

23

MEGA-SPORTING EVENT BROADCASTING AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Moira Thompson Oliver

Introduction

The vast majority of sports fans and audiences will never experience a mega-sporting event (MSE) in person – instead relying on broadcasters to share the atmosphere, excitement and sporting achievements to homes around the world. Broadcasting plays a critical role in amplifying MSEs, including how the impact of a major event is felt far beyond the stadium. This creates opportunities and challenges for broadcasters: by bringing MSEs into the public sphere, choices they make can amplify risks and benefits to human rights. This chapter builds on a white paper published in January 2017 by the Institute for Human Rights and Business and BT plc, with contributions from Discovery, Sky and ITV and a subsequent set of guiding questions for broadcasters developed with the input of BT plc, Discovery, Sky and ITV (Institute for Human Rights and Business, 2018).

The human rights risks which broadcasters could impact include risks which emanate from the MSE itself and risks associated with a broadcaster's own operations. In the first category, there is a question as to whether broadcasters should reflect the broader context of the country or location in which the MSE takes place if there are concerns about human rights, and if so, how. Not considering this could leave broadcasters open to allegations of 'sportswashing' or legitimising regimes, sports bodies or teams with a poor human rights record. Moreover, there are multiple rights at risk for many stakeholders: rights to freedom of expression and information, privacy and freedom from discrimination for athletes, audiences and commentators.

In the second category, broadcasters need to consider risks to the labour rights of people working in their operations and who may be part of ad-hoc, third party or freelance supply chains providing production and support services for the broadcast, the right to free expression of their commentators and experts ('pundits'), through to the right to be free from discrimination for staff commenting live from MSEs taking place in countries where their rights may not be respected.

Given the almost instantaneous nature of broadcasting, decisions about these issues must be made on the spot, often in the context of regulatory requirements for impartiality and

with the potential for third-party complaints. That is even the case where the broadcaster has no control over the content of the immediate broadcast.

Aside from the broadcast, in the same way that finance organisations must consider their role in financing (inadvertently or otherwise) human rights abuses, there are important considerations to address the significant fees paid to acquire broadcasting rights.

This chapter considers the impact broadcasting has on bringing MSEs to a broader audience; it describes how broadcast productions work and the regulatory context in which broadcasting activity operates. It then considers how broadcasting MSEs can impact a range of human rights and proposes potential steps to mitigate those impacts before, during and after a broadcast. Finally, a view of longer-term risks and issues is offered.

The impact of broadcasting

The Berlin 1936 Olympic Games was the first Olympiad to be televised, using three cameras in the stadium (International Olympic Committee, 2016). Footage of Jesse Owens winning became a powerful symbol. Since then, the demand for broadcasting sporting events has increased significantly, facilitated by considerable advances in technology. Whereas Berlin 1936 was broadcast only to selected viewing halls in and around Berlin for an audience of 162,000, broadcasters can now reach a global audience: the Tokyo 2020 Summer Olympic Games were watched by over 3 billion unique viewers on linear TV, with 28 billion video views via digital platforms (International Olympic Committee, 2021).

This scale of audience brings with it enhanced challenges. According to Eve Salomon,

whomever controls access to . . . viewing and listening, and whomever controls the content of what is watched and heard, is in a prime position to influence the way in which viewers and listeners see the world and their attitudes towards their own and other's culture.

(Salomon, 2016)

For example, broadcasters were criticised for their involvement with the 2014 Sochi Winter Olympics and the 2015 Baku European Games, with views expressed that their participation effectively endorsed, respectively, the Russian and Azerbaijani policies on LGBTQI issues and free expression (Skybenko, 2014).

However, broadcasting can also help bring positive impact, as in the case of the increased coverage, promotion and celebration of the Special Olympics (ESPN Front Row, 2016) and the Paralympics (Tate, 2016). In examining the impact of broadcasting of the Paralympics, Pullen et al. (2021) contend that 'spectatorship . . . has facilitated progressive social change'.

How broadcasting works

Broadcasting involves a complex chain of filming at the venue, transmission by satellite and/or internet, commentary and consumption at home or on the move. This chain and the actors involved can vary considerably, depending on rights allocation. Thus, broadcasters often do not control the material they broadcast. They may have sole editorial control, or they may broadcast clips from other broadcasters. In this context, 'rights holder' refers to the entity with exclusive legal rights to protected content. This may sometimes be confusing in the human rights context where rightsholders include people entitled to have their human

rights protected. This chapter will use terminology from the broadcasting industry, so rights holder will refer to the entity which owns the broadcast rights to the MSE, having acquired them from the rights owner such as the sport event owner or organiser, or their agents.

To broadcast an event, there must be cameras and microphones in the venue. The images and sounds ('live feed') are relayed to a vehicle where production staff edits the feed for onward broadcast, to the broadcaster's own television studio and/or to international broadcasters. In turn, the broadcast reaches the audience. The typical mechanisms for broadcasting an MSE are outside broadcasting, relaying a live feed and news access to an event.

Outside broadcasting involves a remote mobile facility or studio gallery that enables broadcasters to transmit images and sound to viewers. Taking a live or world 'feed' involves a broadcaster taking the images and sound from the host broadcaster. The end broadcaster is dependent on the relayed feed. They may choose to use the feed as it is, or use their own commentary, video clips and graphics to suit their audience. News access arrangements involve access to footage by a broadcaster that does not hold rights to an event, either directly as host broadcaster or through arrangements for a live feed. In the EU, broadcasters must offer access to content which is of significant interest to the public on a fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory basis to competing broadcasters.

Due to the coronavirus pandemic, broadcasters had to implement 'remote broadcasting'. Key production crew were at different locations (working from home), with minimal camera crew onsite – typically, the camera crew, a presenter and a producer. Key staff received the feed, and the images, sound and graphics were mixed together remotely and then sent to the viewers. It is a complex technical solution which has accelerated innovation in the broadcasting space.

Broadcasters have considerable editorial control, although the rights owner may impose production requirements. Broadcasters liaise with the organisers concerning logistics, such as discussing the running order of the event, agreeing on camera, microphone and presentation positions and security arrangements. At Olympics, the Olympic Broadcasting Services (established by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) to develop a consistent, unbiased and resource efficient approach) (Obs.tv, n.d.) retains a degree of control over what is depicted in the world feed. The host broadcaster may provide on-screen graphics and commentary; subsequent broadcasters may choose to add their own commentators if they are taking the world feed pictures only. Or they may take the full world feed package, including pictures, commentary and graphics (often referred to as the 'dirty feed'). A 'clean feed' would just be the pictures, with no graphics or commentary.

Broadcasting rights and regulations

The broadcaster must acquire the right to broadcast the MSE from the rights owner (for example, a football club, league or sports organising body such as the IOC), usually through a competitive tender. For most sports organisations, the sale of broadcasting and media rights is now their biggest source of revenue, providing finance to organise MSEs, refurbish stadiums and contribute to the development of sport at grassroots level (WIPO, 2019). Rights may be sold on a territory-by-territory basis or regions bundled together. There are also different types of rights, including free to air,¹ pay (subscription) digital rights,² clip rights³ and highlights rights.⁴

The rights holder (host broadcaster) is typically a domestic broadcaster from the country where the event is taking place. The host broadcaster provides the 'world feed' to the rest of the world's broadcasters who have rights to broadcast in their own countries (or regions).

Some broadcasters may also be onsite at the event with their own presenters and commentary to provide ‘add-on’ content around the event for their home viewers.

In recent years, the nature of broadcast rights and their value has been subject to significant debate and change. Various reports highlight the increase in fan footage across social media; growth in advertising revenues around pirated content, increased consumption of sport across multiple platforms (Lindholm, 2019), athletes with a media profile wanting to command their off-the-field media presence (Mondaq.com, n.d.) and younger consumers (who are used to accessing online content for free) being less willing to pay for premium sports content with a knock-on effect on the value of broadcasting rights.

Salomon (2016) has highlighted the importance of independent regulation of broadcasting in underpinning right to freedom of expression. For example, European jurisdictions require independent regulatory oversight of broadcasting, either through the Council of Europe (the Transfrontier Television Convention) or the EU (the revised Audiovisual Media Services Directive 2018 (AVMSD)). The European Regulators Group for Audiovisual Media Services was set up to advise the European Commission on the implementation of the AVMSD (ERGA, n.d.). While national regulatory practices differ (Indireg, 2011), there is common focus on protection rights, such as the right to freedom of expression, which encompasses ‘the audience’s right to receive creative material, information and ideas without interference but subject to restrictions prescribed by law and necessary in a democratic society’ (Ofcom, 2017). Broadcasters must also respect impartiality and accuracy in their broadcasting. Regulators have the power to investigate issues post-transmission. Regulatory regimes may differ for any social media that is broadcast on television, via an app or through a video-on-demand service.

Risks to human rights from broadcasting at major events

Key stakeholders engaged with MSE broadcasters include international sports bodies (for the event itself and for negotiating broadcasting rights), other broadcasters (if taking or issuing a live feed), event sponsors and advertisers (for ancillary advertising propositions and broadcast sponsorship opportunities),⁵ athletes (as part of the event, or as commentators), local citizens (if they are employed to support the broadcast or are interviewed as part of the broadcast), viewers and fans (at the live event and in other audiences) and workers (either employed staff or contractors). Risk to human rights in connection with these stakeholders could emanate both from the broadcast itself, from the broadcaster’s own operations and from connection to the wider human rights environment in a host country.

When broadcasting from countries with poor human rights records, broadcasters may be accused of complicity in sportswashing. However, broadcasters may be bound by regulatory frameworks which require them to be impartial and not comment on political matters. There may be little they can do if they take a live feed from another broadcaster where the coverage has already been sanitised. However, broadcasters could consider the location of MSEs in the rights package before bidding, although in some instances the rights acquisition process begins before the host cities or countries are known. If prior due diligence identifies that there are human rights risks associated with the MSE location, the broadcaster could choose not to bid or develop a mitigation plan. Nevertheless, even prior due diligence may have limitations: issues may flare up unexpectedly at MSEs, irrespective of the location.

Broadcasters may also face dilemmas when broadcasting the MSE, when having a primary responsibility to enable freedom of expression. For example, potentially discriminatory

images or sounds might take place at the MSE (for example, football chants⁶ or on-pitch discrimination). In such situations, broadcasters must ensure that they are interpreting the right to freedom of expression and its limitations correctly. They must balance freedom of expression of those expressing their views (lawfully) against the right to be free from discrimination of those who may be the subject of the content and also that of the audience. If they lean towards the former, they risk propagating a discriminatory message. If they err in favour of the latter, they may be accused of sanitising the footage, restricting a viewer's right to receive information and censorship. Furthermore, the position at the MSE may be complex. For example, the audience might be displaying hundreds of banners, which cannot all be vetted. Other messages or songs may be difficult to understand without an appreciation of the wider political context – or conversely may be justifiable when that context is understood. Some may be in a foreign language and difficult to translate on the spot when deciding whether a camera angle is appropriate.

Similar issues arise regarding the privacy of athletes. The athlete may have a right to privacy which could be intruded upon if the broadcaster includes sensitive personal information which is then broadcast to millions. This is an increasing challenge given the growth of wearables' data which analyse athletes' performance. Broadcasters may use the data to enrich the broadcast (Deloitte Insights, 2020), but at what cost to the athlete's privacy?

Finally, there is the need to consider the free expression of the broadcast staff. Many commentators and pundits are employed to provide commentary on the MSE because of their expertise. They are unlikely to be full-time staff and may work in other media. Given the growth of social media and the opportunity it presents, broadcasters need to consider what is legitimate expression of the individual and what might conflict with their professional role as a commentator. Many organisations have social media policies to which their staff must adhere. Training on the policies should be regular and updated for individuals who are broadcasting at MSEs and therefore at greater risk of amplifying risks to human rights.

These issues are further complicated when events take place during a live feed. If the host broadcaster is not conscious of and actively managing risks, subsequent broadcasters in the chain may inadvertently amplify the risks created by the host broadcaster as they have limited ability to intervene given the split-second timing of the transmission.

Risks to human rights from a broadcaster's own operations

Consistent with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs), broadcasters must consider the human rights impacts arising from their own operations (see: TV Industry Human Rights Forum, n.d.). In the world of sports broadcasting, these may include the on-screen commentary and policies around self-expression for staff discussed previously. However, there are also risks from the behind-the-scenes operations.

The broadcaster may wish to send staff, such as presenters, to the MSE. If the MSE is taking place in a country where protection of human rights is less mature, there may be risks, particularly if the country does not protect the rights of all genders and sexual expression equally. Prior due diligence will reveal these risks, and staff should be given the option not to travel and instead provide commentary from 'home' or another safer location or to travel with appropriate security protection paid for and provided by the broadcaster. The same options should be given to staff working in less high-profile roles.

Aside from high-profile presenters, many broadcasters employ only a few core staff at their headquarters but use external production teams and ancillary staff such as 'fixers, local crew,

drivers, translators, security personnel and hotel and venue staff' to bring the broadcast to the public (Knott, 2021). These workers may be in a more precarious position than staff employed by the broadcaster, vulnerable to zero-hours contracts and health and safety issues for which they may not be adequately insured. If engaging ancillary staff directly, broadcasters should ensure international labour standards are observed and procure local expertise. If they engage such staff indirectly, all companies in their supply chain should adhere to contractual requirements established by the broadcasters in line with international standards. Adherence should be checked both at the time of onboarding the supplier and in the life of the contract. For each MSE, the supplier should show to and agree with the broadcaster their human rights impact assessment and mitigation plans.

Mitigating risks to human rights

As a matter of prudent business practice or regulatory requirements, many companies already undertake risk assessments and create risk management plans, including risks to human rights. Given the unique nature of broadcasting, where risks may be dynamic in a live and unscripted environment, these assessments need to take place well in advance but should also be updated at various stages of production. Prior planning can mitigate the risks of perpetrating, contributing or being linked to human rights violations taking place in a live broadcasting environment, when reactions need to be swift and appropriate and comply with regulatory frameworks.

Potential actions to mitigate these risks vary considerably, depending on the structure of the broadcaster and the nature of the broadcast. This section considers potential options to consider before, during and after the broadcast.

In advance of the broadcast

The broadcaster could consider joining an industry group taking collective action on human rights challenges and opportunities in broadcasting. Understanding common challenges and creating common standards in response can help shape the industry as a whole and mitigate multiple risks, such as those created if there is a divergence in standards between a host broadcaster and others lower down the broadcast chain.

A broadcaster should signal its commitment to human rights and in public media, such as through a website statement. This demonstrates its intent to its stakeholders (including investors, which are increasingly concerned about risks to human rights from their investee companies' operations) and can initiate a dialogue on issues of concern, since the broadcaster's stance is clear. For example, if a broadcaster has limited leverage with one of its negotiating parties in acquiring rights, the broadcaster's willingness to publicly advocate respect for human rights in all engagements may in itself be influential, as the broadcaster's expectations and values are clear.

When negotiating a rights agreement, a broadcaster should consider whether there are any restrictions – either explicit or implicit – on how the broadcaster is permitted to broadcast the MSE and, if so, whether these are acceptable limitations given the broadcaster's obligation to respect human rights. The broadcaster could include contractual provisions which limit the rights owner from using the broadcast fees to cause, contribute or be linked to human rights violations (for example, in financing agreements where the financier may restrict the use of funds). As things currently stand, there are likely to be limits on how feasible this

is in a competitive tender process; however, if strong collaboration amongst all broadcasters coheres around these issues, then this could be achievable.

Most broadcasters evaluate events in the broadcasting rights package, from both the commercial opportunity but also the risk perspective. That evaluation should include assessing the risks to human rights. The broadcaster should consider the human rights profile of the country of broadcast, the rights owner and the likelihood of the MSE becoming politicised (UK National Contact Point, 2014). The rights owner usually provides a platform to share information about the event in advance. The broadcaster could ask for the information-sharing platform⁷ to include guidance and information on human rights issues.

Nearer the time of broadcast, the broadcaster should conduct a human rights risk assessment of the MSE, taking account of the specific political context and the potential human rights risks using publicly available resources or indices focused on particular rights at risk. There may be other reports to consider, such as the conclusions of any investigations relevant to the particular sporting context, such as the 2013 FIFA anti-racism and discrimination task force. The assessment should identify possible tensions between international human rights law and local laws and devise a plan for honouring the former whilst complying with the latter, as required by the UNGPs (BICL, 2018). The broadcaster could seek support and guidance from its home government when broadcasting in countries where human rights are less protected. This assessment can be included as part of the broadcaster's overall planning and risk management, and it should be clear who is responsible for the mitigating actions.

If the risk assessment shows that there may be higher risks to human rights, the broadcaster should engage local stakeholders to understand and help mitigate the risks, as long as doing so will not present a risk to them as a human rights defender in the country. If the risks are too high, the broadcaster should consider engaging with a proxy such as a civil society organisation or multi-stakeholder collaboration on human rights.

The broadcaster may be constrained from engaging directly on human rights risks for a variety of reasons. One option to consider would be ways the broadcaster could increase the leverage of others who are closer to the risk in question, for example, by providing financial or other support to local independent broadcasters or civil society organisations to enable them to continue bringing the risks into the public domain. Alternatively, it may be that mitigation of the risks is easier to achieve through collaboration and engagement with third parties who are more familiar with the political context, such as other broadcasters focused on news access, via pooling arrangements. Even other departments within the broadcaster's own structure – such as a news channel – may be better placed to highlight the risks to rights and give the broader narrative on a location. Films or other mechanisms could also highlight the wider context. For example, the film *The Workers Cup* (2017), which highlighted the plight of migrant workers building stadia for the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022, was broadcast by a UK sports channel which did not have a news arm.

There are technical measures the broadcaster could consider. For example, taking a live feed with no onsite presence at the event could encourage greater freedom of expression for commentators in circumstances where what is said at the location is more likely to be constrained or could put staff at risk. Similarly, remote broadcasting could mitigate these risks.

The applicable regulatory requirements will also be considered when assessing the risks. A closer analysis of the connection between the MSE and human rights may reveal the ability for the broadcaster to comment on the local human rights situation more directly if it is connected with the sport in play, rather than a more generic statement which could potentially conflict with regulatory obligations of impartiality. For example, when the 2019 UEFA

Europa League final was played in Azerbaijan, one of the players chose not to travel because of fears for his safety, given the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia, the country of his birth. The connection of this event with the ‘field of play’ empowered the broadcaster to refer to the human rights position in-country.

The broadcaster should not forget their own internal policies, practices and procedures to ensure that they are consistent with international human rights standards, particularly those relating to working conditions for all, and to ensure that there are mechanisms for staff and contractors to speak up about any concerns without retribution (IOC, 2016). These channels for airing concerns should apply not only to employees but also freelance workers and local media, taking into account guidelines such as the ACOS Alliance Freelance Journalist Safety Principles (ACOS Alliance, n.d.). If staff are travelling to the MSE, issues concerning human rights (such as the location’s cultural and/or legal position on LGBTQI+ rights) could be included in pre-travel briefings.

As part of the review of internal processes, the broadcaster should consider whether it has provided adequate training to all staff on (i) human rights and why and how the broadcaster must respect them; (ii) the local political context, so that they are able to spot potential issues more quickly; and (iii) how to exercise editorial judgment during a live broadcast, drawing on relevant historic examples. As well as ongoing training, broader matters of relevance to the MSE should be included in commentators’ pre-broadcast scripts so that they are well prepared for any issues that may arise during the broadcast.

The human rights impact assessment should be refreshed at various stages in the event planning but particularly shortly before the broadcast to check for anything that may have changed and to reassess whether the mitigation plan covers the issues.

During the broadcast

The production team should consider how production methods can help to manage risks to human rights, such as changing the camera angles or feeds, dimming microphones, using remote overhead cameras rather than close-up shots to preserve athletes’ privacy or to counter potential bias in representation, particularly in relation to women (EBU, 2021); choosing not to broadcast certain events (such as fan violence); and recording events but considering whether other broadcast media such as a news channels or news access or pooling arrangements may be better able to report on and provide context to the events.

The broadcaster may be able to deploy advertisement breaks to give the production team time to consider how best to reflect an unfolding situation at the MSE but also consider whether the adverts themselves might be inappropriate (for example, not showing a life insurance advert when an athlete may be facing a risk to life situation at the MSE). However, if the broadcaster has already used the advertisement minutage per clock hour permitted by regulations, then other mechanisms may need to be used, such as self-promotions featuring upcoming content.

The team could also consider whether social media might provide better context to events in parallel with the broadcast. For example, if a broadcaster needed to contextualise a human rights issue, they might consider using additional footage without interrupting the sports coverage or to garner the opinions of fans. However, this needs to be weighed against risks to employees at the event if that material were included on social channels during a live broadcast.

With regard to their own operations and supply chains, the broadcaster should assess the working environment and recruitment experience of ancillary staff on location. This could include a social audit carried out by an auditor, preferably as a spot check rather than notified in advance. The staff may be interviewed onsite and asked, for example, whether they have had to pay any fees to get their job (often an indicator of modern slavery). Alternatively, anonymous worker surveys completed by mobile phones may provide a more accurate and honest picture.

Throughout the broadcast, reporting mechanisms (including on an anonymous basis) should be in place for staff to raise any concerns.

After the broadcast

The broadcast team should review the broadcast and, if human rights issues arose, consider whether the risks could have been managed better, with a view to sharing learning internally and improving processes and future broadcasts. In particular, counselling or other appropriate support should be offered to staff if they have witnessed human rights abuses or were subject to violations.

Where feasible, the broadcaster might re-engage with external and local stakeholders, including fans and audiences, for their perspective on the broadcast – such as through customer focus groups or via social media.

The broadcaster's regulatory team could consider proactively engaging with the regulator to make them aware of risks navigated at the time and agree on appropriate future steps, including any changes or guidance necessary in the regulatory framework. If complaints have been raised to the regulator, the broadcaster's legal and compliance team should engage with the issue in a transparent manner, with a mindset to learn and accept recommended improvements.

Given the live and evolving environment of broadcasting MSEs, broadcasters should be willing to share learning within industry and other collaborations to better develop industry practice and to be transparent about the challenges faced.

Conclusion

Consensus is building that organisations which provide finance have a degree of responsibility for how those funds are used. If they are used to perpetrate or may contribute or be linked to human rights violations, the financier may be associated with those outcomes (UNHCR, 2013).

As an example of the significant sums involved, fees for the worldwide rights for the Rio 2016 Olympic Games increased by 52%, with 73% of the revenue coming from television rights (TotalSportek.com, 2022). Broadcast licence fees are therefore now a major source of income for international sports bodies and will likely increase as global audiences grow. It therefore seems likely that broadcasters will come under increasing scrutiny by virtue of the revenue they provide to MSE organisers and so may need to ensure that these fees are not being used in a way that involves human rights abuses.

Prior due diligence can go a long way to understanding where those risks might lie and mitigation steps the broadcaster can take. However, given the competitive tender process for acquiring broadcasting rights and the tendency towards standard contracts with limited scope

for negotiation, the broadcaster might have limited leverage. The development of industry standards or best practice to which rights owning bodies adhere will help mitigate this risk.

Notes

- 1 'Free to air' content is defined in the United Kingdom as programmes available to 95% of the population for free, whereas 'pay' requires the end user to pay a subscription fee.
- 2 'Digital rights' are content provided by mobile, video on demand or broadband.
- 3 'Clip rights' are short video clips of two to three minutes which might be sold online, such as to newspapers.
- 4 'Highlight rights' involve longer periods of footage and would typically be used for magazine-style TV shows.
- 5 For example, Allianz were the broadcast sponsors to the Rio Paralympic Games 2016. As part of that arrangement, Allianz were given 'ancillary' opportunities to promote their product, for example, with advertisements during television or online broadcasts.
- 6 Ofcom has conducted research on public attitudes to offensive language in broadcasts, which shows that context is key to the impact on viewers and listeners (Ofcom, 2021).
- 7 For example, the FAME portal used by UEFA to give prior information for match fixtures.

References

- Acos Alliance. n.d. The principles. Available from: www.acosalliance.org/the-principles [Accessed 04 August 2022].
- Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD). 2018. Shaping Europe's digital future. Available from: <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/audiovisual-and-media-services> [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- BBC. 2020. Guidance: individual use of social media. Available from: www.bbc.co.uk/editorialguidelines/guidance/individual-use-of-social-media/ [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- BBC. n.d. Guidelines. Available from: www.bbc.co.uk/editorialguidelines/guidelines [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- British Institute of Comparative Law (BICL). 2018. When national laws conflict with international human rights standards: recommendations for business. Available from: biicl.org [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- Deloitte Insights. 2020. The use of athlete data analytics. Available from: <https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/insights/industry/technology/technology-media-and-telecom-predictions/2021/athlete-data-analytics.html> [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- European Broadcasting Union (EBU). 2021. Reimagining sport: pathways to gender balanced media coverage. Available from: www.ebu.ch/publications/strategic/open/report/reimagining-sport-pathways-to-gender-balanced-media-coverage [Accessed 4 August 2022].
- European Regulators Group for Audiovisual Media Services (ERGA). n.d. Shaping Europe's digital future. Available from: <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/erga> [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- ESPN Front Row. 2016. ESPN helps Special Olympics reach unified sports milestone. Available from: www.espnfrontrow.com/2016/06/espn-helps-special-olympics-reach-unified-sports-milestone/ [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- Indireg. 2011. Indicators for independence and efficient functioning of audiovisual media services regulatory bodies. Available from: www.indireg.eu/ [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- Institute for Human Rights and Business. 2017. Broadcasters and human rights in the sports context. Available from: www.ihrb.org/uploads/reports/MSE_Platform%2C_Broadcasters_and_Human_Rights_in_the_Sports_Context%2C_Jan_2017.pdf [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- Institute for Human Rights and Business. 2018. Sport, broadcasters and human rights: guiding questions, June. Available from: www.ihrb.org/uploads/reports/Sport%2C_Broadcasting_and_Human_Rights_-_Guiding_Questions.pdf [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- International Olympic Committee. 2016. IOC launches reporting tool for press freedom violations at the games. Available from: <https://olympics.com/ioc/news/ioc-launches-reporting-tool-for-press-freedom-violations-at-the-games> [Accessed 4 August 2022].

- Knott, Amelia. 2021. Respecting human rights in the use of media support workers for documentary making, news and sports. Available from: www.tvhumanrights.org/_files/ugd/70ff11_08bd265cae2430d9a10f01c684f2796.pdf [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- Lindholm, J. 2019. The Netflix-ication of sports broadcasting. *International Sports Law Journal*, 18 (3–4), 99–101. DOI: 10.1007/s40318-019-00145-8 [Accessed 24 February 2023].
- Mondaq.com. n.d. LeBron James: building A Jordanesque brand – intellectual property – United States. Available from: www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/x/323112/Trademark/LeBron+James+Building+A+Jordanesque+Brand [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- Obs.tv. n.d. Olympic broadcasting services. Available from: www.obs.tv/ [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- Ofcom.org. 2021. Public attitudes towards offensive language on TV and radio: summary report, September. Available from: www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/225336/offensive-language-summary-report.pdf [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- Ofcom.org. 2017. The legislative background. Available from: www.ofcom.org.uk/tv-radio-and-on-demand/broadcast-codes/broadcast-code/legislative-background [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- International Olympic Committee. 2021. Tokyo 2020 audience & insights report, the international Olympic Committee, December 2021 Tokyo 2020 – engagement. Available from: <https://stillmed.olympics.com/media/Documents/International-Olympic-Committee/IOC-Marketing-And-Broadcasting/Tokyo-2020-External-Communications.pdf> [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- Pullen, E., Jackson, D. and Silk, M. 2021. Paralympic broadcasting and social change: an integrated mixed method approach to understanding the paralympic audience in the UK. *Television & New Media*, 23 (4). DOI: 10.1177/15274764211004407 [Accessed 24 February 2023].
- Salomon, E. 2016. *Independent regulation of broadcasting: a review of international policies and experiences*. UNESCO Office Montevideo and Regional Bureau for Science in Latin America and the Caribbean. Available from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000246055.locale=en> [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- Skybenko, E. 2014. Companies can help advance human rights; Sochi shows they rarely do. *The Guardian*. Available from: www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/sochi-winter-olympics-sponsor-companies-human-rights [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- International Olympic Committee. 2016. Information sheet broadcasting the Olympic Games the media and the Olympic Games – television broadcasting. Available from: https://stillmed.olympic.org/media/Document%20Library/Museum/Visit/TOM-Schools/Teaching-Resources/Broadcasting-the-Olympic-Games/FicheInfo_DiffusionJO_TV_ENG.pdf [Accessed 1 April 2022].
- Tate, G. 2016. Why channel 4 has proved itself a brilliant Paralympics broadcaster. *The Telegraph*. Available from: www.telegraph.co.uk/tv/2016/09/18/channel-4-has-proved-itself-a-brilliant-paralympics-broadcaster/ [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- TotalSportek.com. 2022. Record 52% increase in Olympics 2021 TV rights money in worldwide deals. Available from: www.totalsportek.com/money/olympics-2021-tv-rights-deals-worldwide-increased-by-522/ [Accessed 4 August 2022].
- TV Industry Human Rights Forum. n.d. Available from: www.tvhumanrights.org/human-rights-and-tv [Accessed 04 August 2022].
- UK National Contact Point. 2014. Initial assessment Americans for democracy & human rights in Bahrain and formula one world championship limited, issues for further examination, October. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/847019/bis-14-1171-uk-ncp-assessment-complaint-by-americans-for-democracy-and-human-rights-in-bahrain.pdf [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner (UNHCR). 2013. Request from the chair of the OECD working party on responsible business conduct. Available from: www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Business/LetterOECD.pdf [Accessed 4 August 2022].
- Wipo.int. 2019. Broadcasting & media rights in sport. Available from: www.wipo.int/ip-sport/en/broadcasting.html [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- The Workers Cup Film. 2017. The workers cup film. Available from: www.theworkerscupfilm.com/ [Accessed 26 March 2022].