

FIFA

Fédération Internationale de Football Association

Melanie Burks and David Shore
Co-Chairs



GSMUN 2011



GSMUN 2011

Ryan Johnson
Secretary-General

Maggie Chambers
Director-General

Olivia Baumann
Undersecretary-General
for External
Communications

Jessica Chaoul
Undersecretary-General
for Logistics

Logan Ferrell
Undersecretary-General
for Crisis Simulations

Carly Spraggins
Charge d'Affaires

Aya Kellam
Director of Specialized
Agencies

Jason Kong
Director of General
Assemblies

Emlyn Crenshaw
Director of
Press and Publications

Emily Ko
Director of Technology

Cole Messersmith
Director of
Charitable Giving

Mr. Max Smith
MUN Club Sponsor

Delegates,

Welcome to the Fédération Internationale de Football Association, where you have the honor of discussing all things soccer! Our names are Melanie Burks and David Shore, and we will be chairing your awe-inspiring FIFA committee.

Melanie is a senior at Maggie Walker who, despite several regal attempts, has yet to coax the employees at IHOP into giving her the senior discount. She plays on several soccer and Futsal teams, including Maggie Walker's Varsity squad, where, with Batman-like ferocity, she defends her title of Most Intimidating Player. Like James Bond, Melanie has a license to operate a marine vessel and spends her summers patrolling the high seas in search of Waldo.

David is a junior at Maggie Walker, waiting to take the reins of the school into his hands in the year to come. He plays soccer, indoor soccer, and futsal every chance he gets and is a member of many prestigious teams in the region. He is also an avid follower of major leagues around the world, with his favorite team being FC Barcelona. Outside of Model UN, David is a leader of SECSEE (the school's environmental club).

In this committee, you will be discussing two overarching issues: first, choosing the possible locations of the 2018 World Cup between Russia, Spain/Portugal, Belgium/the Netherlands, the United States, and England; and second, debating the possibility of adding technology to the sport. For our purposes, only FIFA and IFAB decisions made before August 31st 2010 will be considered applicable to discuss. Please feel free to email us with any questions, observations, suggestions, concerns, or otherwise.

Your esteemed chairs,

Melanie Burks
m_burks26@yahoo.com

David Shore
dshore1013@gmail.com

Committee Information

Committee Background

The Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) is the international governing body that organizes, develops, and promotes integrated games of association football around the world. On May 21, 1904, several European associations came together in Paris to create the umbrella association of FIFA. Representatives from the associations of France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland signed the initial foundation act of FIFA. FIFA's first statutes exclusively recognized its individual association members, restricted athletes from playing in more than one association, ensured widespread recognition of a player's suspension among associations, and upheld the Laws of the Game of the Football Association, Ltd.

After its establishment, FIFA had two goals: to increase membership and to plan the first international competition. Germany, Austria, Italy, and Hungary joined FIFA in 1905, and by 1913, the first non-European countries, South Africa, Argentina, Chile, and the US, had become members as well. Tensions during World War I made it a struggle to maintain the association, but following the war, 20 members remained, despite England's absence. By the time the FIFA World Cup opened in Switzerland in 1954, FIFA had 85 member nations.

The first original international football competitions of FIFA took place as part of the Olympic Games. On July 18, 1930, the first FIFA World Cup was held in Montevideo, Uruguay, but only four European teams participated. With greater participation, Italy and France held the second and third world cups, respectively. Despite World War II and other conflicts, FIFA continued to grow over the years, increasing membership and improving competitions. Between 1975 and 2002, 60 new member associations joined FIFA. As of 2007, FIFA was comprised of 208 member associations, which are also a part of the six confederations that make up FIFA. They include the Asian Football Confederation; Confédération

Africaine de Football; Confederation of North, Central American, and Caribbean Association Football; Confederación Sudamericana de Fútbol; Oceania Football Confederation; and Union des Associations Européennes de Football (UEFA). The confederations hold their own football competitions at club and international levels, and they offer support to FIFA. The current headquarters of FIFA are in Zurich, Switzerland, and Joseph Sepp Blatter of Switzerland has been president since 1998.

FIFA is governed by three bodies: the FIFA Congress, the Executive Committee, and Standing Committees. The Congress is made up of the 208 member associations, with each member holding one vote. The FIFA Congress meets annually to make decisions regarding statutes, hold elections, approve an annual report, and accept new member associations. The Executive Committee consists of the President, eight vice presidents, and 15 other members. The President is elected by the Congress, while the vice presidents and other members are appointed by the confederations and associations. The Executive Committee meets at least twice a year and is responsible for determining the dates, locations, and formats of tournaments. It also appoints delegates to the International Football Association Board (IFAB), which determines the Laws of the Game of association football. There are 25 standing committees, along with the FIFA Disciplinary Committee and the FIFA Appeal Committee, that aid FIFA's Secretary-General in work. Each committee works on the organization of games and the development of football. Their decisions then go to the Executive Committee to be ratified.

FIFA was created to bring together people of different cultures with a passion for football to compete against each other in a peaceful, respectful environment. The organization's mission is to "develop the game, touch the world, and build a better future." The work of FIFA has already had a significant impact on social, educational, and

cultural values around the world by unifying global communities.

Committee Structure and Expectations

While there may be decisions made on the topics addressed by this committee, plans and accomplishments of the committee by no means need to reflect those made by the actual FIFA organization. This is a fictional committee. Delegates should realize that it is similar to a historical committee in that the outcomes may be different.

Delegates should also keep in mind that this overview is by no means exhaustive

and does not contain country specific information, which will be necessary when preparing for the next meeting of FIFA. As this is a current event, it is important for delegates to be informed of current technologies and decisions within the football community. That being said, for the purposes of our FIFA Congress, only FIFA and IFAB decisions made before August 31, 2010 will be considered applicable. Take this opportunity to delve into different resources and prepare for a fun and informative conference.

Location for the 2018 World Cup

Introduction

FIFA follows a very simple process for choosing the location of future host sites. Invitations to submit a bid as a potential World Cup location are sent to all member associations of FIFA, and nations interested in hosting the World Cup confirm their interest by submitting a bid. The bidding country cannot be a part of the confederation that last hosted the World Cup, and the previous event's host cannot bid for two more cycles. If necessary, a country may withdraw its bid at any time. The FIFA Executive Committee uses an exhaustive ballot system, where the bid receiving the fewest votes is eliminated, and a re-vote is conducted. This process is repeated until only one location remains. Major factors in the selection process include, but are not limited to, number of suitable stadia, location of stadia, infrastructure, technology, and security.

It should be noted that serving as a host country can have positive or negative effects on the host country. The nation must have the infrastructure to support hundreds of thousands of visitors in their cities over a short period of time. Also, the economy must be able to handle the financial stress of a world event like this, and the host country must be secure and stable. In this age of

environmental awareness, the host country must be prepared for the environmental impacts of the World Cup. Not only will the visitors increase production from various industries, but the host country will also need to be prepared to appropriately adjust any preexisting stadium or completely build a new stadium.

The five bids that have been accepted for the consideration of the 2018 FIFA World Cup location are from Belgium and the Netherlands, England, Russia, Spain and Portugal, and the United States. Each of these countries meets the requirements for a host country, but it is up to the delegates to debate the most important attributes of a host nation and decide which bid plays to the strengths of those aspects.

Belgium and the Netherlands

Belgium and the Netherlands are bidding together, focusing on the fact that they wish to be considered a single political entity in their bid. In the joint bid, Eindhoven, the Netherlands would be the capital city for the Cup. Joining Eindhoven in hosting matches would be Amsterdam, Enschede, Heerenveen, and Rotterdam in the Netherlands, and Antwerp, Bruges, Brussels, Charleroi, Genk, Ghent, and Liège in

Belgium. Both Amsterdam and Rotterdam would have two stadia for the World Cup. The current bid requires that six new stadia be built in time for the 2018 World Cup and the preceding events. The smallest stadium's capacity is 41,000 people, while the largest stadium holds 83,000 people.

Both Belgium and the Netherlands have extensive transportation systems. Belgium is home to Brussels International Airport, which serves over 100 airlines. The Netherlands is home to Amsterdam's Schiphol International Airport, Europe's third-largest airport and one of the busiest. Also located in the Netherlands is the Eindhoven International Airport, which processes 400,000 passengers per year through a single terminal. Additionally, Belgium has major ports in Antwerp, Gent, and Liège, while the Netherlands has major ports in Amsterdam and Rotterdam. Another important aspect of transportation is not only international transportation, but intranational transportation. Belgium and the Netherlands both have extensive rail systems, with over 3,100 combined miles of electric rail service. Each country has a relatively low number of expressways, at about 2,500 combined miles.

Economic stability is another important factor to consider when choosing a host location. Although all aspects of the economy should be considered, three easily accessible data points can be used for a superficial understanding of the economy: gross domestic product (GDP), unemployment rate, and total debt. Belgium has a \$381 billion (USD) GDP, a 7.9 percent unemployment rate, and a \$1.354 trillion debt. The Netherlands has a \$654.9 billion GDP, a 4.9 percent unemployment rate, and \$3.733 trillion debt.

England

England's bid consists of twelve cities and fifteen stadia. If England is awarded the location for the 2018 World Cup, the stadia used during the World Cup will be decided upon by the Executive Committee. The cities

currently included in England's bid are London, Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle, Sunderland, Nottingham, Birmingham, Bristol, Sheffield, Leeds, Milton Keynes, and Plymouth. The largest stadium would hold 90,000 spectators, while the smallest would hold 42,000. The current bid accounts for one new stadium, but it requires ten other stadia be expanded.

England is home to two major airports. London Heathrow is considered the world's busiest airport, and Manchester Airport is the second-busiest airport in England, only behind Heathrow. There are major ports located in both London and Liverpool. England also has very extensive intranational travel systems, with over 3,250 miles of electric rail and over 2,000 miles of expressways. England has the world's seventh-largest GDP at \$2.149 trillion. England's unemployment is at 7.6 percent and its debt is \$9.088 trillion.

Russia

Russia's World Cup bid relies on a system of geographical clusters. Due to Russia's enormous size, the bidding team decided to form the Northern Cluster, Central Cluster, Volga Cluster, Southern Cluster, and Ural Cluster. In total, FIFA would have access to thirteen cities across Russia. The cities in the Northern Cluster are Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg; each city has the potential for one stadium. Moscow is the only city in the Central Cluster and is considered to be the capital city for the World Cup; there are four available stadia in the Central Cluster. Six stadia in six cities are available across the Volga Cluster; Kazan, Nizhny Novgorod, Yaroslavl, Samara, Volgograd, and Saransk could each hold cup games according to Russia's bid. The Southern Cluster contains the cities of Krasnodar, Rostov-on-Don, and Sochi; each city would be allotted a single stadium. Finally, the only city represented in the Ural Cluster is Yekaterinburg; a single stadium would be located in this cluster. According to Russia's plan, nine new stadiums

would be built. The largest stadium is located in the capital city, and it holds approximately 90,000 spectators. The smallest stadium would hold about 44,000.

Due to Russia's size, the quality and effectiveness of travel is extremely important. There are two major international airports that serve the bid cities. Both Domodedovo and Sheremetyevo International Airports are major hubs for travelers across Russia. There is at least one major airport in each of the five clusters, including the Pulkovo and Rosov-on-Don Airports, although not all the airports are considered international. Both St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad have major ports. Russia has over 25,000 miles of electric rail and over 18,500 miles of expressways. Russia's debt is one of the smallest in the world at \$369.2 billion. Its GDP is very large, at \$2.116 trillion, with an 8.4 percent unemployment rate.

Spain and Portugal

Spain hosted the World Cup in 1982, and Spain and Portugal have now joined to make a combined bid to hold the 2018 World Cup on the Iberian Peninsula. The bid contains 16 cities across Spain and two cities in Portugal that could have host venues for the World Cup. Each city mentioned in the bid contains one venue, except for Barcelona, Madrid, and Lisbon, each of which have two. The other 15 cities proposed in the bid are Valencia, Sevilla, Bilbao, Zaragoza, Badajoz, Santander, Málaga, A Coruña, San Sebastian, Valladolid, Vigo, Murcia, Alicante, Gijón, and Porto. The largest stadium is located in Barcelona, and can hold 99,000 people. The smallest stadium is in Gijón and holds 40,000 people. According to the bid, six new stadia would be built and eight stadia would be expanded.

The Madrid-Barajas and El Prat Airports are Spain's two largest airports. Each is an international airport with service around the globe. Portugal has one major airport, the Lisbon Portela International Airport. Between Spain and Portugal, there

are over 9,500 miles of expressways. Spain has a \$1.368 trillion GDP, a \$2.41 trillion debt, and 18 percent unemployment, Europe's highest. Portugal has a \$233.4 billion GDP, a \$507 billion debt, and 9.5 percent unemployment.

United States

The United States is looking to host another World Cup in 2018 after a successful 1994 World Cup held in nine cities across the US. The bidding team has put together a list of 21 possible venues located in 18 possible cities across the contiguous US, including Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Dallas, Denver, Houston, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Miami, Nashville, New York City, Philadelphia, Phoenix, San Diego, Seattle, Tampa, and Washington, DC. The two largest stadiums are both located in Los Angeles and can each hold about 95,000 fans. The smallest stadium would be Indianapolis' Lucas Oil Stadium, which holds about 67,000 people. No stadia would have to be built or expanded for this bid.

The US is a very large country, so, like Russia, all forms of transportation are crucial for the World Cup to be successful. The US has a major international airport in each of the aforementioned cities, many of which function as international hubs. The US also has the greatest railway and expressway mileage in the world. There are major ports in Houston, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, and Tampa. The United States has the world's largest GDP at \$14.26 trillion, but also is responsible for the world's largest debt at \$13.45 trillion. The unemployment rate is 9.3 percent.

Security Concerns

One last consideration that must be addressed by the FIFA Executive Committee is security. Therefore, every bidding nation must have adequate security measures in place. Each has a different set of strengths and weaknesses, but it is the job of the Executive Committee to determine which

country has the strongest security system in place. The Committee should consider the strength of local and national law enforcement, prevalence of domestic terror organizations, distance to nearest hostile country, and stadium security systems, in addition to other factors.

Conclusion

Each of the five bids has a large set of strengths and small set of weaknesses. Every country is not only qualified but also deserving of hosting the 2018 World Cup. Unfortunately, FIFA's Executive Committee can only choose one location. The committee must decide which aspects of a country's bid are most crucial in selecting a location. The Executive Committee must also decide which country has the best combination of qualifications. The spirit of the World Cup is one of world unity and celebration, not one of exclusion or political dispute. It is FIFA's job to determine which location is most suitable, all things considered, for the 2018 World Cup.

Questions to Consider

- What is the most important factor when evaluating the qualifications of a host country?
- What security concerns exist, and how can bidding countries deal with these issues effectively?
- What are the goals of the 2018 FIFA World Cup, and how do these affect the choice of location?
- To what extent can the bidding nations handle the influx of visitors to the region?
- Do neighboring countries support the bidding country?
- What will the standard of "satisfactory" broadcast technology be in 2018? What about security? Sanitation? Transportation?
- What types of back-up plans, if any, should the committee have in place in case the hosting nation has a crisis or falls through on its commitment?

Implementation of Technology

Introduction

Technology is important to FIFA for its use in broadcasting and viewing games, communicating, and organizing and holding tournaments. Many new uses of technology have been introduced to the sport in the past 15 years. Computerized analysis has revolutionized the statistics of the game to be able to record number of passes, tackles, distance covered, etc. in real-time. However, none of this available technology has been implemented as an attempt to make the game more equal. The only current use of technology as an integrated aspect of the game is replay, where FIFA has the power to review games to determine any fine or punishment for player action.

Recently, there have been an overwhelming number and significance of mistakes made by referees. Television coverage and live broadcasts of games have made football exceedingly popular worldwide. While this growth in popularity is a major achievement for FIFA, with the growing coverage of football comes growing critiques of how the game is played and refereed. In a November 2009 World Cup qualifying game, a hand ball by Thierry Henry that was not called by the referee was the deciding factor in a game, and because of this oversight, France qualified for the World Cup finals over Ireland. Largely because of this event, along with other less decisive events, football officials began to look to technology as a way to correct mistakes by referees. The current system of refereeing has three referees, one head referee and two assistants, along with a fourth official, who has a better view of the playing field and assists the head referee in decision making. The fourth official was a more recent addition to the refereeing staff, after being officially introduced in 1991.

To accommodate some of the referee errors that have spurred the debate over technology, additional assistant referees have

been used and will continue to be used in UEFA matches. The “fifth” referee stands within view of the penalty area and assists the head referee in any situation where he may have a better view of the play. The experimental use of the fifth referee started in UEFA’s Europa League qualification in October 2008 and continues through the Europa League group stage, at which time a report will be submitted to IFAB and FIFA.

In March 2010, IFAB decided not to implement goal-line technology. FIFA and IFAB have not taken any action on this topic since the end of the 2010 World Cup. Meanwhile, other influential people in the final decision have voiced their opinions. Sepp Blatter has said that he is not necessarily in favor of technology, especially on offside decisions, stating “It is obvious that after the experiences so far at this World Cup it would be a nonsense not to reopen the file on goal-line technology.” He feels that the non-off sides call was purely a mistake by the assistant referee, while the disallowed goal was something that should be fixed. The president of UEFA, Michel Platini, has said that there is no need for video replay. He is confident in the experimentation with five referees in the Europa league and UEFA Champions League this season and is not even considering video replay until testing is over.

In March, when IFAB decided against the incorporation of goal-line technology in the sport, FIFA supported the decision. One purpose of FIFA is to have an international agreement on football, whether it be recreational or in the World Cup. FIFA attributes the simplicity and universality to the success of the game. Another important point was the financial consideration, where the use of new technology increases the cost for teams and decreases the ability to maintain universality. FIFA does not want to jeopardize its roots as an international game in

order to involve technology in the sport. Once technology, such as goal-line technology, is used for one aspect of the game, the pressure rises to use technology in more situations.

Another reason that FIFA gave for supporting the IFAB decision was that the technology would ruin the dynamics of the game. Football is a sport that has two halves that are played without stop, and the use of technology to stop play would interrupt the rhythm of the game. Blatter is in favor of opening the debate solely on goal-line technology, since play is already stopped if there is a goal. However, for any situation where the game is stopped for something other than a goal, the dynamic will be disrupted. FIFA continues to defend the decision on the basis that with or without technology, the final decision will still be made by a human, whether it is at the time of play or after watching the replay. Blatter said, "No matter which technology is applied, at the end of the day a decision will have to be taken by a human being. This being the case, why remove the responsibility from the referee to give it to someone else?"

Current Analysis of the Situation

Those involved in the debate over technology in football have varying arguments for both sides. Both the principle behind the rules and their practicality are important factors in the future of this debate. Of the issues at hand, the goal-line technology argument focuses more on the state of the technology available, while video replay focuses on the principle of how football should be played and judged.

There are two major goal-line technology systems currently available. The first is the Hawk-eye system, which is also used in tennis instant replays. Depending on the size of the sports stadium, four or more cameras are placed around the stadium so as to capture all of the playing field as well as any important boundaries or sidelines; in the case of football, special attention would be

expected to be paid to the goal-line. Using geometric principles of triangulation, a computer system uses measured angles to capture the three-dimensional image of the ball and thus track its path. Critics say that the system's time delay of around 30 seconds interrupts play in much the same way that a challenge in American football does. Additionally, the mathematical analysis system does have a margin for error.

The second system that could be used is called Cairos goal zone technology. This system is the product of a new collaboration between sports apparel manufacturer Adidas and 3D technology firm Cairos, both prominent German companies. The Cairos system involves changes to both the actual football and the pitch. In the system, the entire goal and the area within the goal line boundaries is exposed to magnetic radiation. The newly designed, Cairos-specific football contains a special sensor which, when exposed to this radiation, would set off a monitor worn by one or more of the referees, signaling a goal. The Cairos system has gained support because of its newer technology, small margin of error, and nearly instantaneous notification time. However, the system involves extensive changes to the equipment used in football, likely making its use limited to the most elite football tournaments.

Although it has received slightly less attention in the media, another option is to permit the referee to stop the game for an instant video replay. This would allow any disputed or controversial call to be reviewed and then supported or refuted by the use of video replay. The use of a fifth referee at the end lines for a better view of the penalty box, as has been experimented with by UEFA, could also be implemented more widely.

Conclusion

It is clear that technology in football is a very important issue, not only to FIFA, but also to the sport as a whole. It is important to consider not only the fairness of different

systems in the context of football, but also the expenses involved and the international availability. It is up to this committee to analyze the advantages and disadvantages of various solutions and decide upon a course of action that will be best for the international game. Any solution decided upon ought to take into account the mission and purpose of both FIFA and IFAB, as this will affect the game at an international level.

Questions to Consider

- What are IFAB's major hesitations in approving any further technology use?
- Who would be responsible for the funding of any new technologies?
- With each possible solution, how would the game have to be changed?
- What process and time-table would be best for implementing any rules changes?
- Even if some solutions are not guaranteed to be correct 100 percent of the time, are they still worth implementing?
- How has the use of technology affected sports in the past?
- How will each solution affect the flow of the game and the ideals of play?

Selected Bibliography

BBC. "World Cup 2010: Blatter apologises for disallowed goal." *BBC Sport*, June 29, 2010. http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport2/hi/football/world_cup_2010/8771294.stm (accessed August 30, 2010).

Bidding Nation England. "Road to 2018." 2010. <http://www.england2018bid.com/theroadto2018/> (accessed August 27, 2010).

Bidding Nation Russia. "The Bid." *Host Cities*. 2009. <http://www.russia2018-2022.com/en/the-bid/host-cities.aspx> (accessed August 27 2010).

Dougdale, Addy. "Why FIFA Refuses to Sanction Goal-Line Technology." *Fast Company*, June 28, 2010. <http://www.fastcompany.com/1664627/why-fifa-refuses-to-sanction-goal-line-technology> (accessed August 30, 2010).

Fédération Internationale de Football Association. "About FIFA: FIFA Executive Committee." FIFA.com. <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/federation/bodies/exco.html> (accessed August 27, 2010).

- . “About FIFA Congress.” FIFA.com. <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/federation/bodies/congress.html> (accessed August 27, 2010).
- . “About FIFA: Refereeing.” FIFA.com. <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/developing/refereeing/index.html> (accessed August 30, 2010).
- . “About FIFA: Things to know.” FIFA.com. <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/federation/bodies/congress/thingstoknow.html> (accessed August 27, 2010).
- . “FIFA’s position on technology in football.” FIFA.com. <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/federation/president/presidentialcolumn/news/newsid=1179851.html> (accessed August 30, 2010).
- . “The History of FIFA.” FIFA.com. <http://www.fifa.com/classicfootball/history/fifa/historyfifa1.html> (accessed August 27, 2010).
- . “The History of the Laws of the Game.” FIFA.com. <http://www.fifa.com/classicfootball/history/law/ifab.html> (accessed August 30, 2010).
- FIFA.com. “IFAB decides not to pursue goal-line technology.” *Fédération Internationale de Football Association*, March 6, 2010. <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/federation/administration/releases/newsid=1177755.html> (accessed August 30, 2010).
- FIFA Media Department. *Additional Assistant Referee experiment in 2009-2010 UEFA Europa League*. http://www.fifa.com/mm/document/afdeveloping/refereeing/01/09/72/32/additionalassistanrefs-backgroundpaper_e.pdf (accessed August 30, 2010).
- FIFA. “Big Count 2006: 270 Million People Active in Football.” FIFA World Cup. <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/media/newsid=529882.html> (accessed August 30, 2010).
- . “Statutes.” August 2009. http://www.fifa.com/mm/document/affederation/federation/01/24/fifastatuten2009_e.pdf (accessed August 27, 2010).
- “FIFA arrive in Sydney to inspect Australia's 2022 FIFA World Cup bid.” *Fox Sports*. Australian Associated Press. 26 July 2010.
- National Soccer Hall of Fame. “History of FIFA.” National Soccer Hall of Fame. <http://www.soccerhall.com/history/HistoryofFIFA.htm> (accessed August 30, 2010).
- “SOCCER TECHNOLOGY.” COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY IN SOCCER. <http://www.soccerperformance.org/specialtopics/companalsystems.htm> (accessed August 30, 2010).
- Staffin, Scott. “Watch Referee Errors Video and Check Full List.” MeriNews - Power to People. <http://www.merineews.com/article/fifa-world-cup-2010-watch-referee-errors-video-and-check-full-list/15824824.shtml> (accessed August 30, 2010).

