

**Disciplinary Proceedings against
The Karatedo Federation of Hong Kong, China Limited
Summary of Background Information**

Introduction

This document provides background information on the present disciplinary proceedings against the Karatedo Federation of Hong Kong, China Limited (KFHKC).

(I) Maladministration and Lack of Procedure for Declaration of Interests

1. Failure to promulgate the details of the 13th National Games of the People's Republic of China to athletes in a timely manner

The 13th National Games qualification process for the Karatedo event was different from that for the other 21 events of the Games in that no assessment by the HKSAR Government was required. Individual athletes could register directly with the organizer in accordance with the competition rules.

Mr. FUNG [REDACTED] was holding various positions in different capacities. Within the Karatedo Federation of Hong Kong, China Limited (KFHKC), he was Convenor of the General Committee, Coaching Director (Elite Sports) of the Coaching Council, and Coaching Director of the Elite Sports Development and Monitor Council. But he was also the President of the Hong Kong Shitoryu Karatedo Ken Kai. Three students from this dojo were able to obtain information on the 13th National Games and register for the Karatedo event individually. They eventually qualified for the event by passing two rounds of qualifying competitions. On the other hand, KFHKC, as the sole governing body of Karatedo receiving subvention from the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and Hong Kong Sports Institute (HKSI), had failed to disseminate the information to local athletes.

Furthermore, when handling complaints against Mr. FUNG [REDACTED], KFHKC argued that the complaints concerned Mr. FUNG's own personal matters and refused to comment on them. Complainants were asked to approach Mr. FUNG directly, which was totally unreasonable and unacceptable.

Conclusion: In the appointment of office bearers, KFHKC failed to take into account their conflict of interests, which led to the violation of the principle of fair play. In the 13th National Games case, Mr. FUNG should have declared his

interests and refrained from taking any part in the process. KFHKC's refusal to handle the case, based upon the argument that it concerned Mr. FUNG's own matters, showed a clear case of maladministration.

2. Administrative confusion in the selection of the National Championship Junior 2017

During the selection of the National Championship Junior 2017, Mr. [REDACTED], Instructor of [REDACTED], did not withdraw as a referee when the students of [REDACTED] took part in the competitions and KFHKC failed to notice this problem. This lack of procedure for declaration of interests revealed maladministration in KFHKC.

Upon receipt of the complaint against Mr. [REDACTED] conflict of interests as a referee, KFHKC simply cancelled the scores given by Mr. [REDACTED] and added together the scores given by the remaining four referees to arrive at the total score. This differed from the established scoring method, in which out of the five scores received, the highest and lowest are deleted and the remaining three scores are added together to get the total score. When the complainant made further enquiries, KFHKC refused to comment on the case saying that the competition had already concluded. This revealed KFHKC's administrative confusion in the referee arrangement, and inability to resolve the matter and provide a fair and equitable selection mechanism.

Conclusion: KFHKC did not have a procedure in place for referees to declare interests. This resulted in a referee giving scores to his own students and led to conflict of interests and violation of the principle of fair play. When the incident was discovered, KFHKC merely cancelled the scores given by the referee concerned and used the scores given by the remaining four referees to get the total score, which differed from the existing scoring method. This reflected the administrative confusion of KFHKC and its failure to adhere to the established selection mechanism. When the complainant made further enquiries, KFHKC refused to comment on the case on grounds that the competition had already concluded, which again indicated maladministration.

(II) **Unfair Selection Mechanism**

3. Adoption of a scoring system different from that used by the Asian Karate Federation (AKF) and the World Karate Federation (WKF)

For the selection mechanism of Kata, KFHKC adopted a “new point scoring system” different from the “red / blue flag scoring system” currently used by WKF for world competitions.

In response to the complaint about the use of a different scoring system in selection, KFHKC replied that competition and selection were two separate issues and that it had adopted the “new point scoring system” in selection for over two years, during which only one individual had made a complaint. The Referee Panel was formed by representatives from different groups, including referees recognized by KFHKC, Level 3 coaches under the HKSI Coach Accreditation Programme and HKSI coaches, hence ensuring that assessment could be made from three different perspectives to achieve fair play and impartiality as well as to balance the interests of all. KFHKC added that it would not adopt the “red / blue flag scoring system” for selection and claimed that the “new point scoring system” was running well and could cater for different stakeholders. KFHKC added that it had considered the interests of all stakeholders (referees, coaches and athletes included) when it formulated the current selection mechanism. KFHKC emphasized that there was essentially no difference between the “new point scoring system” and the “red / blue flag scoring system”. Both scoring systems rely on referees to determine the result and the only difference lies in the method of expression. KFHKC hence argued that the complainant’s case was unfounded.

Conclusion: Although KFHKC claimed that WKF would adopt the “new point scoring system” in future and that it would be the scoring system used in the Tokyo 2020 Olympics, KFHKC was unable to provide any evidence to support this claim. Moreover, KFHKC only mentioned the advantages of the “new point scoring system” but did not analyse the pros and cons of the “red / blue flag scoring system” widely used in Kata. The explanation given by KFHKC was rather implausible. Added to the fact that KFHKC was unable to provide a selection mechanism recognized by all, it would appear that the principle of fair play had been violated.

(III) Lack of Transparency in the Selection and Appeal Mechanism

4. 14th Asian Karate Championships (AKC) – Inequitable Selection and Appeal Process

According to the selection mechanism of KFHKC, a selection shall identify a first-

choice candidate and a second-choice candidate and all contestants will be notified of the results in writing. During the selection of the 14th AKC, there were complaints that KFHKC had not followed the procedure of informing all contestants of the results, which deprived contestants of their right of appeal. In accordance with the appeal mechanism on KFHKC's website, if an athlete is not satisfied with the selection results, the representative of his dojo may appeal to KFHKC in writing within 14 days from the date of the announcement of results.

KFHKC explained that the selection took place on 23 April 2017 and notification letters were sent to the first-choice candidates on 19 May 2017. Selection results were sent to all other contestants (including second-choice candidates) on 26 May 2017. The 14th AKC was held from 7-18 July 2017. Throughout this period, no written appeals had been received from dojo representatives. On the other hand, the complainant stated that he had not received any news on the selection results after taking part in the 14th AKC selection on 23 April 2017. It was not until 27 May 2017 when the complainant checked the online registration page of 14th AKC that he found that KFHKC had already registered the selected candidates on 19 May 2017 and that he was not on the list. It seemed that the contestants would not have the chance to file an appeal at all.

Conclusion: The Federation had repeatedly requested KFHKC to produce proof of having notified the complainant (a contestant not selected) of the selection results but KFHKC had not responded. Hence there were reasons to believe that KFHKC had not issued any notification to the complainant, thereby depriving him of the chance to file an appeal. KFHKC was unable to provide an equitable selection mechanism and it violated the principle of fair play.

Overall Conclusion

To sum up, the above incidents reveal a number of undesirable administrative practices in KFHKC, including (i) a lack of a procedure for declaration of interests; (ii) administrative confusion in the appointment of referees; (iii) non-compliance with the established selection procedures; (iv) refusal to reply to public enquiries; (v) refusal to adopt the latest scoring system; and (vi) a lack of transparency in selection and appeal mechanism, etc.