidence in their physical abilities and encourage those who have poor confidence to overcome this barrier to participation.

Cost of Sport

There has been much discussion across all states as to the financial cost of participation in sport. These costs for families and individuals vary from sport to sport, but we believe a national approach to coordinated cost reduction initiatives would be highly beneficial. Strategies may be explored through the current Standing Committee on Recreation and Sport (SCORS) or reviewed separately through a different forum.

Transport is another issue especially in regional areas. As a consequence of demographic changes, population shifts, the drought and the cost of petrol, regional sport faces significant challenges. Country athletes achieve elite status in numbers disproportionate to those playing at grass roots level.

If we are to maintain our elite sporting programs, the breeding ground of country sport needs more support.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

When people are faced with journeys of up to 250km each way, each weekend to play sport, there are significant disincentives in cost. Where country clubs merge, the difficulty can be as simple as children getting to training in the next town.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. There is a role for national initiatives that address specific issues through innovations across government
 2. We support a process to increase participation in sport and physical activity that involves finding solutions to overcome the barriers, being negotiated at a state or local level
 3. That a taskforce of all State and Territory Governments, with the Federal Government, be established to review recreation and sport infrastructure capacity and funding options available to support the provision of such infrastructure
- ***Recommend strategies to increase the effectiveness of the promotion of sport by the Federal Government to better communicate positive health and activity messages to the broader community***

Since 'Active Australia', the Australian Sports Commission and the Commonwealth Government has not had a universal participation strategy in place.

'Active Australia' was based on supporting local clubs and Local Government through collaboration with state departments/agencies and a range of other stakeholders to build national participation. It was an extremely effective model and delivered positive outcomes.

Its goals of increasing and enhancing lifelong participation, communicating the social, health and economic benefits of participation and developing quality infrastructure, opportunities and services to support participation are even more relevant now.

Since its demise, each state subsequently developed its own broad participation strategy. In South Australia, this was the *be active* initiative, with its emphasis on participation in sport and physical activity under the broad framework mentioned earlier.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the implementation of a national 'participation' agenda is a priority and it must attempt to link together the various state initiatives into one national program.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

3. Strengthen pathways from junior sport to grassroots community sport right through to elite and professional sport.

- ***Examine the capacity of the system to ensure optimal and efficient delivery of the athlete and coach pathway for any given sport***

Unless sport delivery is 'modernised' and capacity built at grass roots level to meet the emerging challenges such as: an increase in dual working parents; increasing number of single parent/single adult family units; increased petrol costs; working outside of core business hours etc, there will be consequences for participation and the pathways to elite and professional sport.

What is concerning is that despite significant funding going to NSO's from the Federal Government, very little of that funding appears to flow from NSO's through to the SSO's in the form of services and resources (apart from the largest organisations, AFL, cricket, rugby codes and tennis).

SSO's rely on State Government funding, which often requires differing funding objectives; that is, more emphasis on participation outcomes and developing community infrastructure than elite pathways.

It is essential that consistent and complementary funding outcomes are set by various levels of government to enable sport and recreation organisations to develop national strategic plans, and objectives that can flow through the whole sporting structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That sports develop clear national development pathway plans for consistent implementation vertically through the sport system
 2. That these national plans are endorsed and supported by the various levels of Federal and State funding.
- ***Recommend the most effective support and recognition for the coaches, officials, umpires, administrators and volunteers who keep our community clubs alive***

Many of NSO's are 'east coast' focused and do not necessarily have the capacity to provide services to affiliates in South Australia, Western Australia and Northern Territory, particularly in the area of coaching development.

We would therefore like to see more emphasis on equity in resourcing and service delivery. The ASC is best placed to work with the NSO's to ensure equity of delivery of services.

We agree that sports need to recognise their coaches and officials more regularly. Ensuring that coaches are provided with opportunities to learn about the latest and best information will allow them to pass this onto the athletes. Sport would not work without coaches and officials.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

The national coaching and officiating program run by the ASC, of which ORS is a partner, is very effective. The ASC has moved towards on-line delivery and correspondence, which has had a benefit for regional associations and individuals.

The Thanks Coach-Thanks Official-Thanks Volunteer projects, which were nationally coordinated by the ASC, were and are, very valuable and these should be supported and expanded.

These are a good example of how the ASC can take a leadership role, but work with the states in the delivery process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Areas of duplication need to be further investigated and where possible eliminated or linked to provide the best outcome and the less confusion in the community.
 2. That funding put into the programs at local level by the ASC is better directed through the state government recreation and sport agencies to align with existing infrastructure and programs.
 3. The ASC is best placed to work with the NSO's to ensure equity of delivery of services nationally.
- ***Examine how relationships between the Commonwealth Government and National Sporting Organisations, State Sporting Organisations and Australia's peak representative bodies at key multi-sports competitions may be strengthened to deliver better performance outcomes***

National sporting organisations are the cornerstone of the national sporting system. They provide the conduit and common thread through state associations to grass roots sport. Many NSO's in Olympic and Commonwealth Games sports are not major participation sports. Many have significant capacity issues and a high level of dependence on Federal Government funding. Federal Government funding is principally targeted towards achieving high performance outcomes. The capacity of these NSO's to support the development of their respective State Associations is often commensurately limited.

State Sporting Organisations in many sports also have a limited capacity and high dependence on State Government funding.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Individual sport and generic sport solutions need to be developed at both State and National levels to address major challenges in participant, member and volunteer attraction and retention, as well as infrastructure and facility maintenance and development. Similar frameworks for talent athlete and coach identification and development need to be developed with the support of the ASC and State Departments/Agencies.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

4. **Maintain Australia's cutting edge approach to sports science, research and technology.**
- ***Examine the capacity of the system to ensure provision of cutting edge technology, innovation, sport science, sports medicine, applied research to underpin sport performance and development, including ways to maintain Australia's position as leaders in anti-doping***

Sport Science/Sport Medicine is a key component and major competitive advantage of Australia's National High Performance Sport System

The 'service, research and innovation' success foundations and ongoing capability of Australian Sport Science/Sport Medicine has been achieved across the system, and not just at the AIS. Many SIS/SAS as well as the AIS have developed highly specialised areas of expertise.

The SIS/SAS and AIS each commit a significant proportion of their human resource, capital and operation budgets to the delivery and provision of support services. The current AIS/SIS/SAS Sport Science/Medicine system has capacity issues meeting current demands.

Many NSO's lack the resources/capacity to purchase the required Sport Science/Medicine services to fully support their National Teams/National Team programs.

The overall research capacity and resources available to support current and required future high performance sport related research is inadequate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Enhanced investment and continued development and refinement of the current Sport Science/Sport Medicine system is required to maintain and enhance the system's capability to 'value add' and enhance performance to remain at the cutting edge internationally.
2. Knowledge and information sharing is critical and fundamental. The AIS with its specialist staffing and facilities should have a central mandate and resource capacity to play a national leadership and coordinating role.
3. There is a need to develop and provide a uniform "baseline and benchmark standards" of Sport Science/Medicine services and support to "scholarship" athletes across the system. Irrespective of location, servicing standards may need to be stratified across levels of athletes.
4. NSO's should be required to establish a national sports science plan and appoint a National Coordinator and advisory panel as a compulsory component of their National High Performance plan.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

5. Priority areas for future national resourcing and development include the development and implementation of “national network systems and resources” such as database and ICT systems as well as standardised core service and evaluation programs.
 6. That targeted initiatives be developed at a national level for talent identification, career path development, and succession planning across the Sport Science disciplines.
- ***Examine the current partnerships in place within these fields and recommend any potential partnerships***

Individual SIS/SAS autonomy should not preclude National cooperation and harmonisation of Sport Science/Medicine services. These structures can also be used to optimise cellular and hot spot environments to foster innovation.

There exists an opportunity and requirement for continued and enhanced National Sport Science/ Medicine cooperation and coordination at all levels, across institutions, within and across disciplines and across sporting programs.

The SIS/SAS and AIS Network has a demonstrated capacity to deliver nationally coordinated and quality assured programs and services through programs such as OAP Sport Science program, Laboratory Standards, ACE/Talent Search and National Team and Decentralised AIS Programs.

Strategic partnerships with universities and the commercial sector should also be fostered to increase research capabilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That an audit of existing partnerships across National and State jurisdictions is undertaken to identify future opportunities.
 2. That a review of existing Sport Science service capacities be undertaken to ascertain gaps in service provision.
5. **Identify opportunities to increase and diversify the funding base for sport through corporate sponsorship, media and any recommended reforms, such as enhancing the effectiveness of the Australian Sports Foundation.**

Australian Sports Foundation

The Australian Sports Foundation has a limited profile in South Australia.

In general terms, the ASF appears to have no coordinated marketing strategy in place and can be difficult to access, for example there is no link from the Australian Sports Commission’s website home page.

Independent Sports Panel Request for Submissions

Submission by the SA Government

To be more effective there is a need for a state based representative (preferably co-located within our state funding area) who is able to work with South Australian clubs and associations to help them develop programs.

The review also provides an opportunity to consider other funding alternatives for recreation and sport infrastructure.

National Sports Lottery

It is well recognized that a number of countries have used a National Sports Lottery to support the provision of programs, services and infrastructure.

Whilst we recognize that various States and Territories apply different formulas to distribute funding, the opportunity to develop this revenue base should be further explored in conjunction with the States and Territories to determine if a national model can be established to improve or supplement existing mechanisms.

Taxation Measures

The competing demands for service provision and infrastructure on all levels of Government are escalating.

In order to determine and diversify alternative sources of revenue we recommend that the Federal Government investigate the potential for tax deductible Infrastructure Bonds. This may enable institutional funding organisations, such as Superannuation Funds, to invest in Community Service opportunities such as recreation and sport infrastructure within a secured Government Funding Arrangement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the Federal Government considers other revenue opportunities to enable and support the provision of recreation and sport infrastructure.
2. Consideration needs to be given to the need for a state based representative for ASF who is able to work with state clubs and associations to help them develop programs, and at the same time develop stronger day to day relationships with state sport and recreation agencies so that they can cross promote the ASF with funding programs.