

Centralized Disciplinary Database

MATTERS ADJUDICATED BY THE NGBs / LAOs / USOPC

I. Centralizing the U.S. Center for SafeSport’s Disciplinary Database

In early 2019, the U.S. Center for SafeSport (the Center) began publishing prior disciplinary records from all the NGBs and the USOPC, in an effort to centralize within the Center’s Disciplinary Database (CDD) all records of individuals who have been rendered ineligible to participate in Olympic & Paralympic sport. As a result, the CDD includes not just those matters investigated and adjudicated by the Center, but also certain eligibility decisions rendered by the National Governing Bodies (NGBs), their Local Affiliated Organizations (LAOs), and/or the United States Olympic & Paralympic Committee (USOPC).

How do I tell the difference?

The organization that issued the eligibility decision is listed in the “Adjudicating Body” column of the CDD. For example, if a Participant was suspended or rendered ineligible by an NGB or one of its LAOs, that NGB will be listed in that column. This means the Center was not directly involved in the investigation or adjudication of that particular matter, however, there is reciprocal enforcement for that decision by all other NGBs/USOPC and their LAOs across the U.S. Olympic & Paralympic Movements.

II. Why are some cases handled by the NGBs, LAOs, or the USOPC?

Per the SafeSport Code, the types of alleged misconduct over which the Center exercises jurisdiction (i.e., where the Center is the designated entity within the U.S. Olympic & Paralympic Movements that will investigate the allegations) fall into two jurisdictional categories: Exclusive jurisdiction and Discretionary jurisdiction (*see* Section IV of the [Code](#)).

Generally, the Center’s Exclusive jurisdiction covers all forms of sexual misconduct and/or child abuse of a criminal nature, whereas the various forms of physical and/or emotional abuse fall within the Center’s Discretionary jurisdiction. Some allegations—including low-severity forms of bullying between athletes, coaches using harsh or inappropriate language, or other discretionary matters—are more promptly and effectively handled by the club or gym (i.e., the LAOs), and others can be escalated to the national level with the NGBs/USOPC.

The Center typically exercises jurisdiction over allegations in its Discretionary jurisdiction when they either *involve more egregious forms of misconduct* (e.g., hazing or physical misconduct resulting in severe injury or death) or when they present a potential *conflict of interest* for the NGB/USOPC (e.g., with a NGB’s staff or investigators, or when a matter involves Team USA athletes or coaches, or other high-profile Participants).

III. What is displayed in the CDD?

Temporary Measures

Since various NGBs and LAOs may have different standards and/or processes by which they implement temporary measures, the Center *does not, by default*, include temporary measures issued by the NGBs/USOPC or their LAOs in the CDD. However, if the Center exercises jurisdiction over allegations of physical, emotional, or sexual abuse that were originally reported to an NGB/USOPC or its LAO, and temporary measures were implemented prior to the Center exercising jurisdiction, the Center will either *adopt*, *adopt and modify*, or *lift* those temporary measures based on all the information and evidence the Center has at that time. If the Center adopts certain temporary measures as its own, they may be published in the CDD consistent with the Center's publication practices.

Sanctions

Similar to what is published in the CDD for decisions issued by the Center, the CDD also includes all decisions rendered by the NGBs/USOPC or their LAOs, where the sanctions imposed include some period of suspension or ineligibility, after a comprehensive investigation has established a violation of the Code.

For additional information regarding what types of matters are displayed in the CDD, [click here](#).

IV. NGB Disclaimers for their Misconduct Records

Some of the NGBs have unique governance structures, which impact either the specific types of records they provide and/or the specific LAOs from whom they aggregate records. For those NGBs, a specific disclaimer applies to the records displayed on the CDD, which are shown below:

Disclaimer from U.S. Soccer

U.S. Soccer has provided records of individuals who have been disqualified from participation, either by U.S. Soccer or by its Organization Members. However, the records are not intended to be a complete historical record of current or past members who have ever been disqualified or suspended, and may not be exhaustive. While U.S. Soccer continues to solicit responses from its Organization Members and will supplement these records as information becomes available, to date, U.S. Soccer has received records from the following Organization Members: Arkansas State Soccer Association, Eastern New York Youth Soccer Association, Florida Youth Soccer Association, Illinois Youth Soccer, Kansas State Youth Soccer, Massachusetts State Soccer Association, Minnesota Youth Soccer, Missouri Youth Soccer Association, New Jersey Youth Soccer, North Texas Soccer, Oregon Youth Soccer, Tennessee State Soccer Association, U.S. Club Soccer, and West Virginia Soccer Association.

Disclaimer from United States Tennis Association (USTA)

The USTA, as the national governing body for the sport of tennis in the United States, has provided records pursuant to the U.S. Center for SafeSport's authority under the Bylaws of the United States Olympic Committee and the *Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017*. Specifically, the USTA has provided records on behalf of its corporate affiliates: the USTA National Tennis Center Incorporated, USTA Player Development

Incorporated, USTA Foundation Incorporated, as well as those USTA Sectional Associations as defined in the Bylaws of the USTA.

Updated: December 2019