

Technology and Performance Audit and Management Review of the Federal Election Commission

Volume II – Appendixes

January 29, 1999

Prepared by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

1616 North Fort Myer Drive

Arlington, Virginia 22209

This report in its entirety is posted on the Internet at
www.gao.gov/special.pubs/publist.htm

Volume II: Appendixes

	<u>PAGE</u>
Table of Contents.....	TOC-1
Appendix A: FEC Organizational Chart	
Office of the Commissioners.....	A-1
Office of the Staff Directors.....	A-2
Office of the General Counsel.....	A-3
Appendix B: FEC “Regulated” Customer Satisfaction Survey and Tabulation	
Survey Methodology and Summary.....	B-1
Overall Assessment of the FEC.....	B-3
Composition of the Sample.....	B-3
Analysis of 51 Questions	
Appendix C: FEC Program Process Maps and Narratives	
1.0 Public Disclosure Division	C1-1
1.1 Processing Campaign Finance Reports (FEC and Senate)...	C1-1
1.1.1 Receiving Campaign Finance Reports.....	C1-2
1.1.2 Preparing Documents.....	C1-2
1.1.3 Scanning and Filming Documents.....	C1-3
1.1.4 Post-Processing Documents.....	C1-3
1.2 Processing Agency Documents.....	C1-3
1.2.1 Placing a MUR on the Public Record.....	C1-4
1.3 Processing Internal Documents.....	C1-4

1.4 Responding to Information Requests.....	C1-4
Process Maps	
2.0 Data Systems Division.....	C2-1
2.1 Processing of Campaign Finance Reports (Manual and Electronic).....	C2-1
2.1.1. Logging and Sorting.....	C2-1
2.1.2 Conducting Pass 1 Coding.....	C2-2
2.1.3 Conducting Pass 1 Data Entry.....	C2-2
2.1.4 Conducting Pass 1 Data Entry/Verification.....	C2-3
2.1.5 Conducting Pass 3 Coding.....	C2-3
2.1.6 Conducting Pass 3 Data Entry/ Verification.....	C2-4
Process Maps	
3.0 Reports Analysis Division.....	C3- 1
3.1 Processing Campaign Finance Documents.....	C3-1
3.1.1 Reviewing and Analyzing Reports.....	C3-1
3.1.2 Updating Status Report and Re-filing Original.....	C3-2
3.2 Processing Requests for Additional Information (RFAs).....	C3-3
3.3 Processing Non-Filer Notices.....	C3-3
3.4 Processing Debt Settlements.....	C3-3
3.5 Processing Administration Terminations.....	C3-4
Process Maps	
4.0 Audit Division.....	C4- 1
4.1 Audits-For-Cause.....	C4-1
4.1.1 Preparing for Commission Vote and Notifying Candidates/Committees.....	C4-1
4.1.2 Conducting Pre-Audit.....	C4-2

4.1.3	Conducting Fieldwork.....	C4-2
4.1.4	Conduct Post-Audit and Processing Audit Report.....	C4-3
4.2	Audit-For-Cause – Referral (437(g)).....	C4-4
4.2.1	Receiving Referral.....	C4-4
4.2.2	Conducting Pre-Audit.....	C4-5
4.2.3	Conducting Fieldwork.....	C4-5
4.2.4	Conducting Post-Audit and Processing Audit Report..	C4-6
4.3	Presidential Public Funding Program.....	C4-6
4.3.1	Certifying Presidential Public Funding.....	C4-6
4.3.2	Conducting Title 26 Audits.....	C4-8
	Process Maps	
5.0	Office of General Counsel.....	C5- 1
5.1	Public Financing, Ethics and Special Projects.....	C5-1
5.1.1	Prosecuting Violations.....	C5-1
5.1.2	Conducting Legal Review of Public Financing.....	C5-1
5.1.2.1	Reviewing Eligibility for Matching Funds.....	C5-1
5.1.2.2	Reviewing Entitlement Recommendations.....	C5-2
5.1.2.3	Conducting Legal Review of Audit Reports...	C5-3
5.1.2.4	Reviewing Repayment Recommendation.....	C5-3
5.2	Policy Division.....	C5-4
5.2.1	Rendering Advisory Opinions.....	C5-4
5.2.1.1	Reconsideration.....	C5-4
5.2.2	Reviewing Regulations.....	C5-5
5.2.3	Conducting Legal Review of Federal Election Commission Act.....	C5-6


5.3 Enforcement Division.....	C5-6
5.3.1 Enforcement.....	C5-6
5.3.2 Central Enforcement Docket.....	C5-6
5.3.3 Statements of Reason.....	C5-8
5.3.4 Dismissing Low Rating and Stale Cases.....	C5-8
5.3.5 Maintaining the Permanent File.....	C5-8
5.3.6 Coordinating Executive Session Agenda.....	C5-8
5.3.7 Tracking Civil Penalties.....	C5-8
5.3.8 Archiving.....	C5-9
5.4 Litigation Division.....	C5-9
Process Maps	
6.0 Office of Planning and Management.....	C6- 1
6.1 Budget Formulation.....	C6-1
6.2 Budget Management.....	C6-2
6.3 Monthly Budget Reporting.....	C6-3
6.4 Developing FY2000 Performance Plan.....	C6-3
Process Maps	
7.0 Administration Division.....	C7- 1
7.1 Accounts Payable.....	C7-1
7.2 Procurement.....	C7-1
7.3 Vouchering.....	C7-1
7.4 Monthly Reconciliation.....	C7-2
7.5 Cash Receipt System.....	C7-2
Process Maps	

Appendix A

FEC Organization Chart

Federal Election Commission

Office of the Commissioners




Note: Only full-time permanent positions identified.

Source: FEC Staffing Report, September 25, 1998

Federal Election Commission


Office of the Staff Director



Note: Only full-time permanent positions identified.

Source: FEC Staffing Report, September 25, 1998

Office of General Counsel



Note: Only full-time permanent positions identified.

Source: FEC Staffing Report, September 25, 1998

Appendix B

FEC “Regulated” Customer Satisfaction Survey and Tabulation

Survey Methodology and Summary

The Federal Election Commission (FEC) Customer Satisfaction Survey was designed to evaluate FEC effectiveness in providing information to the regulated community and in facilitating disclosure of campaign finance information. The questionnaire focused on specific FEC products, services, and processes and was administered by telephone to 353 randomly selected Congressional candidate committees, political party committees, and PACs that filed reports with the FEC during the 1997–1998 election cycle. These committees were selected from a list of all registered committees provided by the FEC, using a stratified random sample technique to assure a sufficient sample size for each major filer group. The PricewaterhouseCoopers Survey Research Center in Bethesda, Maryland, conducted the interviews during August and September 1998. Each committee was notified of the survey through a front-page article in the August issue of *The Record*.

The results of the survey indicated that, overall, the regulated community is quite satisfied with the products and services provided by the Federal Election Commission. While the level of usage of these products and services varies, the degree of satisfaction is consistently positive. Moreover, surveyed filers generally perceive the Commission to be fair and nonpartisan. Details of the survey

follow this narrative. Here are the notable findings from the survey:

- **Reporting Forms and Instructions.** Four out of five (83%) believed that the instructions included with reporting forms were either “somewhat” or “very” clear. Only 7% said that they required a “great deal” of assistance in filing their FEC reporting forms, and a quarter (25%) did not need any assistance at all.
- **Reports Analysis Division (RAD) Staff.** Nearly three-quarters (72%) of all surveyed filers have contacted their assigned RAD staff person since January 1, 1997. Nine out of ten (92%) committees spending over \$500,000 report contacting RAD staff, while only six out of ten (60%) committees spending \$50,000 or less report contacting their RAD staff person. On average, filers contacted their RAD staff person once per reporting period.

RAD personnel were seen in positive terms. For example, 86% stated that the RAD staff always answer in a timely fashion, 80% agreed that RAD staff always answered questions accurately, and 67% stated that RAD staff always are available to respond to requests.

Two-thirds (66%) of all filers report having received a Request for Additional Information (RFAI) since January 1, 1997; however, only one-half (49%) of PACs report receiving an RFAI. Of those who received RFAIs, four

out of five (82%) believed that the content of RFAs is either “somewhat” or “very” clear.

- **Phone Calls to the FEC.** One-half (51%) of all surveyed filers had called the FEC for reasons other than to discuss their reports, and, on average, they made two calls to the FEC during a reporting period. Reasons for calls to the FEC included obtaining information on laws and regulations (78%), ordering forms or publications (53%), obtaining public records about candidates or committees (25%), obtaining information about voting laws and election statistics (11%), and obtaining other information (17%). Of those surveyed filers who had called the FEC, nearly all (96%) agreed that the FEC staff person answered their questions accurately. Nine out of ten (92%) filers reported that their questions were answered within 24 hours of the call.
- **Publications.** Nine out of ten (90%) surveyed filers were aware of the FEC newsletter, The Record, and almost half read it every month.

Over three-quarters (76%) of sampled filers were aware of the FEC Campaign Guides. However, only two-thirds of PACs (65%) and small committees (67%) were aware of them. Almost nine out of ten (87%) surveyed filers believed that the Campaign Guides were either “somewhat” or “very” clear, and two out of five (42%) said that they are “very” helpful as a resource for completing disclosure reports. Political party

committees, however, were less likely to view Campaign Guides as “very” helpful (19%).

- **Web Site.** Only four out of ten (42%) surveyed filers had accessed the FEC World Wide Web site. Further, only three out of ten (29%) small committees had accessed the site, while six out of ten (61%) large committees had. Those filers who did access the Web site did so an average of two times per month. Reasons for accessing the Web site included to find campaign finance reports and statistics (71%), to get FEC forms and documents (55%), to obtain election results (32%), and to obtain FEC press releases (16%) and FEC publications (17%). Nine out of ten filers (91%) who have accessed the Web site said that information there was either “somewhat” or “very” accessible.
- **Enforcement Staff.** Only 14% of surveyed filers had ever had any interaction with FEC enforcement staff. Of these, nearly three-quarters (73%) agreed that FEC enforcement staff operated in an independent, nonpartisan manner. Less than one out of five (18%) said that the written communications from the enforcement staff were either “somewhat” or “very” unclear.
- **Importance of Various Services.** Among the various services mentioned, the RAD staff person and Campaign Guides were deemed either “somewhat” or “very” important by nine out of ten filers (93% and 92%

respectively). Over half of the surveyed filers reported that they had never used the automated Faxline (54%) or the Public Records Office (52%) or that they had never attended an FEC conference or workshop (60%).

Overall Assessment of the FEC

Surveyed filers were quite positive in their assessments of the FEC, perhaps higher than one would have expected, given the strength of recent criticisms leveled at the FEC. On a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 means poor and 10 means excellent, they gave the FEC an average rating of 8. Three out of five rated the FEC as an 8 or higher.

In general, surveyed filers perceived the FEC to be fair and impartial. However, large committees and political parties were more likely to disagree that the FEC fairly applies compliance laws (21% each) than committees as a whole (12%).

Composition of the Sample

A random, stratified sample was selected, based both on the type of committee and the amount of financial activity, to allow for comparisons between groups as well as to represent the population as a whole. From the 510 selected respondents, 353 completed interviews (69%). The distribution of the sampled respondents, by committee type, was Senate – 14%, House – 26%, PACs – 42%, and Party –

18%. The distribution for the amount of spending by the respondents was 22% for committees spending more than \$500,000, 33% for those spending between \$50,000 and \$500,000, and 45% for committees spending less than \$50,000.

The partisan representation in the sample was fairly evenly divided among Republicans and Democrats. Among candidate committees, 50% of the candidates were Republican, 45% Democrat, and 4% represent another party. Among political party committees, 45% were Republican, 42% Democrat, and 11% from other parties.

Q1. Have you filed a report with the FEC since January 1, 1997?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
No	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q2. On a scale from one to ten, where one means poor and ten means excellent, overall, how well do you think the FEC does its job?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
One to Four	5.9%	6.0%	5.5%	5.4%	7.9%	4.4%	7.8%	6.5%
Five	7.4%	12.0%	4.4%	6.0%	11.1%	8.1%	3.4%	11.7%
Six	9.3%	12.0%	9.9%	8.7%	7.9%	10.6%	6.0%	11.7%
Seven	13.6%	12.0%	15.4%	11.4%	17.5%	13.1%	12.9%	15.6%
Eight	32.0%	24.0%	34.1%	30.9%	38.1%	30.0%	38.8%	26.0%
Nine	17.3%	22.0%	17.6%	18.8%	9.5%	18.1%	19.0%	13.0%
Ten	10.8%	10.0%	9.9%	14.1%	4.8%	10.6%	11.2%	10.4%
Don't know	3.1%	0.0%	3.3%	4.0%	3.2%	4.4%	0.9%	3.9%
Refused	0.6%	2.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average Rating	8	7	8	8	7	8	8	7
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q3. How clear would you say the instructions included with reporting forms are?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very clear	34.6%	38.0%	35.2%	37.6%	23.8%	31.9%	37.1%	36.4%
Somewhat clear	48.2%	42.0%	48.4%	50.3%	47.6%	48.1%	50.0%	45.5%
Somewhat unclear	13.6%	16.0%	13.2%	7.4%	27.0%	15.0%	10.3%	15.6%
Very unclear	2.3%	2.0%	2.2%	2.7%	1.6%	3.1%	1.7%	1.3%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	1.4%	2.0%	1.1%	2.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.9%	1.3%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q4. In filing your FEC reporting forms, do you find that you need...

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
A great deal of assistance	6.5%	4.0%	5.5%	3.4%	17.5%	6.3%	5.2%	9.1%
Some assistance	28.3%	46.0%	33.0%	18.8%	30.2%	22.5%	31.0%	36.4%
Only a little assistance	39.7%	34.0%	41.8%	43.0%	33.3%	37.5%	42.2%	40.3%
No assistance at all	24.6%	16.0%	19.8%	32.9%	19.0%	33.1%	19.8%	14.3%
Don't know	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.7%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q5. Have you ever contacted the staff person who reviews your reports?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	71.7%	72.0%	81.3%	64.4%	74.6%	60.0%	74.1%	92.2%
No	27.5%	28.0%	18.7%	34.2%	23.8%	38.8%	25.0%	7.8%
Don't know	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q6. On average, how many times during a reporting period do you call the staff person who reviews your reports?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Less than 1 time	14.6%	11.1%	12.2%	20.8%	8.5%	17.7%	15.1%	9.9%
1 time	58.5%	52.8%	56.8%	57.3%	68.1%	62.5%	52.3%	60.6%
2 - 3 times	19.8%	27.8%	28.4%	13.5%	12.8%	15.6%	23.3%	21.1%
More than 3 times	5.9%	8.3%	2.7%	6.3%	8.5%	3.1%	8.1%	7.0%
Don't know	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	2.1%	0.0%	1.2%	1.4%
Refused	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average Number of Times	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
Sample Size*	253	36	74	96	47	96	86	71

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 5.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q7. How often is this staff person available to respond to your requests?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Always	67.2%	69.4%	66.2%	66.7%	68.1%	62.5%	72.1%	67.6%
Sometimes	28.9%	25.0%	27.0%	30.2%	31.9%	34.4%	23.3%	28.2%
Rarely	2.0%	5.6%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	4.2%
Never	0.8%	0.0%	1.4%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%
Don't know	1.2%	0.0%	1.4%	2.1%	0.0%	2.1%	1.2%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	253	36	74	96	47	96	86	71

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 5.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q8. How often does this staff person answer your questions accurately?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Always	79.8%	83.3%	81.1%	81.3%	72.3%	84.4%	81.4%	71.8%
Sometimes	15.8%	16.7%	13.5%	13.5%	23.4%	11.5%	12.8%	25.4%
Rarely	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Never	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%
Don't know	3.6%	0.0%	5.4%	3.1%	4.3%	3.1%	4.7%	2.8%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	253	36	74	96	47	96	86	71

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 5.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q9. How often does this staff person answer your questions in a timely manner?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Always	86.2%	86.1%	86.5%	84.4%	89.4%	86.5%	84.9%	87.3%
Sometimes	11.5%	8.3%	10.8%	13.5%	10.6%	11.5%	12.8%	9.9%
Rarely	1.2%	5.6%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%
Never	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	1.2%	0.0%	1.4%	2.1%	0.0%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	253	36	74	96	47	96	86	71

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 5.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q10. Have you received a Request for Additional Information or RFAI since January 1, 1997?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	66.3%	80.0%	80.2%	49.0%	76.2%	48.1%	76.7%	88.3%
No	29.7%	14.0%	16.5%	47.7%	19.0%	44.4%	23.3%	9.1%
Don't know	4.0%	6.0%	3.3%	3.4%	4.8%	7.5%	0.0%	2.6%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q11. In your opinion, how clear is the content of RFAIs?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very clear	42.7%	40.0%	42.5%	50.7%	33.3%	41.6%	50.6%	33.8%
Somewhat clear	39.3%	45.0%	34.2%	37.0%	45.8%	39.0%	36.0%	44.1%
Somewhat unclear	13.2%	12.5%	16.4%	8.2%	16.7%	14.3%	9.0%	17.6%
Very unclear	4.7%	2.5%	6.8%	4.1%	4.2%	5.2%	4.5%	4.4%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	234	40	73	73	48	77	89	68

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 10.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q12. Other than to discuss your reports, have you ever called the FEC?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	50.7%	56.0%	56.0%	45.6%	50.8%	35.6%	61.2%	66.2%
No	49.3%	44.0%	44.0%	54.4%	49.2%	64.4%	38.8%	33.8%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q13. Other than to discuss your reports, on average, how many times during a reporting period do you call the FEC?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Less than 1 time	19.8%	7.1%	15.7%	28.8%	18.8%	28.6%	21.4%	7.8%
1 time	48.6%	53.6%	49.0%	43.9%	53.1%	42.9%	47.1%	56.9%
2 - 3 times	21.5%	28.6%	25.5%	15.2%	21.9%	19.6%	21.4%	23.5%
More than 3 times	9.6%	10.7%	9.8%	10.6%	6.3%	7.1%	10.0%	11.8%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average Number of Times	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2
Sample Size*	177	28	51	66	32	56	70	51

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 12.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q14. Please tell me for which of the following reasons you have called the FEC since January 1, 1997.

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Obtain information on campaign finance laws and FEC regulations	77.7%	78.6%	82.4%	79.4%	65.6%	66.7%	87.3%	76.5%
Order forms or publications	52.5%	50.0%	49.0%	52.9%	59.4%	45.6%	53.5%	58.8%
Obtain public records about specific candidates or committees	24.6%	25.0%	25.5%	22.1%	28.1%	7.0%	28.2%	39.2%
Obtain information about voting and registration laws or election statistics	10.6%	10.7%	7.8%	10.3%	15.6%	8.8%	12.7%	9.8%
Other	16.8%	21.4%	19.6%	13.2%	15.6%	14.0%	15.5%	21.6%
Don't know	2.2%	0.0%	2.0%	1.5%	6.3%	5.3%	0.0%	2.0%
Refused	0.6%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%
Total	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Sample Size	179*	28	51	68	32	57	71	51

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 12.

**Totals may not add to 100% because respondents could select multiple answers.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q15. Other than to discuss your reports, what was the reason for your most recent phone call?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Obtain information on campaign finance laws and FEC regulations	52.5%	57.1%	64.7%	48.5%	37.5%	49.1%	62.0%	43.1%
Order forms or publications	19.6%	17.9%	11.8%	19.1%	34.4%	21.1%	14.1%	25.5%
Obtain public records about specific candidates or committees	8.9%	3.6%	5.9%	13.2%	9.4%	7.0%	9.9%	9.8%
Obtain information about voting and registration laws or election statistics	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	3.1%	0.0%	1.4%	2.0%
Other	15.1%	21.4%	11.8%	14.7%	15.6%	21.1%	7.0%	19.6%
Don't know	2.2%	0.0%	3.9%	2.9%	0.0%	1.8%	4.2%	0.0%
Refused	0.6%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	179	28	51	68	32	57	71	51

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 12.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q10. Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following statement: When I called, the FEC staff person answered my questions accurately.

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Agree strongly	70.4%	64.3%	72.5%	73.5%	65.6%	73.7%	77.5%	56.9%
Agree somewhat	25.7%	32.1%	17.6%	25.0%	34.4%	21.1%	19.7%	39.2%
Disagree somewhat	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree strongly	1.7%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	3.9%
Not applicable	0.6%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	1.7%	0.0%	3.9%	1.5%	0.0%	3.5%	1.4%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	179	28	51	68	32	57	71	51

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 12.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q17. When you called, did the FEC staff member respond to your request...

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
During the same call	54.7%	46.4%	56.9%	63.2%	40.6%	54.4%	53.5%	56.9%
Within 24 hours of your call	37.4%	46.4%	33.3%	30.9%	50.0%	33.3%	38.0%	41.2%
More than 24 hours after your call	4.5%	3.6%	7.8%	2.9%	3.1%	7.0%	4.2%	2.0%
Don't know	3.4%	3.6%	2.0%	2.9%	6.3%	5.3%	4.2%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	179	28	51	68	32	57	71	51

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 12.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q18. Are you aware of the FEC's newsletter called The Record?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	90.4%	86.0%	90.1%	89.3%	96.8%	88.1%	92.2%	92.2%
No	9.3%	14.0%	8.8%	10.7%	3.2%	11.3%	7.8%	7.8%
Don't know	0.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q19. On average, how often do you read The Record?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Every month	48.6%	55.8%	41.5%	52.6%	44.3%	35.5%	57.0%	62.0%
Every other month	14.1%	16.3%	15.9%	9.8%	19.7%	12.1%	18.7%	11.3%
Only a few times per year	21.0%	16.3%	20.7%	24.1%	18.0%	28.4%	13.1%	18.3%
Almost never	14.1%	11.6%	18.3%	11.3%	16.4%	21.3%	8.4%	8.5%
Don't know	2.2%	0.0%	3.7%	2.3%	1.6%	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	319	43	82	133	61	141	107	71

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 18.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q20. Have you ever used the FEC Campaign Guide?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	75.9%	92.0%	84.6%	65.1%	76.2%	66.9%	81.9%	85.7%
No	22.7%	8.0%	13.2%	33.6%	22.2%	31.3%	18.1%	11.7%
Don't know	1.4%	0.0%	2.2%	1.3%	1.6%	1.9%	0.0%	2.6%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q21. How clear would you say the Campaign Guide is?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very clear	33.6%	30.4%	32.5%	41.2%	22.9%	29.9%	38.9%	31.8%
Somewhat clear	53.0%	56.5%	51.9%	49.5%	58.3%	54.2%	51.6%	53.0%
Somewhat unclear	11.6%	13.0%	14.3%	7.2%	14.6%	13.1%	7.4%	15.2%
Very unclear	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	4.2%	0.9%	2.1%	0.0%
Don't know	0.7%	0.0%	1.3%	1.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	268	46	77	97	48	107	95	66

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 20.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q22. How helpful is the Campaign Guide as a resource for completing your disclosure reports?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very helpful	42.2%	47.8%	49.4%	45.4%	18.8%	41.1%	45.3%	39.4%
Somewhat helpful	48.1%	45.7%	44.2%	43.3%	66.7%	43.9%	50.5%	51.5%
Not very helpful	5.6%	2.2%	3.9%	7.2%	8.3%	9.3%	3.2%	3.0%
Not at all helpful	2.2%	0.0%	1.3%	2.1%	6.3%	2.8%	1.1%	3.0%
Don't use Campaign Guide as a resource	1.9%	4.3%	1.3%	2.1%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	3.0%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	268	46	77	97	48	107	95	66

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 20.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q23. Have you ever accessed the FEC's world wide web site?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	41.9%	32.0%	49.5%	41.6%	39.7%	29.4%	46.6%	61.0%
No	57.8%	66.0%	50.5%	58.4%	60.3%	70.6%	52.6%	39.0%
Don't know	0.3%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q24. On average, how many times per month do you access the FEC web site?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Less than 1 time	18.9%	6.3%	17.8%	22.6%	20.0%	29.8%	18.5%	8.5%
1 time	48.6%	56.3%	46.7%	53.2%	36.0%	53.2%	51.9%	40.4%
2 - 3 times	17.6%	18.8%	24.4%	8.1%	28.0%	6.4%	20.4%	25.5%
More than 3 times	12.8%	18.8%	8.9%	12.9%	16.0%	6.4%	9.3%	23.4%
Don't know	2.0%	0.0%	2.2%	3.2%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	2.1%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average Number of Times	2	4	2	2	2	1	2	5
Sample Size*	148	16 [†]	45	62	25	47	54	47

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 23.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q25. Which of the following FEC website features have you accessed?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
FEC publications such as The Record	16.9%	18.8%	15.6%	16.1%	20.0%	17.0%	20.4%	12.8%
Agency press releases	16.2%	12.5%	13.3%	19.4%	16.0%	17.0%	18.5%	12.8%
Election results, voter registration information, or turnout statistics	32.4%	25.0%	37.8%	30.6%	32.0%	34.0%	35.2%	27.7%
Official FEC forms or documents	54.7%	43.8%	57.8%	53.2%	60.0%	63.8%	48.1%	53.2%
Campaign finance reports or statistics	70.9%	62.5%	75.6%	62.9%	88.0%	57.4%	81.5%	72.3%
Don't know	5.4%	6.3%	6.7%	4.8%	4.0%	8.5%	3.7%	4.3%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Sample Size*	148	16 [†]	45	62	25	47	54	47

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 23.

**Totals may not add to 100% because respondents could select multiple answers.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q26. How accessible is information on the FEC website?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very accessible	50.7%	56.3%	51.1%	53.2%	40.0%	57.4%	48.1%	46.8%
Somewhat accessible	40.5%	37.5%	40.0%	35.5%	56.0%	31.9%	42.6%	46.8%
Not very accessible	4.7%	6.3%	2.2%	6.5%	4.0%	2.1%	7.4%	4.3%
Not at all accessible	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	4.1%	0.0%	6.7%	4.8%	0.0%	8.5%	1.9%	2.1%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	148	16 [†]	45	62	25	47	54	47

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 23.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q27. Have you ever had any interaction with the FEC enforcement staff?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	13.9%	14.0%	12.1%	14.8%	14.3%	11.3%	15.5%	16.9%
No	80.2%	82.0%	78.0%	81.2%	79.4%	83.1%	78.4%	76.6%
Don't know	5.9%	4.0%	9.9%	4.0%	6.3%	5.6%	6.0%	6.5%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q26. Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly with the following statement: The FEC enforcement staff operate in an independent, nonpartisan manner.

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Agree strongly	57.1%	28.6%	72.7%	54.5%	66.7%	50.0%	66.7%	53.8%
Agree somewhat	16.3%	28.6%	9.1%	18.2%	11.1%	16.7%	11.1%	23.1%
Disagree somewhat	12.2%	14.3%	9.1%	13.6%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	15.4%
Disagree strongly	2.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%
Don't know	12.2%	28.6%	0.0%	13.6%	11.1%	22.2%	11.1%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	49	7 [†]	11 [†]	22 [†]	9 [†]	18 [†]	18 [†]	13 [†]

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 27.

[†] Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q29. How clear were the written communications you received from the FEC enforcement staff?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very clear	55.1%	71.4%	45.5%	63.6%	33.3%	61.1%	50.0%	53.8%
Somewhat clear	24.5%	14.3%	36.4%	18.2%	33.3%	11.1%	38.9%	23.1%
Somewhat unclear	16.3%	0.0%	18.2%	18.2%	22.2%	22.2%	11.1%	15.4%
Very unclear	2.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	49	7 [†]	11 [†]	22 [†]	9 [†]	18 [†]	18 [†]	13 [†]

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 27.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q30. Has the issue raised by the FEC or another party been resolved?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	79.6%	71.4%	63.6%	95.5%	66.7%	77.8%	77.8%	84.6%
No	18.4%	28.6%	36.4%	4.5%	22.2%	22.2%	22.2%	7.7%
Don't know	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	49	7 [†]	11 [†]	22 [†]	9 [†]	18 [†]	18 [†]	13 [†]

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 27.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q31. How important is the following service in helping you comply with federal election law: The staff person who reviews your reports?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very important	55.2%	60.0%	65.9%	47.7%	54.0%	47.5%	58.6%	66.2%
Somewhat important	23.5%	22.0%	19.8%	24.8%	27.0%	22.5%	25.9%	22.1%
Not very important	4.0%	4.0%	3.3%	4.7%	3.2%	3.8%	2.6%	6.5%
Not at all important	1.1%	0.0%	3.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%	1.7%	1.3%
Have not used the service	15.6%	14.0%	6.6%	21.5%	15.9%	25.0%	10.3%	3.9%
Don't know	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q52. How important is the following service in helping you comply with federal election law: The public affairs specialist who answers questions regarding the law?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very important	33.4%	38.0%	39.6%	32.9%	22.2%	25.0%	41.4%	39.0%
Somewhat important	20.7%	26.0%	18.7%	20.8%	19.0%	18.1%	19.8%	27.3%
Not very important	3.1%	6.0%	4.4%	1.3%	3.2%	3.8%	2.6%	2.6%
Not at all important	1.7%	2.0%	4.4%	0.7%	0.0%	1.3%	2.6%	1.3%
Have not used the service	38.5%	26.0%	29.7%	40.9%	55.6%	51.3%	29.3%	26.0%
Don't know	2.3%	2.0%	3.3%	2.7%	0.0%	0.6%	4.3%	2.6%
Refused	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q33. How important is the following service in helping you comply with federal election law: The automated Faxline for obtaining FEC information?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very important	15.9%	24.0%	23.1%	8.1%	17.5%	13.1%	19.8%	15.6%
Somewhat important	17.8%	14.0%	20.9%	20.1%	11.1%	16.9%	13.8%	26.0%
Not very important	7.9%	14.0%	6.6%	7.4%	6.3%	5.0%	10.3%	10.4%
Not at all important	3.4%	0.0%	6.6%	2.0%	4.8%	3.8%	3.4%	2.6%
Have not used the service	54.4%	44.0%	42.9%	62.4%	60.3%	61.3%	51.7%	44.2%
Don't know	0.6%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	1.3%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q34. How important is the following service in helping you comply with federal election law: The FEC newsletter, The Record?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very important	17.8%	18.0%	16.5%	18.8%	17.5%	15.6%	22.4%	15.6%
Somewhat important	52.1%	44.0%	46.2%	56.4%	57.1%	50.0%	53.4%	54.5%
Not very important	15.6%	22.0%	16.5%	12.1%	17.5%	17.5%	12.1%	16.9%
Not at all important	5.4%	2.0%	13.2%	2.7%	3.2%	5.6%	4.3%	6.5%
Have not used the service	8.8%	14.0%	6.6%	10.1%	4.8%	10.6%	7.8%	6.5%
Don't know	0.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q35. How important is the following service in helping you comply with federal election law: FEC Campaign Guides?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very important	45.0%	50.0%	53.8%	38.9%	42.9%	35.6%	52.6%	53.2%
Somewhat important	33.4%	36.0%	36.3%	30.9%	33.3%	35.0%	32.8%	31.2%
Not very important	5.1%	8.0%	1.1%	6.0%	6.3%	5.0%	4.3%	6.5%
Not at all important	1.4%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.6%	1.3%	1.7%	1.3%
Have not used the service	14.4%	4.0%	7.7%	21.5%	15.9%	22.5%	8.6%	6.5%
Don't know	0.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q36. How important is the following service in helping you comply with federal election law: The Public Records Office?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very important	17.8%	18.0%	18.7%	16.1%	20.6%	11.3%	18.1%	31.2%
Somewhat important	20.4%	28.0%	22.0%	18.1%	17.5%	20.6%	21.6%	18.2%
Not very important	5.4%	6.0%	6.6%	6.0%	1.6%	3.8%	4.3%	10.4%
Not at all important	2.8%	2.0%	2.2%	3.4%	3.2%	3.1%	2.6%	2.6%
Have not used the service	51.8%	46.0%	46.2%	55.7%	55.6%	60.0%	52.6%	33.8%
Don't know	1.7%	0.0%	4.4%	0.7%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	3.9%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q37. How important is the following service in helping you comply with federal election law: FEC conferences and workshops?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very important	16.4%	16.0%	17.6%	14.8%	19.0%	8.8%	23.3%	22.1%
Somewhat important	13.9%	14.0%	16.5%	12.1%	14.3%	8.8%	16.4%	20.8%
Not very important	6.8%	8.0%	8.8%	4.7%	7.9%	6.3%	5.2%	10.4%
Not at all important	2.3%	2.0%	3.3%	2.0%	1.6%	3.1%	0.9%	2.6%
Have not used the service	60.3%	60.0%	53.8%	65.8%	57.1%	72.5%	54.3%	44.2%
Don't know	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q38. How important is the following service in helping you comply with federal election law: The FEC world wide web site?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very important	18.1%	10.0%	15.4%	18.8%	27.0%	15.6%	16.4%	26.0%
Somewhat important	23.2%	18.0%	30.8%	25.5%	11.1%	19.4%	26.7%	26.0%
Not very important	4.5%	6.0%	5.5%	4.7%	1.6%	2.5%	6.9%	5.2%
Not at all important	4.2%	4.0%	8.8%	1.3%	4.8%	3.8%	2.6%	7.8%
Have not used the service	49.0%	62.0%	38.5%	49.0%	54.0%	57.5%	46.6%	35.1%
Don't know	0.8%	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q59. Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly with the following statement: The FEC conducts business during hours that are convenient to me

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Agree strongly	55.0%	60.0%	46.2%	60.4%	50.8%	50.6%	59.5%	57.1%
Agree somewhat	30.6%	34.0%	33.0%	27.5%	31.7%	34.4%	29.3%	24.7%
Disagree somewhat	8.5%	4.0%	12.1%	6.7%	11.1%	8.1%	8.6%	9.1%
Disagree strongly	3.7%	2.0%	8.8%	0.7%	4.8%	2.5%	2.6%	7.8%
Neutral	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Don't know	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	1.6%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q40. Agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly with the following statement: Overall, FEC staff demonstrate a sincere interest in solving my election law problems

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Agree strongly	61.5%	60.0%	65.9%	59.7%	60.3%	56.9%	71.6%	55.8%
Agree somewhat	29.5%	28.0%	23.1%	32.9%	31.7%	33.8%	20.7%	33.8%
Disagree somewhat	4.2%	6.0%	6.6%	2.7%	3.2%	2.5%	3.4%	9.1%
Disagree strongly	2.0%	6.0%	2.2%	0.7%	1.6%	1.9%	2.6%	1.3%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	2.8%	0.0%	2.2%	4.0%	3.2%	5.0%	1.7%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q41. Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly with the following statement: Overall, FEC staff are courteous

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Agree strongly	71.7%	66.0%	75.8%	71.8%	69.8%	69.4%	73.3%	74.0%
Agree somewhat	22.7%	28.0%	16.5%	22.8%	27.0%	22.5%	23.3%	22.1%
Disagree somewhat	2.0%	2.0%	5.5%	0.7%	0.0%	2.5%	0.9%	2.6%
Disagree strongly	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	0.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	3.4%	4.0%	1.1%	4.7%	3.2%	5.0%	2.6%	1.3%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q42. Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly with the following statement: Overall, FEC staff operate in an independent, nonpartisan manner.

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Agree strongly	56.4%	62.0%	54.9%	57.7%	50.8%	54.4%	59.5%	55.8%
Agree somewhat	25.8%	20.0%	24.2%	27.5%	28.6%	25.0%	25.9%	27.3%
Disagree somewhat	4.2%	6.0%	5.5%	1.3%	7.9%	4.4%	1.7%	7.8%
Disagree strongly	2.3%	2.0%	4.4%	1.3%	1.6%	1.3%	4.3%	1.3%
Neutral	0.8%	0.0%	1.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0.6%	0.9%	1.3%
Don't know	10.5%	10.0%	9.9%	10.7%	11.1%	14.4%	7.8%	6.5%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q43. Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly with the following statement: The FEC as an institution fairly applies compliance laws

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Agree strongly	38.2%	38.0%	38.5%	43.0%	27.0%	36.9%	41.4%	36.4%
Agree somewhat	31.2%	32.0%	25.3%	31.5%	38.1%	30.6%	31.0%	32.5%
Disagree somewhat	6.5%	8.0%	8.8%	4.0%	7.9%	5.0%	6.0%	10.4%
Disagree strongly	5.7%	8.0%	6.6%	1.3%	12.7%	3.1%	6.0%	10.4%
Neutral	1.1%	4.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.9%	0.0%
Don't know	17.0%	10.0%	18.7%	19.5%	14.3%	22.5%	14.7%	9.1%
Refused	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q44. What is your title or role in the committee?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Treasurer / Assistant Treasurer	49.6%	58.0%	56.0%	48.3%	36.5%	60.0%	46.6%	32.5%
Executive Director	6.5%	2.0%	2.2%	4.7%	20.6%	2.5%	8.6%	11.7%
Manager / Administrator	5.9%	6.0%	5.5%	8.7%	0.0%	3.1%	6.9%	10.4%
Bookkeeper / Comptroller	5.4%	6.0%	4.4%	5.4%	6.3%	3.8%	4.3%	10.4%
Administrative Assistant / Staff Assistant	2.8%	0.0%	2.2%	5.4%	0.0%	4.4%	2.6%	0.0%
Attorney / Accountant	4.2%	0.0%	1.1%	7.4%	4.8%	3.8%	5.2%	3.9%
Finance Director	4.2%	8.0%	2.2%	1.3%	11.1%	1.9%	5.2%	7.8%
Candidate	3.1%	6.0%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.9%	1.3%
Other	17.6%	14.0%	16.5%	18.1%	20.6%	15.0%	19.0%	20.8%
Don't know	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	1.3%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

Q45. How long have you been working with this committee with the responsibility for filing FEC reports?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
1 year or less	21.8%	26.0%	35.2%	13.4%	19.0%	23.1%	18.1%	24.7%
1 - 3 years	33.1%	34.0%	30.8%	34.9%	31.7%	35.0%	30.2%	33.8%
3 - 5 years	16.4%	16.0%	8.8%	20.8%	17.5%	16.9%	18.1%	13.0%
More than 5 years	28.6%	24.0%	25.3%	30.9%	31.7%	25.0%	33.6%	28.6%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q46. Have you ever tried to use the FEC's electronic filing system?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Yes	5.9%	2.0%	5.5%	7.4%	6.3%	4.4%	8.6%	5.2%
No	93.8%	98.0%	94.5%	91.9%	93.7%	95.0%	91.4%	94.8%
Don't know	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q47. Would you say the FEC's electronic filing system is very easy-to-use, somewhat easy-to-use, not very easy-to-use, or not at all easy-to-use?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Very easy-to-use	28.6%	**	**	36.4%	**	28.6%	30.0%	**
Somewhat easy-to-use	19.0%	**	**	27.3%	**	28.6%	10.0%	**
Not very easy-to-use	9.5%	**	**	9.1%	**	14.3%	10.0%	**
Not at all easy-to-use	33.3%	**	**	18.2%	**	28.6%	30.0%	**
Don't know	9.5%	**	**	9.1%	**	0.0%	20.0%	**
Refused	0.0%	**	**	0.0%	**	0.0%	0.0%	**
Total	100.0%	**	**	100.0%	**	100.0%	100.0%	**
Sample Size*	21 [†]	1	5	11 [†]	4	7 [†]	10 [†]	4

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Yes' to question 46.

**Results based on sample sizes of five or less are not reported.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q48. Do you represent a candidate committee, a political party committee, or a Political Action Committee?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Candidate Committee	39.4%	98.0%	98.9%	0.0%	0.0%	35.0%	40.5%	46.8%
Political Party Committee	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.4%	12.5%	18.1%	27.3%
Political Action Committee	41.9%	0.0%	0.0%	99.3%	0.0%	50.6%	40.5%	26.0%
Don't know	0.6%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	353	50	91	149	63	160	116	77

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q49. CANDIDATE COMMITTEE: Is the candidate your committee represents a Republican, Democrat, or from some other political party?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Republican	50.0%	49.0%	50.6%	--	--	34.5%	61.7%	58.3%
Democrat	44.9%	46.9%	43.8%	--	--	52.7%	38.3%	41.7%
Other	4.3%	4.1%	4.5%	--	--	10.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	--	--	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Refused	0.7%	0.0%	1.1%	--	--	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	--	--	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	138	49	89	--	--	55	47	36

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Candidate Committee' to question 48.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q50. PARTY COMMITTEE: Which party does your committee represent?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
Republican	45.2%	--	--	--	45.2%	45.0%	33.3%	57.1%
Democrat	41.9%	--	--	--	41.9%	25.0%	66.7%	33.3%
Other	11.3%	--	--	--	11.3%	30.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Don't know	1.6%	--	--	--	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Refused	0.0%	--	--	--	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	--	--	--	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	62	--	--	--	62	20 [†]	21 [†]	21 [†]

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Political Party Committee' to question 48.

[†] Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Q51. PAC: Which best describes the Political Action Committee you represent?

	All	Type of Committee				Amount of Spending		
		Candidate Committee		Political Action Committee	Political Party Committee	Less than or Equal to \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$500,000	More than \$500,000
		Senate	House					
A PAC for a corporation	46.9%	--	--	46.9%	--	51.3%	46.8%	30.0%
A PAC for a labor union	10.2%	--	--	10.2%	--	6.3%	4.3%	40.0%
A membership or trade association	23.8%	--	--	23.8%	--	26.3%	27.7%	5.0%
An issue organization or non-connected PAC	15.0%	--	--	15.0%	--	12.5%	14.9%	25.0%
Other	2.0%	--	--	2.0%	--	1.3%	4.3%	0.0%
Don't know	2.0%	--	--	2.0%	--	2.5%	2.1%	0.0%
Refused	0.0%	--	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	--	--	100.0%	--	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size*	147	--	--	147	--	80	47	20 [†]

*Sample sizes based on those who responded 'Political Action Committee' to question 48.

† Results based on sample sizes of less than 25 may be too small for drawing statistical conclusions. Therefore, caution should be used when basing conclusions on these data.

Appendix C

FEC Program Process Maps and Narratives

1.0 Public Disclosure Division

Process Customers

Internal: Other FEC Offices

External: Filers, Public, Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate

Process Descriptions

The Public Disclosure Division is divided into two offices: Processing and Public Records. Together they are responsible for the following mapped processes: Processing Campaign Finance Reports (1.1), Processing Agency Documents (1.2), Processing Internal Agency Documents (1.3), and Responding to Information Requests (1.4). Other division responsibilities include placing documents on the public record, developing intra-agency publications, conducting various administrative processes, answering requests from other agencies, and participating in the State relations program. These processes were not mapped because they represent a small portion of the total workload or because they typically are not process driven.

1.1 Processing Campaign Finance Reports was separated into two subprocesses, one for FEC filers and one for Senate filers. Senate filers send their campaign finance reports to the Secretary of the Senate, while all other filers, including the

House of Representatives candidates, send their finance reports directly to the FEC.

Processing Campaign Finance Reports for FEC filers begins when a filer sends an original campaign finance document to the FEC. The FEC Mailroom usually receives the document, and the document is forwarded to the Processing Office (1.1.1). The Processing Office prepares the document for scanning and microfilming (1.1.2). The document is scanned/filmed (1.1.3). Processing then reassembles the original documents and forwards it to Data Systems for entry and coding (1.1.4).

Processing Campaign Finance Reports for Senate filers begins when the Secretary of the Senate forwards paper or microfilmed Senate documents to the FEC. The Processing Office receives the documents and logs in their receipt. If the documents are paper, the Processing Office forwards the documents to Public Records, which makes the documents available for public viewing. In addition, one paper copy of the documents is sent to Data Systems for entry and coding. If the documents are microfilm, the Processing Office splices the microfilm so that each office has a complete copy of the documents. The Processing Office then makes paper copies of the spliced microfilm. Processing then sends one paper copy to Public Records and one paper copy to Data Systems for coding.

1.1.1 Receiving Campaign Finance Reports begins when FEC filers send their disclosure reports to the FEC. Reports can be in several forms: paper, disk Version 1, disk Version 2, faxed, or via the Internet. The Processing Office processes reports that are faxed or hardcopy. Data Systems processes reports filed on diskettes or electronically through the Internet.

The Processing Office receives documents from several sources, including the Mailroom, other FEC Offices, the Clerk of the House, and Public Records. The Mailroom receives any mailed or hand-delivered documents. Upon receipt, the Mailroom opens envelopes, time-stamps the document, paperclips envelope to document, and delivers documents to the Processing Office. If the Mailroom is closed (after hours), Public Records receives hand deliveries and forwards them to the Processing Office. If another FEC Office (usually RAD) receives a campaign finance report or an amendment to a campaign finance report (sometimes reports are addressed to a RAD analyst), the office forwards the document to the Processing Office. If filers send House reports to the Clerk of the House, the prior point-of-entry for House Reports, FEC couriers bring the reports to the FEC, and the 48-hour deadline begins when the reports are received at the FEC. The Processing Office receives faxed reports directly.

The Data Systems Division (Data Systems) receives all electronic filings, which include disks. Data Systems uploads

the disks, prints the documents, and forwards paper copies to the Processing Office, unless the electronic filing is a Version 2 disk or filed via the Internet. (See Data Systems Division map, 2.1 Processing of Campaign Finance Reports (electronic) for a complete description of the process).

Processing staff log in receipt of all documents and place documents in Processing's in-box for document preparation (1.1.2).

1.1.2 Preparing Documents begins when a processing clerk removes the documents from the Processing in-box and screens them. If the documents are Senate filings, the clerk forwards them to the Secretary of the Senate, the appropriate point-of-entry for Senate documents. If the documents are not for the public record, then the Processing Office delivers documents to appropriate offices. If reports are FEC filings and are for the public record, the clerk separates reports by type of filer. The clerk separates documents by House filers and FEC Party/Non-Party filers so that the House documents can be printed and made available to the public as soon as possible. The clerk then prepares the documents for scanning by removing staples and separating multiple documents. Since the envelope is difficult to pass through the scanner, the clerk takes the relevant information on the envelope and completes the envelope replacement page, which is placed in back of each document. At this point, a processing clerk conducts a quality check by ensuring that

all documents are separated. The documents are ready to scan and film (1.1.3).

1.1.3 Scanning and Filming Documents begins when the scanner operator sets the 990 Scanner. This includes logging onto the computer system, setting up scan/film functions, calibrating the system, and setting frame numbers. Before and after scanning, the operator enters data into logbook: date, operator name, filer name, and batch and image numbers. The operator operates the scanner and conducts random spot checks to ensure quality scanning. The operator scans batches and places the documents on a table for Post-Processing (1.1.4).

1.1.4 Post-Processing Documents begins after the documents are scanned, and the operator conducts a quality check of imprint numbers to ensure that each page has been scanned.

The clerk reassembles and staples each original, counts the number of documents, and records this number in a log. The clerk prints the House reports and forwards them to Public Records for public viewing. The Processing Office delivers originals to Data Systems for entry and coding.

Post-Processing also includes processing of the microfilm. The clerk cuts the film and boxes it for messenger pickup. The messenger picks up the film and delivers it to the developer. Overnight, the developer develops the film and makes copies. The next day, the Processing Office checks

the quality of the film and splices nine copies of each roll so that each Office can have a complete copy of the documents. The Processing Office delivers the film to various FEC Offices, including Data Systems, RAD, OGC, Press Office, and Public Records. Meanwhile, the clerk checks the scan log. If there are errors, the clerk works with other FEC offices to resolve any entries on the Error Report. If there are no errors, the clerk takes no further action.

1.2 Processing Agency Documents begins when Public Records receives paper documents from various FEC offices. The source of the documents can be OGC, Audit, Staff Director, Press Office, or the Information Division. Documents include Matters Under Review (MURs), audits, advisory opinions, meeting documents, litigation documents, matching fund submissions, commission directives, commission bulletins, publications, Sunshine Act Notices, and press releases. Once received, Public Records places the paper documents in notebooks in the Public Records room for public viewing. Then, every year, during downtime, the Processing Office indexes documents and commits the paper to film, which is placed on the public record. Agency Document Processing for the Public Record has one subprocess.

1.2.1 Placing a Matter Under Review (MUR) on the Public Record begins when OGC sends to the Processing Office the original MUR. Processing prepares the MUR for filming and then films the MUR using the microfilm camera. The

Processing Office then reassembles the original document and returns it to OGC. Meanwhile, the Processing Office sends the film to a contractor to develop it overnight. The next day, the Processing Office splices the film to make complete copies and places the MUR in Public Records in accordance with Directive 48. Lastly, the Processing Office distributes film to other FEC offices and enters the location of the film into the MUR Search System.

1.3 Processing Internal Documents begins when an FEC office sends the Processing Office a document to be filmed. The source of the document is usually OGC, RAD, or Administration. The Processing Office prepares, films, reassembles, and returns the document to the appropriate Division. The Processing Office sends the film to a contractor for overnight developing. The contractor returns the film to the Processing Office, where Processing splices the film into complete copies. Copies of the film are delivered to the appropriate FEC office.

The Public Records Office is involved in several processes, including Responding to Information Requests (1.4). They are also responsible for processes that were not mapped, such as placing documents on the public record, developing intra-agency publications, conducting administrative activities, answering requests from other agencies, and coordinating the State relations program.


1.4 Responding to Information Requests begins when someone requests information. This process will normally follow a phone-based information request; however, information requests can also come in via postal mail, e-mail, fax, or in person. The clerk logs in the information request on an order sheet and places the order sheet in the in-box of the Chief of Public Records. During the day, the Chief of Public Records assigns each request to a researcher and places the order sheet in the box of the assigned researcher. The researcher fills the information request and then completes and signs a cover letter explaining what information is included in the packet. Public Records retains the order sheet in case follow-up is needed. The researcher places requested documents in an open, addressed envelope and leaves the entire packet in the in-box of the Chief of Public Records. The chief reviews the quality of the information, as well as copy quality. Upon approval, the Chief seals the envelope and places it in the out-box to be picked up by the mailroom clerks. The Mailroom clerk picks up the envelope, mails it, and completes the order form with the date mailed (on mail correspondence control slip). Note: Public requests for information usually require in-depth research, conversation, and follow-up.

1.0 Public Disclosure Division

PDD 1


Processing Office

Process: Processing Reports



Public Records Office

Process: Disclosure of Campaign Finance Information




¹ Campaign Finance Records, Commission Documents, Publications, Computer Printouts


² State Relations Program includes acting as liaison with state election offices, coordinating DSD, Press Office and the state Non-Filer Program functions

1.1 Processing Campaign Finance Reports

FEC Filers (Including House of Representatives)




Senate Filers



¹ 12 different types of documents

² Senate filers send the Secretary of the Senate paper reports. The Secretary films the reports and forwards the paper copy to the FEC. Then, after 500 pages have been filmed, the Secretary forwards the microfilm to the FEC.

1.1.1 Receiving Campaign Finance Reports



¹ 48-hour clock begins from date of receipt in FEC building (by statute). Although the Mailroom receives both Version 1 and 2 of disks, Data Systems only makes a copy of Version 1 to forward to the Processing Office. This process only tracks what is processed by the Processing Office. Internet, modem and version 2-based filings are processed by either Data Systems or the electronic filing contractor, SDR. See Data Systems' 2.1 Processing of Campaign Finance Reports (electronic) process for a complete process description.

² Receive hand deliveries if Mailroom is closed

³ Mailroom opens envelopes, time stamps, paper clips envelope to documents, and delivers documents to Public Disclosure Division; Receives hand deliveries as well. For disks, notifies SDR (contractor) by phone and SDR comes to get disks


⁴ A paper copy is only made of Version 1 of software and forwarded to the Processing Office.

⁵ Two deliveries a day

⁶ Receives and processes electronic filings

⁷ Incoming log data can be used to track source of documents, elapsed time, touch time

1.1.2 Preparing Documents




¹ FEC is not the first point-of-entry for Senate documents

² Separate documents into House filers and FEC party/non-party filers to track image frame numbers so paper copies can be made of House documents and be available to public more immediately among other reasons

³ Remove staples and separate multiple documents

⁴ Discard envelope


1.1.3 Scanning and Filming Documents



¹ Log onto computer program, set up scan/film functions, calibrate system, set frame numbers


² Log by batch: date, operator name, filer name, and batch numbers

1.1.4 Post-Processing Documents



¹Quality Control: Data Clerk goes through each PDD to ensure each PDD has been filmed/scanned by checking each PDD for 990 imprint numbers

²Staple documents by Envelope Replacement PDD



³ Overnight delivery of film copies


⁴Quality control check of film to ensure good quality, verify content, and take density reading

⁵ Error Report with beginning and ending frame numbers

⁶ Data Systems, RAD, OGC, Press Office, and Public Record


⁷ Usually RAD or Data Systems

1.2 Processing Agency Documents




¹Documents include closed Matters Under Review (MURs) (placed on Public Record as received because of Directive 48 and 11 CFR 111.20 specify a deadline of 30 days after being closed), Advisory Opinions, Meeting Documents, Litigation, Matching Fund Submissions (Placed on Public Record as received - once every four years), Commission Directives, Commission Bulletins, Publications, Sunshine Act Notices, Press Releases

1.2.1 Placing a MUR on the Public Record




1.3 Processing Internal Documents



¹ Payroll, internal RAD files, etc...

1.4 Responding to Information Requests



¹ Requests also come in via mail, e-mail, fax, and in person

² Only applies to mail correspondence control slips

2.0 Data Systems Division

Process Customers

Internal: RAD, Public Disclosure, OGC, Audit

External: Filers, Public

Process Descriptions

The Data Systems Division (Data Systems) is responsible for preparing and collecting data, disseminating data, and assisting with information technology. Preparing and collecting data includes making public within 48 hours required campaign finance information, which is captured in the Processing Campaign Finance Reports Process (2.1). Information technology assistance is not mapped because of the varying nature of the requests and responses.

2.1 Processing of Campaign Finance Reports (manual)

begins when the filer sends campaign finance documents to the FEC. The Mailroom receives disks (Versions 1 and 2) as well as paper documents, while Data Systems receives electronically filed forms. The Mailroom forwards disks to Data Systems. Data Systems uploads the data on both types of disks. Version 2 disks filter into the electronic processing of campaign finance documents, and Version 1 disk information is processed manually. Data Systems prints the information on the Version 1 disk and forwards the paper

copy to Processing for imaging. Processing also receives all paper copies of filings directly from the Mailroom, which are also imaged. When Data Systems receives the original documents from Processing, they log and sort the documents (2.1.1). Next, coders code the documents (2.1.2). Then the data entry staff enter the coded information into the system (2.1.3). Overnight, the system compares the image to what was entered and marries the data. The next day, a different data entry staff member enters the same data as a quality check (2.1.4).

If the document has itemized transactions, it needs further coding and entry (Pass III) (2.1.5). If the document does not need further coding, then the original document is forwarded to the RAD file room for analysis. Once Pass III coding is complete, Data Systems decides whether to do the data entry in-house or contract it out to ILM in Fredericksburg, Virginia. Either way, once Pass III data entry is complete (2.1.6), the system updates the data in the disclosure database.

Processing of Campaign Finance Reports (electronic) begins when either the Mailroom forwards Version 2 disks to Data Systems or the Filer electronically submits forms via the Internet. Once disks are received, Data Systems uploads the data. Then the system verifies the data, populates the database, creates TIF files, creates two sets of data files (Pass I and Pass III), and updates the disclosure database.

Before the disclosure database is updated, Data Systems conducts exception processing, a quality-control check. Also, when Data Systems receives electronically filed forms, they print out the forms and forward them to RAD. Processing Campaign Finance Documents manually incorporates six subprocesses.

2.1.1 Logging and Sorting for non-Senate documents begins when Processing sends Data Systems the paper non-Senate filings. Data Systems updates the log with the date, time, beginning and ending image frames, year, office, and logger's initials. If there is a problem, Data Systems checks their log against Processing's log. Data Systems verifies that the documents are sorted by House and Non-Party filers. A senior coding specialist distributes documents to assigned individuals for Pass I coding.

Logging and Sorting for Senate documents begins when Processing sends Data Systems the paper Senate filings. Data Systems updates the Senate log and assembles the documents for Pass I coding.

2.1.2 Conducting Pass I Coding begins when coders identify report type and check for line consistency. Then they identify committee type, coverage dates, amendment indicator, primary/general indicator (3, 3p), and database receipt date. Next, they color-code documents by

committee type with stickers.¹ Coders then check the identification number in the appropriate database and assign identification numbers for new 1, 2, 5i, 7, and i (if required). If the report covers more than one report type, the coder must generate a cross-referencing page (substitute sheet) to be scanned, coded, and entered as an additional report. Coders then sort documents by database.² Lastly, the coders count documents and time spent coding for timesheet. The documents are now ready for Pass I data entry.

2.1.3 Conducting Pass I Data Entry begins when a Data Systems staff member manually logs in the documents by batches. The data entry clerks pick up batches of paper documents and sort batches by form type. Each type of document has a unique screen for data entry. Separating documents eliminates toggling between screens. The data entry clerks enter the data that has been coded. When finished, they place the original document in a specified file cabinet for the evening. Overnight, the system automatically updates the disclosure database(s) and ties the imaged document to the information that has been updated. In addition, the system begins the automatic tracking system, enters and verifies the data, updates processes, and identifies errors. The system conducts logical checks for duplicates,

¹ Committee types are Presidential, House, Senate, Party, and Non-Party.

² There are separate databases for each two-year election cycle.

etc. The next day, a different technician takes a batch of documents and prints out a copy of an RP1.³ Once the update process begins,⁴ the system cannot be used until the following morning.

2.1.4 Conducting Pass I Data Entry/Verification (double entry) begins when the second technician rekeys the coded data and corrects any data entry errors using the RP1 report information. The technician flags documents with error codes for special handling by a senior coder. The system then applies RAD's priority threshold indicators to the document, and if the document meets or exceeds the threshold level, the system prints "Priority" on the verification printout for those documents. Priority documents are those that RAD needs to work on as soon as possible, and the priority label tells Data Systems to code and enter these documents before nonpriority documents. The technician then sorts the documents, based on priority and filer type. Next the technician brings the batches to assigned areas, based on filer type.

2.1.5 Conducting Pass III Coding begins when coders sort the documents to determine whether Pass III coding is needed. Itemized and codable transactions of new/amended documents must go through Pass III coding. If Pass III coding

³ The RP1 printout consists of the Pass I Data Entry Journal with error codes.

⁴ Around 7:30 p.m.

is not necessary, coders manually update the Reports Status System (RSS) with the date that the file was sent to RAD and forward the documents to the RAD file room. If Pass III is needed, coders analyze and code the documents and count the transactions. Data Systems then determines if the contractor should enter the data for Pass III or if data entry should be performed in-house.⁵ If the contractor performs Pass III entry, Data Systems limits batches to 4,000 transactions⁶ and sends them to the contractor for entry. At the end of each day, coders update RSS with the number of transactions and batch documents coded that day.

2.1.6 Conducting Pass III Data Entry/Verification begins when Data Systems either sends documents to the contractor for entry or performs data entry themselves. If the contractor is responsible for performing Pass III entry, the contractor enters the data and returns the documents to Data Systems. A senior coder checks all contractor-entered documents for omissions/errors, corrects errors, and performs additional data entry, if necessary. Once data entry is complete, the documents are sent to the RAD file room.


⁵ Most documents for prior election cycles and low-volume amendments for the current election cycle stay in-house.

⁶ FEC pays the contractor on a per transaction basis.

If Data Systems conducts Pass III data entry, then data entry clerks enter the data and forward the original files to the RAD file room. The data, which is now in the system, is automatically updated overnight. The system prints out a journal if any reconciliation errors are found. The disclosure databases are populated. No matter who performs data entry, Data Systems updates the RSS system with the date that entry was completed.

2.0 Data Systems Division

DSD 1




¹Data Dissemination includes programming and indexing journals.

²Information Technology includes: network administration, programming, operations, technical support and training, research and development (strategic technical planning)

2.0 Data Systems Division


DSD 2

2.1 Processing of Campaign Finance Reports




2.1 Processing of Campaign Finance Reports, continued

Manual Processing




Electronic Processing




⁴ Forms 1, 2, 6, MS, 1M go to RAD File Room; Forms 3, 3P, 3x, 5i, 7, i and 4 get coded.
⁵ Volume, specific situation, etc. warrant use of contractor. Currently, the contractor is ILM.
⁶ System automatically updates database overnight.

2.1.1 Logging and Sorting

Non- Senate Documents



Senate Documents




¹ Date, time, beginning and ending image number, year and office (03 - FEC, 02- Senate), logger's initials. This log is used by Irene to compare with Processing's log.

² Photocopies of originals

³ Log is used to ensure duplicate copies do not exist because Senate sends over microfilm once a week and paper once a day.

2.1.2 Conducting Pass 1 Coding




¹ Identify Presidential, House, Senate, Party, Non-Party with color-coded stickers. Check B-Index if don't know committee type.

² So no duplication of documents.

³ FEC maintains separate Databases by 2-year election cycle

2.1.3 Conducting Pass 1 Data Entry



¹ Each type of document has a unique screen for data entry. Separating documents eliminates toggling between screens


² First step in creating an electronic document - ties images together

³ The System begins to update around 7:30 p.m. - takes approximately 12 hours. During the update process, no work can be done with the system until 7:30 a.m. The update begins Auto Tracking System which is the first initial check of reporting error - conducts logical checks for duplicates, etc.

⁴ Keep in order as entered. Store in special area.

⁵ RP1 Printout consists of Pass 1 Data Entry Journal with error codes


2.1.4 Conducting Pass 1 Data Entry Verification (Double Entry)



¹ Priority labeling requested by RAD. RAD determined the threshold level and the system is set to print "Priority" on the verification printout.

2.0 Data Systems Division


2.1.5 Conducting Pass 3 Coding



¹ Itemized and codeable transactions of new/amended documents must go through Pass 3 Coding

² Amendments almost always stay in-house. Primarily, current election cycle database documents go to the contractor. Documents for different election cycles cannot be combined in the same batch.

2.1.6 Conducting Pass 3 Data Entry/Verification



3.0 Reports Analysis Division

Process Customers

Internal: OGC, Audit, Data Systems, Public Records, and Information Division

External: Filers, Public, and Candidates

Process Descriptions

The Reports Analysis Division responsibilities are divided into five mapped processes and one not-mapped process, Processing FOIA Requests.

3.1 Processing Campaign Finance Documents begins when Data Systems completes the required data entry (Pass I or Pass III) of campaign finance information. Data Systems then forwards the original campaign finance documents to the RAD file room, which houses current election cycle campaign finance documents. Upon receipt, a file room clerk sorts the documents by committee type and files the documents in file folders chronologically and by form type. Reports analysts have access to a workflow program that, when queried, allows them to view the committees to which they have been assigned. The analyst chooses a committee to review and pulls that committee's file folder. Rather than use the original paper document to review the data, the

analyst can work off the report image. Either way, the reports analyst begins to review and analyze the report.

3.1.1 Reviewing and Analyzing the Report begins when the reports analyst compares the original document with the R Index. The R Index provides a history of the committee's filings, based on Pass I data entry. For example, the R Index shows whether a previous filing was new or amended, the type of document (monthly, midyear, etc.), the beginning cash on hand, coverage dates, total receipts, and ending cash on hand. The analyst then reviews for compliance, which consists of mathematical, content, and disclosure analyses. The analyst notes any compliance problems on his or her logbook. Missing or perceived incorrect information triggers the Request for Additional Information Process (3.2).

At any time in the process, if the analyst finds data entry errors, the analyst sends the file containing the original document back to Data Systems for correction. Data Systems corrects the error(s) and sends the folder to the RAD file room. If the analyst uncovers any compliance problems, he or she sends a letter to the committee, indicating the problems. When the compliance review is complete, the analyst notes any problems with the report in his logbook.

If the analyst does not find any compliance problems or at the end of the RFAI process, the analyst updates the Report Status System (RSS) and returns the report to the RAD file room. The RSS contains information about the committee's

filings, including Pass I and Pass III start and end dates, the coder's name, and the date that Data Systems sent the file to RAD. Finally, the file room clerk files the report. Any report that is not for the current year's database is sent to Archives because of file room space constraints.

3.2 Processing Requests for Additional Information (RFAI)

begins when the analyst conducting the document review needs additional information from the filer to complete the review. The reports analyst decides whether the letter is tracked (RFAI) or nontracked (informational). If the letter is nontracked, the reports analyst sends an informational notice to the filer. The reports analyst fills out with codes one transmittal form per request and forwards all forms related to a committee to the secretary for completion. From the codes, the secretary composes a letter and returns the letter to the reports analyst for review. The reports analyst reviews the letter and, if complete, signs the letter and forwards it, along with the appropriate folder, to the branch chief for approval. The reports analyst retains a copy of the letter, puts a copy of the RFAI into the committee's folder, and returns this folder to the RAD file room. Meanwhile, the branch chief reviews the letter and, if there are no problems, forwards the letter to the Compliance Branch. If there is a problem, the branch chief sends the letter back to the analyst, who corrects the problem and sends the edits to the secretary for retyping. Once typed, secretary gives the letter back to the analyst, who forwards it to the branch chief for

another review. Once the letter is correct, the branch chief forwards the letter to the Compliance Branch.

The Compliance Branch tracks the mail date and makes two copies of the letter. A compliance analyst enters the RFAI data into the disclosure database. A compliance analyst sends the original letter to the filer, forwards one copy to Public Records, and retains one for the compliance files.

The filer is given 15 days in the letter to respond to the RFAI. If the filer does not respond in three weeks (21 days), a compliance analyst sends the filer a second RFAI letter. Once again, the filer has 15 days to respond to the RFAI. If the filer still does not respond, the reports analyst identifies any outstanding issues. These issues are weighed in terms of importance and whether the filer should be referred to Audit or OGC. If RAD decides not to refer the matter to Audit or OGC, the outstanding issues remain outstanding and are noted on the analyst's log for possible action at a later date.

If the filer responds in 15 days, the compliance clerk reviews the response to see whether the response is adequate. If the response is adequate, the reports analyst reviews the response for accuracy and for compliance problems. If the analyst finds that the response is not accurate or that other compliance problems exist, the analyst notes the problems as an outstanding issue. If the analyst discovers a compliance problem, he or she must determine whether it is an audit issue (assign audit points) and/or a legal issue. If the

filer receives enough audit points, RAD refers the committee to the Commissioners for a possible audit. If the analyst finds a problem that meets OGC's threshold, the analyst prepares review documents for OGC and forwards a referral to them. Otherwise, the issues remain outstanding.

3.3 Processing Non-Filer Notices begins when a compliance analyst reviews a computer printout of filers who have not filed by the deadline. The compliance analyst provides the reports analyst with the names of the non- or late filers. The compliance analyst checks with other departments to see whether the report has been filed, and whether Processing, SDR (the electronic filing contractor), and/or Data Systems are still working with the report. If the report has not been filed, the compliance analyst sends the filer a nonfiler notice.

3.4 Processing Debt Settlements. According to law, committees must settle debts with creditors, so to help facilitate settlement, FEC requires the committees to file a Debt Settlement Plan. Debt Settlement Processing (DSP) begins when the reports analyst receives the debt settlement request from a committee attempting to terminate. The reports analyst forwards the request to the compliance analyst and PFESP staff. The compliance analyst reviews the DSP and sends the committee an RFAI if needed (begin 3.2 RFAI Process). Once all information is received from the requester, the compliance analyst determines whether the committee meets the criteria for a debt settlement. If the


committee meets the criteria, the FEC accepts the settlement with a possible PFESP review and closes the case. RAD tells PFESP that the matter meets the review threshold. PFESP prepares a formal memo to the Commission, analyzing the request and making recommendations to the Commission. The Commission reviews the recommendation, and if the Commissioners approve the termination and/or settlement approval letter, the compliance analyst sends the committee a settlement approval letter and a termination letter, if appropriate.

If the committee does not meet the criteria, the settlement is not accepted, and the compliance analyst sends the committee a letter saying that the settlement offer was not approved.

3.5 Processing Administrative Terminations. Committees are required to file campaign finance reports even if no money has exchanged hands. Since it costs money to have nonfilers in the system, RAD has a process that "terminates" committees so that they are not required to file. Processing Administrative Terminations begins when either RAD periodically reviews its files or when a committee requests an administrative termination. RAD, with OGC/PFESP assistance if necessary, determines whether the filer meets the thresholds for administrative termination. Either way, RAD sends the filer a letter indicating its decision. If RAD receives no response, then the filer is automatically administratively terminated.

3.0 Reports Analysis Division


RAD 1



Reports Analysis Division


RAD 2

3.1 Processing Campaign Finance Documents




¹ Report Analysts can use a Workflow Program (Program 117) any time to see which committees they are assigned which have documents to be reviewed

3.1.1 Reviewing and Analyzing Reports




²Data entry problems can be identified throughout the review of the report. The analyst compares the coder's marks with what should have been coded and what was entered into the database. Problems are noted and when the Compliance Review is complete, the corrections will be sent to Data Systems for correction.

3.1.2 Updating Status Report and Refiling Original Documents




³Reports are archived August of the non-election year because of file room space constraints


3.2 Processing Requests for Additional Information (RFAs)




⁴ Informational Notices inform the Filer of future actions to take which would make analyzing the report easier. No reply is required.



3.2 Processing Requests for Additional Information (RFAs) (Continued)




3.2 Processing Requests for Additional Information (RFAs) (Continued)



Reports Analysis Division

3.3 Processing Non-Filer Notices

Compliance Branch




¹ Printout indicates who has not filed


² Report might have been received, but in processing. Analyst checks with Mail Room, Processing and Data Systems.

³ Mail by the 4th of the month

3.4 Processing Debt Settlements



3.5 Processing Administrative Terminations (AT)



4.0 Audit Division

Process Customers

Internal: OGC, RAD

External: Filers, Public, Department of the Treasury

Process Descriptions

The Audit Division is responsible for processes within the following categories: Audit-For-Cause (4.1), Audit-For-Cause Referral (437(g)) (4.2), and Presidential Public Funding Program (4.3).

4.1 Audits-For-Cause. For purposes of analysis, this process has been separated into four subprocesses.

4.1.1 Preparing for Commission Vote and Notifying

Candidates/Committees begins when the staff at the Reports Analysis Division (RAD) reviews each report filed by Federal candidates, committees, and political parties to ensure that they have complied with the disclosure requirements and the limits and prohibitions on contributions. A confidential point system is used to assign points to violations of FECA. When RAD recognizes areas of apparent noncompliance or deficiencies, it assigns points to the reports. Once a certain threshold of points is reached, the referral is forwarded to the Audit Division for further investigation.

Audit receives these referrals in batches from RAD. They generally receive the candidate committee referrals in March following the year of the general election. The statute written by Congress requires FEC to initiate the audit within six months after the general election. Once the pool of referrals is received from RAD, Audit has six weeks to get authorization from the Commissioners and commence the audit.

For referrals of noncandidate committees (e.g., PACs, Party committees), Audit also receives these referrals in batches from RAD, generally during the period from August to December following the year of the general election. The statute requires FEC to initiate the audit within 30 days of the Commission's vote to conduct an audit.

In the case of candidate committee referrals, after Audit quickly reviews the referrals, Audit attaches a cover letter and takes them to the next Commission meeting for approval. The Commissioners and Audit decide on how many audits they are capable of completing, given the timing and the available resources. They generally will select for audit the referrals that generated the most points. Four out of six Commissioner votes are needed for approval. The referrals that fail to get Commissioner approval or are not pursued because of lack of resources are considered closed at this time. However, referral to OGC from RAD may still be considered.

For noncandidate committee referrals, Audit also conducts a quick review of the referrals and then attaches a cover letter requesting that the Commission determine which referrals will not be subject to audit. Audit forwards those remaining referrals to the Commission for approval to conduct an audit as resources permit.

Once approval is granted, the Audit Division sends an overnight engagement letter to the committee stating that it has been selected for an audit. This document requests certain key information that the auditors will need to look at in advance to start the fieldwork. The auditors will then contact the candidate or committee to schedule the fieldwork. The auditee can either have the auditors start right away or request a delay. In the latter case, the audit will be scheduled outside the 30-day or six-month window. This contact of the candidate/committee and scheduling are presumed to be initiation of the audit, meeting statutory requirements.

4.1.2 Conducting Preaudit begins when auditors contact RAD and the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) to discuss any pending items concerning the auditee such as Matters Under Review (MURs). They review past and present reports to see trends and identify different areas on which they may want to focus more attention during the audit. They analyze the receipts and disbursements as disclosed in the reporting. They reconcile these data and set

up to compare them to the financial data provided by the candidate/committee.

When a candidate/committee is selected for an audit-for-cause, a full-scope audit is always done. After the auditors complete their analysis in the preaudit process, a modification of the audit program may be necessary to further focus analysis .

4.1.3 Conducting Fieldwork begins when Audit conducts an entrance conference with the candidate/committee. This conference explains, in general terms, why they were selected for an audit, what they can expect, and also what initial information the auditee will need to provide. The auditee also provides the auditors contact names to use in the field.

The auditors first conduct an inventory of records, including limited testing to determine whether the records are materially complete and in an auditable state. If a material portion of the records have not been provided, the auditee is notified in writing and given 30 days to obtain the requested records. If at the end of this 30-day period the records are available, fieldwork will commence. If not, the auditors may recommend to the Commission that subpoenas for records be authorized, both to the auditee and any other entities in possession of the relevant records.

Once the records are deemed materially complete, the auditors conduct the fieldwork, using the audit program developed during the preaudit phase. They perform tests and, depending on the amount of activity, use sampling methods to test the auditee's transactions. They gather evidence and data to support the findings in the final report and to maintain as workpapers.

At the end of the fieldwork, an exit conference is conducted. At this time, the auditors disclose to the candidate/committee material findings based on predetermined thresholds that are standard for all audits.

When the auditors leave the field, the auditee has 10 days to submit an official response to the findings disclosed at the exit conference. The auditee may send the auditors any documented evidence, receipts, or reports that may prove a finding incorrect.

4.1.4 Conducting Postaudit and Processing the Audit

Report begin when the auditors return from the field. The auditors prepare an interim audit report that discloses any material findings. This report encompasses all responses submitted by the auditee after the exit conference. The auditors consider the magnitude of the findings and decide whether the findings are sufficient enough to include in the report. The auditors compare the findings to the parameters set by the Commission and also determine whether further analysis by the OGC is warranted.

At this time, the Audit staff completes the audit program and indexes the workpapers. The manager of the team reviews the workpapers. Once the draft interim report is completed, it, along with the workpapers, undergoes a peer review.

If the findings are significant and do not contain any unresolved legal issues, the report is prepared and forwarded to the auditee. The report bypasses the Commission at this time. The auditee has 30 days to respond to the claims and can also receive a 15-day extension.

After receiving the auditee response or the 45-day response period has elapsed, the Auditors prepare the Audit Report. This report encompasses the response from the auditee. The report is peer-reviewed and forwarded to the Commissioners for a tally vote or for consideration at an open Commission meeting. Upon approval of the Commissioners, the final report is provided to the auditee, and a few days later the report is released to the public.

If a finding in the interim report contains any unresolved legal issues, the Audit Division will forward the report to OGC. OGC will analyze the finding and determine legal implications. After OGC review, OGC will forward its legal analysis to the Audit Division. If the auditors agree with the OGC analysis, the auditors will incorporate it into the interim report and forward it to the Commissioners. If Audit disagrees with the OGC report, Audit will write a separate

cover page and attach it to the front of the interim report with its analysis of the issues.

The reports will go to the Commissioners for their consideration at an executive session in which they will discuss and vote on the interim report. If the Commissioners approve the report, it will be sent to the auditee. The auditee then has 30 days (plus a possible 15-day extension) to respond. If the report is not approved, it is reworked for resubmission or it is simply held with no further action and is never publicly released.

After receiving the auditee responses or the 45-day response period has elapsed, the Audit Report is prepared and peer-reviewed. The responses are reviewed with OGC for adequacy and completeness. If unresolved legal issues still remain at this point, the final report is then forwarded to OGC for analysis (as described above). Once completed, the Audit Report is then forwarded to the Commissioners for a tally vote or for consideration at an open Commission meeting. Upon approval by the Commissioners, the official report is provided to the auditee. A few days later, the report is released to the public.

4.2 Audit-For-Cause. 4.2.1 Referral (437(g)) process is divided into four subprocesses. **4.2.1 Receiving Referral** begins when OGC determines that as a result of its MUR investigations, some evidence may warrant an audit of a

committee. Depending on the matter, a full-scope audit may not be necessary.

When OGC determines that a committee should be audited, OGC sends a memo to the Commissioners stating the reasons and recommendation for an audit. Through informal methods, the Commissioners will contact the Audit Division to assess their current availability of resources. If Audit's resources are unavailable at this time, the case can be put on hold until resources can be allocated to the audit. If it is deemed that resources would not be available in a timely manner, the referral is closed.

If the Audit Division has available resources to allocate, the Commissioners vote on the memo. Upon approval of the Commissioners, Audit works with OGC to determine the audit scope and parameters. They also determine whether Audit is to perform a full-scope audit or a modified-scope audit. It is sometimes possible to perform a modified-scope audit in-house without contacting the auditee when there is enough information already gathered between election reports and what OGC has already obtained. The audit is scheduled with or without contacting the auditee, depending on the scope of the audit. If the auditee is to be contacted, a letter will be sent overnight to the committee informing it of the audit and preferable dates that fieldwork is to be performed. The Audit Division will contact the committee the following day and confirm the arrangements.

Note: The following steps in the preaudit process may or may not be performed, depending on the type of audit and various circumstances surrounding the audits.

4.2.2 Conducting Preaudit Process begins when the auditors contact RAD and OGC to discuss any pending items concerning the auditee and any other pending MURs. They review past and present reports to see trends and identify different areas on which they may want to focus more attention during the audit. Auditors analyze the receipts and disbursements as disclosed in the reporting and organize the information, using different sorts so that they analyze the data from different perspectives. They reconcile these data and compare them to the financial data provided by the candidate/committee.

After completing their analysis in the preaudit process, a modification of the audit program may be necessary to add or delete additional areas that they may need to investigate further.

4.2.3 Conducting Fieldwork. A typical audit begins with a conference to explain the purpose of the audit, what the auditee can expect, and also what initial information needs to be provided. The auditee also establishes contacts for the auditors while they are in the field.

The fieldwork is then conducted, using the audit program developed during the preaudit phase. Auditors perform tests

and, depending on the amount of activity, use sampling methods to test the auditee's transactions. They gather evidence and data to keep in the workpapers that will be used to support the findings in the final report.

At the end of the fieldwork, the auditors conduct an exit conference in which they disclose to the candidate any material findings found, according to predetermined thresholds that are standard for all audits. Generally, the auditee has 10 days to submit a response to the disclosed findings. The auditee may send the auditors any documented evidence, receipts, or reports that may prove a finding incorrect.

If the audit is to be performed in-house with no contact with the auditee, the fieldwork is conducted at the FEC offices by gathering evidence and data from the information already obtained.

4.2.4 Conducting the Postaudit and Processing Audit Report begins when the auditors complete the fieldwork. Auditors prepare an audit report that discloses the material findings or information requested by OGC. This report encompasses any relevant auditee response to the discussed findings.

At this time, the auditors complete the audit program and the indexing of the workpapers. The manager of the team

reviews the workpapers. The completed report, along with the workpapers, undergoes a peer review.

The report is then given to OGC and is included in the OGC scope of investigation. OGC will use the report in its analysis of the MUR. There may be follow-up questions from OGC for further understanding. Once OGC is finished and the MUR is closed, the MUR and the audit report are opened for public record.

4.3 Presidential Public Funding Program is divided into two sections. Under the FECA, the Commission is required to determine whether candidates meet certain eligibility criteria and to certify candidates eligible to receive public funds. The public funding program involves certifying eligibility (primary elections), funding primary elections, funding conventions, and generating general election grants.

4.3.1 Certifying Presidential Public Funding is divided into three maps. **4.3.1.1 Certifying Eligibility (Primary Elections)**. Primary election candidates seeking matching funds submit to the FEC a Letter of Agreements and Certifications (9033 Letter), which is a contract with the Government in which a candidate promises to comply with the law and to submit to an FEC audit in exchange for public funding. A candidate's "threshold submissions" may accompany this letter as well.

Threshold submissions include documentation of individual contributions up to \$250 each. The FEC requires participants in the Presidential public funding program to submit contribution information through electronic media in order to expedite the certification and disbursement of matching funds. Data Systems makes hardcopy printouts of the threshold submissions for use in Audit.

Audit conducts a threshold review on all submissions, with zero tolerance for error. The Deputy Assistant Staff Director of Audit manages this process with temporary staff to

- Verify that each check is matchable by State, based on statutory criteria;
- Verify that contributor information is adequate (i.e., includes name of contributor, occupation, and correct signature); and
- Analyze threshold submissions for any unusual patterns or trends.

Audit staff follow standard review procedures for threshold submissions to verify that the requests meet the necessary requirements of matchability.

The threshold review process is repeated again by a different temporary staff person, reviewed by the Deputy Assistant Staff Director, and then reviewed again by an available auditor. In addition, the Deputy Assistant Staff Director

identifies apparent trends, using Data Systems Division printouts that sort the threshold submissions based on a variety of single variables.

If the candidate submits all appropriate documents and meets the necessary requirements, Audit prepares an eligibility report for the Commissioners. Upon report approval, Audit drafts a letter to the Treasury requesting the disbursement of funds. If the requirements are not met, Audit proactively works with candidates to help them become eligible for matching funds. Although this has never occurred, if the candidate could not meet the eligibility requirements, Audit would issue an ineligibility report, which would be reviewed by OGC for legal compliance and voted on by the Commission.

4.3.1.2 Certifying Matching Funds (monthly) begins with the candidate submitting monthly lists of contributions up to \$250 from individuals for matching. Presidential candidates and committees are also required to provide electronic media for all matching submissions. The media are reviewed for completeness and sent to Data Systems to download and from which to draw a sample. After eligibility certification, the Audit staff rely on sample committee submissions to determine the appropriate amount that is matchable. Audit uses reject codes to indicate why specific submissions within the sample were not matchable. If a sample has too many unmatchable submissions, the entire request for matching funds could be rejected for that month. Audit

determines how much to certify for Commission approval. Upon Commissioner approval, the FEC issues a letter to the Treasury for funds disbursement.

4.3.1.3 Certifying Matching Funds (conventions) is a grant process that takes only a few days and occurs once every four years. The Treasurer or President of the convention committee sends to Audit a Request-for-Funds letter. Audit reviews the letter, works with the committee to make any necessary revisions, and makes a recommendation to disburse funds. The letter is forwarded to OGC for legal analysis. Audit incorporates any feedback from OGC into a report to the Commission that recommends funding the convention. The Commission generally votes within 24 hours to approve the funding, and Audit drafts and forwards an approval letter to the Treasury.

4.3.1.4 Certifying Matching Funds (general election) begins when the parties nominate the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. The candidates immediately send a signed Nomination Letter to the FEC. Audit and OGC simultaneously review the letter to make sure that it satisfies all of the necessary requirements. Audit will work with the candidates to quickly identify any information that may have been neglected and correct the situation. Once the FEC accepts the letter, Audit prepares a Grant Eligibility Report. The Commission immediately votes to approve the funding, and Audit drafts a letter certifying payment, which is

couriered to the Treasury. This entire process only takes a few hours.

4.3.2 Title 26 Audits is divided into three subprocesses.

4.3.2.1 Conducting Preaudit begins when auditors educate themselves on issues surrounding the candidate and prepare for the fieldwork and is often started before the candidate has dropped out of the election. Once the candidate has dropped out, the FEC will contact him or her to schedule the audit. Auditors contact RAD and OGC to discuss any pending items concerning the auditee, such as Matters Under Review (MURs). They review past and present reports to see trends and identify different areas that they may want to focus more attention on during the audit. They analyze the receipts and disbursements as disclosed in the election reporting. The data are sorted into different categories for different methods of testing. Auditors reconcile these data and compare them to the financial data provided by the candidate. Computerized data are required for Title 26 audits.

A full-scope audit is always conducted for the Presidential audits. After completing their analysis in the preaudit process, auditors may modify the audit program to add additional areas that warrant further review.

4.3.2.2 Conducting Fieldwork begins with an entrance conference with the candidate and the FEC auditors. This conference explains what the auditee can expect during the audit and also what initial information the auditors will need.

The auditee also provides the necessary committee contacts for the FEC auditors while they are in the field.

Auditors conduct an inventory of records, including limited testing to determine whether the records are materially complete and in an auditable state. If the auditee has not provided a material portion of the records, auditors notify the auditee in writing that the auditee has 30 days to provide the requested records. If at the end of this 30-day period, the records are provided, fieldwork will commence. If the requested records are not provided, the auditors may recommend to the Commission that subpoenas for records be authorized, both to the auditee and any other entities in possession of the relevant records.

The auditors commence fieldwork, using the audit program developed during the preaudit phase. They gather data and perform various tests (generally using sampling methods) on the transactions of the candidate. They gather evidence and document the results in the workpapers that will be used to support the findings in the final report.

At the conclusion of fieldwork, auditors conduct an exit conference. At this time, the auditors disclose to the candidate any material findings found that meet the predetermined thresholds that are standard for all audits. The auditee has ten days to submit an official response to the findings and may send the auditors any documented

evidence, receipts, or reports that may prove a finding incorrect.

4.3.2.3 Conducting Post Audit and Processing Audit Report

begins when the auditors return from the field, and they prepare the Exit Conference Memorandum that discloses the material findings. This report encompasses auditee comments.

At this time, the audit staff complete the audit program and index the workpapers for review by the audit manager and a subsequent peer review.

The final memorandum is forwarded to OGC for an informal legal review of the findings. Once this review is complete, the reports are returned to the Audit Division.

The memorandum is presented to the candidate or his or her designee(s) at a formal meeting for a formal response to the findings. Committee officials, the auditors, and OGC also attend the meeting. The candidate has 60 days to respond and can obtain an additional 15-day extension, if necessary. Once the Audit Division receives the candidate's responses, they draft the Audit Report.

Audit forwards the Audit Report to OGC for legal analysis. OGC analyzes the report and makes any necessary recommendations. If audit agrees with the OGC analysis, Audit will incorporate the OGC recommendations and

analysis into the report. Audit then forwards the report to the Commissioners. If Audit disagrees with the OGC recommendations, Audit attaches a separate cover letter to the final report, explaining the situation and the differences of opinion. Audit forwards the reports to the Commissioners for an open session vote under the "Sunshine Laws." An informational copy of the report for consideration by the Commission is forwarded to the candidate prior to the vote.

Multiple sessions may occur before the Commission votes on the recommendations, and the Audit Division and OGC may be called upon to discuss their recommendations. During these sessions, the Commission may approve, alter, or reject in its entirety the report recommendations for repayments. Once the Commission renders a vote, the report is final and is made public. However, if the Commissioners vote against the recommendations for repayment, the public record will include an explanation concerning the Commissioners' votes. No repayments are required of the candidate when the Commissioners vote against the recommendations. It takes four votes to uphold a repayment determination in an audit report.

When the Commissioners approve a recommendation for repayment, the candidate has 30 days to petition the Commission for a hearing to argue the repayment assessed against him or her. Depending on other significant findings found during the audit, a referral may be sent to OGC under the MUR track.

4.0 Audit Division

AUD 1

4.1 Audit-For-Cause


4.2 Audit-For-Cause: Referral
(437(g))

4.3 Presidential
Public Funding
Program


4.0 Audit Division

AUD 2


4.1 Audit-For-Cause




4.1.1 Preparing for Commission Vote and Notifying Candidates/ Committees




4.1.2 Conducting Pre-Audit



4.1.3 Conducting Fieldwork




4.1.4 Conducting the Post-Audit and Processing the Audit Report



Audit Division


AUD 5

4.2 Audit-For-Cause: Referral (437(g))




Audit Division

4.2.1 Receiving Referral




4.2.2 Conducting Pre-Audit


(Varies depending on scope of audit)



4.2.3 Conducting Fieldwork




4.2.4 Conducting Post-Audit and Processing Audit Report




Audit Division

4.3 Presidential Public Funding Program

4.3.1 Presidential Public Funding Certification




4.3.2 Title 26 Audits



An audit of all presidential candidates receiving public funds is mandated by statute. The FEC has an internal policy that all presidential audits must be completed within two years of the general election.

4.3.1 Certifying Presidential Public Funding

4.3.1.1 Certifying Eligibility (Primary Elections)




¹ Regulations set a deadline of 15 days to determine eligibility

² Normally check 21-22 states. One pass takes a couple of hours per state


³ Logical checks based on review of the documents and electronic records provided

⁴This is an opportunity for the candidate to appeal the decision and demonstrate he or she has met the requirements


4.3.1.2 Certifying Matching Funds (Primary Elections)



4.3.1.3 Certifying Matching Funds (Conventions)



4.3.1.4 Certifying Matching Funds (General Election)¹




¹ Process only takes a couple of hours to complete.

Audit Division


4.3.2 Title 26 Audit

4.3.2.1 Conducting Pre-Audit


FEC staff tracks candidates and begins scheduling former candidate audits (primary losers and drop outs)



4.3.2 Conducting Fieldwork



4.3.2.3 Conducting Post-Audit and Processing Audit Report



5.0 Office of the General Counsel

Process Customers

Internal: Other FEC Offices

External: Filers, Public

Process Descriptions

The Office of the General Counsel is divided into four divisions: Public Financing, Ethics, and Special Projects; Policy; Enforcement; and Litigation. High-level process maps have been drawn for each.

5.1 Public Financing, Ethics, and Special Projects (PFESP) is responsible for two mapped processes and five areas of responsibility not mapped: reviewing debt settlements, administrative terminations, ethics, Title 2 audits, and managing special projects. These latter processes were not mapped either because they represent a small portion of the total workload or because they typically are not process driven.

5.1.1 Prosecuting Violations begins when Audit refers a case or Enforcement forwards a matter to PFESP. [See the process map for a description of the process following this section.]

Within **5.1.2 Conducting Legal Review of Public Financing**, several subprocesses exist.

5.1.2.1A Reviewing Eligibility for Matching Funds begins when PFESP receives a request from the Audit Division to review candidate's Letter of Agreements and Certifications (9033 Letter) for legal accuracy. This letter is a contract with the Government in which a candidate promises to comply with the law and to submit to an FEC audit in exchange for public funding. PFESP conducts a legal review, generates a report concerning its review, and forwards the report to the Associate General Counsel for review and approval. If the Associate General Counsel does not approve the report, the attorney who drafted the report rereviews the legal analysis, incorporates edits into the report, and resubmits the edited report for review and approval. If the Associate General Counsel approves the report, PFESP sends comments to Audit. Audit sends the Commissioners the recommendation, which the Commissioners consider. If approved, PFESP sends notification to the candidate.

5.1.2.1B Reviewing an Ineligibility Determination After Candidate Has Been Determined Eligible begins after Audit initially determines that a candidate is eligible for matching funds, but then finds the candidate to be ineligible by the 10 percent rule. In addition, candidates are no longer eligible for public funds after they withdraw from the race. A PFESP attorney reviews Audit's determination, drafts a memo concerning date of ineligibility, and forwards the draft to the

Associate General Counsel for review. If the Associate General Counsel does not approve the memo, then the staff attorney redrafts the memo, incorporating the comments, and resubmits the memo for review. If the Associate General Counsel approves the memo, the attorney sends the memo to the Commissioners for consideration and a tally vote. If the Commissioners vote to approve the date of ineligibility, PFESP notifies the candidate of the Commissioners' decision. If the Commissioners do not agree with the date of ineligibility, the Commissioners return the memo to PFESP for revision. If the candidate challenges the ineligibility date determination, the process repeats for a Final Determination.

5.1.2.1C Reviewing Ineligibility Prior to Candidate Being Determined Eligible begins when PFESP receives a request from Audit to conduct a legal review of a 9033 Letter. PFESP conducts an analysis and submits it to the General Counsel for review and approval. If the General Counsel does not approve the analysis, the attorney reconsiders and redrafts his or her analysis and resubmits the document to the General Counsel for approval. If the General Counsel approves the analysis, PSESP forwards the review to Audit for comment. Using Audit's comments, PSESP drafts a memo to the Commissioners concerning the legal review and forwards the memo to the General Counsel for review.

Upon approval, PFESP sends the memo to the Commissioners, who review the memo. If approved, PFESP sends a Statement of Reason (SOR) notification to the

candidate. The candidate reviews the SOR notification and responds to the findings. PFESP reviews the response and forwards it to Audit for comment. PFESP incorporates Audit's comments into the Final Determination/SOR draft. The General Counsel reviews the draft, and upon his or her approval, PFESP sends the memo to the Commissioners for consideration. If the Commissioners approve, PFESP notifies the candidate of the Commissioners' decision. If the candidate is determined to be eligible for funds, then the process ends. If the candidate is determined to be ineligible for funds, then the candidate can appeal the determination to the Court of Appeals.

5.1.2.2 Reviewing Entitlement Recommendations begins when PFESP receives a request from Audit to review an entitlement determination. PFESP conducts a legal review of the entitlement determination and drafts a memo of findings. The General Counsel reviews the memo and, if he or she does not approve, returns the draft with comments to the drafting attorney. The attorney incorporates his or her comments into the new draft memo and resubmits it for approval. If the General Counsel approves the memo, PFESP sends the memo to Audit. Taking into account the legal review, Audit makes a recommendation to the Commissioners concerning initial determination of entitlement, and the Commissioners consider the recommendation. No matter the Commissioners' decision, PFESP notifies the candidate of the decision and waits for a response. PFESP receives the candidate's response and

forwards the document to Audit for comment. Audit reviews the response and sends its comments to PFESP, who incorporates them into the Final Determination Recommendation draft. The General Counsel reviews and approves the draft, and PFESP sends the memo to the Commissioners for consideration. No matter the Commissioners' decision, PFESP notifies the candidate. Based on the Commissioners' determination, the candidate can either petition for a rehearing or file an appeal in the Court of Appeals.

5.1.2.3 Conducting Legal Review of Audit Reports can begin during the audit fieldwork phase when Audit asks PFESP to issue subpoenas for missing documentation. Before Audit's exit conference with the auditee, Audit sends the Exit Conference Memorandum (ECM) to PFESP for legal review. The committee responds to issues raised at the exit interview, which Audit may include in its report. Audit issues the audit report, which PFESP reviews and forwards to the General Counsel for review. Upon General Counsel approval, PFESP issues and forwards to Audit a memo concerning the review. In addition, PFESP sends the memo and packet of information concerning the audit report to the General Counsel for review. If the General Counsel does not approve the memo and/or packet, he or she returns them to PFESP for revision. PFESP incorporates the General Counsel's feedback and resubmits the packet for General Counsel approval. If the General Counsel approves, PFESP sends the memo to Audit. Throughout the rest of the audit

process, PFESP provides continuous support to Audit. The Commissioners issue the audit report and send the report and Determination of Repayment to the committee. If the committee repays the money owed to the Commission, the process ends. If the committee does not pay the money owed to the Commission, the repayment process begins.

5.1.2.4 Reviewing Repayment Recommendation begins when a committee requests an Administrative Review and Hearing concerning the amount of money owed to the Commission. PFESP notifies Audit of the request and sends a memo to the Commissioners to schedule the hearing. PFESP creates an informational Briefing Memo for the Commissioners, and FEC holds a public meeting concerning the repayment issue. If the committee submits more information after the hearing, PFESP reviews it and provides the committee with transcripts of the hearing and their comments. PFESP drafts a Statement of Reason (SOR) incorporating Audit's comments and has Litigation and the General Counsel review it. Upon approval, PFESP sends the Commissioners the SOR for review. If the Commissioners do not approve the SOR, PFESP rewrites the SOR, including the Commissioners' comments, and resubmits the revised SOR to the General Counsel for review. If the Commissioners approve the SOR, PFESP generates a Notification Letter concerning the Commissioners' decision on repayment and sends it to the committee. Depending on the decision, the committee can either petition for a Rehearing or appeal to

the Court of Appeals. Pending the appeal, the debt owed the Commission is stayed.

5.2 Policy is responsible for essentially four mapped processes. In addition, this Division is responsible for conducting legal review of non-FECA regulations; however, this process was not mapped because it represents a small portion of the total workload or because it typically is not process driven.

5.2.1 Rendering Advisory Opinions begins when a requester, such as a committee or corporation requests the FEC to issue an advisory opinion on a particular topic. The request is routed to the OGC Policy Division, which evaluates the issue for jurisdictional requirements. If the FEC does not have jurisdiction, then the FEC declines to issue an advisory opinion and informs the requester of the decision. If the issue passes legal requirements, Policy assigns the issue an Advisory Opinion Request (AOR) number and sends a copy of the request for Public Records. An attorney is assigned to research and write the advisory opinion. The assigned attorney researches the issues and clarifies with the requester whether the request is a formal or informal one. If the requester does not respond to the attorney's request for information, the attorney attempts to contact the requester again.

If the requester withdraws his or her request for an advisory opinion, the process ends. If the requester does not

withdraw his or her request, the attorney prepares a white draft of the advisory opinion and forwards the draft to the Associate General Counsel for review. Upon approval, the attorney e-mails the approved draft for comment to senior General Counsel staff, the General Counsel, and the Commissioners. These comments are incorporated into the white draft, and the attorney submits an agenda proposal and schedules a Sunshine Act notice to appear in the public record. The Associate General Counsel and the General Counsel review the draft report. Once approved, the attorney forwards a hardcopy of the blue draft to the Commission Secretary. The Commissioners review the draft and submit comments to Policy. Meanwhile, Policy makes the agenda proposal public for comment. The attorney evaluates and incorporates public comments into the draft and determines whether to counter comments or incorporate them into the document.

The Commissioners debate and vote on the draft advisory opinion. If the Commissioners do not vote to approve the draft, then Policy issues an AOR Closure Letter. If the Commissioners vote to approve the draft, then the attorney reformats the document and forwards it to the Commission Chairman for signature. Once signed, the attorney sends the advisory opinion to the requester and releases it to the public via the Public Records office. Upon receiving the advisory opinion, the requester can either take no action or ask the FEC to reconsider the issue. The Commissioners can also ask OGC to reconsider the opinion.

5.2.1.1 Reconsideration can begin when either the requester or a Commissioner submits a Request for Reconsideration within 30 days of the Commission’s decision. In response, Policy drafts both a Memorandum to Reconsider the Advisory Opinion and a Reconsideration Opinion, which the Associate General Counsel and General Counsel review. Following their review, the attorney forwards the Reconsideration Opinion to the Commissioners, who debate it in an open session. At this point, the process feeds into the Advisory Opinion process at the “Commissioners debates and votes” step.

5.2.2 Reviewing Regulations can begin one of three ways: (1) the Commissioners can direct OGC to draft a regulation; (2) an external petitioner can petition to repeal, modify, or add a new regulation; or (3) an internal office, such as Litigation or Audit, can petition a regulation.

If the Commissioners direct OGC to repeal, modify or add a new regulation, then Policy drafts a Course-of-Action document. If the request comes from an external petitioner, then Policy issues a Public Notice of Availability, receives and evaluates comments from the public, and generates a Course-of-Action document. If an internal petitioner begins the process, Policy generates a memo to Recommend Rule Making Process, informs the Commissioners through a memo, and generates a Course-of-Action document.

In the Course-of-Action document, Policy recommends to the Commissioners one of three alternatives: (1) OGC should not proceed with rule making; (2) OGC should issue an Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making; or (3) OGC should issue a Notice of Proposed Rule Making.

If Policy recommends not to proceed with rule making, the Commissioners debate and discuss this recommendation. If the Commissioners vote to accept the recommendation, the process ends. If the Commissioners vote not to accept the recommendation, then Policy issues a Notice of Proposed Rule Making.

If Policy recommends to issue either an Advanced Notice of Rule Making or a Notice of Proposed Rule Making, the Commissioners debate, discuss, and vote whether to approve the recommendation. If they vote to approve the Notice, OGC publishes the Notice of Rule Making for comment and offers a proposed rule for public comment (30–60 days). Policy incorporates public comments into the proposed rule and decides whether a public hearing on the proposed rule is necessary. If a hearing is not necessary, the proposed rule is sent to the Commissioners for a vote to approve, modify, or reject the rule. If the Commissioners vote to reject the rule, the process ends. If the Commissioners vote to modify the rule, the process continues with the “Formulate Draft/Final Rule” activity. If the Commissioners vote to approve the rule, the rule is made

public and sent to Congress 30 legislative days before its effective date.

If a hearing is necessary, Policy sets a hearing date, holds a public hearing, evaluates hearing testimony, and incorporates hearing data into the draft rule. The Associate General Counsel and the General Counsel review and approve the draft rule, and once approved, OGC presents the revised draft rule to the Commissioners. The rule is made public, and the Commissioners debate and vote whether to approve, modify, or reject the rule. If the Commissioners reject the draft rule, the process ends. If the Commissioners vote to modify the draft rule, the process continues with the “Formulate Draft/Final Rule” activity. If the Commissioners vote to approve the draft rule, the rule is made public and sent to Congress 30 legislative days before it becomes effective.

5.2.3 Conducting Legal Review of FECA documents begins with an internal request to Policy to review FEC publications. Publications include the Record, the Annual Report, and the Guide and Brochure series. Policy assigns to the publication a legal review number and a staff attorney. Once the attorney reviews the draft of the publication, the Associate General Counsel reviews the attorney’s comments. Upon approval, Policy returns the publication draft with comments to the editor for editing. As the FEC Record and other publications often have multiple drafts, this process would be repeated as many times as necessary.

5.3 Enforcement. 5.3.1 Enforcement Process is a series of complicated legal processes with so many paths that to try to commit the process to a narrative would not add value to this analysis. Therefore, please refer to the process maps for a high-level description of enforcement activities.

5.3.2 Cases on the **Central Enforcement Docket (CED)** are either internally or externally generated. If the cases are internally generated, their sources are a Directive 6, a RAD referral, sua sponte, or an outside agency referral. Once received, where appropriate, Enforcement assigns each case a pre-Matter Under Review (MUR) number.

If the complaint is externally generated, Enforcement reviews the complaint for statutory criteria and submits issues to the special assistant who reviews for jurisdiction. If the issues do not meet the criteria, Enforcement notifies the complainant and respondents of the rejection of the complaint. If the complainant resubmits the complaint, Enforcement resubmits the issues to special assistant. If the issues meet the criteria, Enforcement assigns the complaint a MUR number and sends a copy of the MUR to the Commissioners for information.

No matter how the matter was generated, Enforcement creates files, including a permanent file, for the CED leader and staff and assigns a paralegal to process the matter. The paralegal opens the case on the Enforcement Priority System (EPS) and MUR Tracking System (MTS), inputs the basic case

data (i.e., statute area affected), and prepares the fact summary of the case. Meanwhile, the assigned paralegal conducts a preliminary review of legal issues, generates a list of respondents, sends the list to the CED leader, and incorporates edits as necessary. If there is an overlap with an audit, then Enforcement refers the complaint to PFESP. Otherwise, the process continues.

For complaint-generated matters only, CED generates and mails letters to the respondent. The respondent can request an extension, and CED can grant extensions up to 30 days. Extensions greater than 30 days require Commissioner approval. Enforcement receives all requests for extension.

For all cases, CED rates the case on EPS, creates an EPS rating sheet, and circulates the sheet to the Commissioners. If the case rates below the threshold, Enforcement holds the case in CED, and the paralegal prepares a narrative summary for each case. The CED leader drafts a periodic General Counsel (GC) Report recommending dismissal, which the Associate General Counsel reviews. When the Associate General Counsel approves the report, he or she forwards the report to the General Counsel, who reviews the report. If the General Counsel approves the report, CED circulates the GC report to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners approve the GC report on a tally vote, CED notifies complainants and respondents. CED closes the case in EPS and MTS, enters the case in the MUR coding system,

and transfers the files to the Freedom of Information Act section. At this point, Defensive Litigation can occur.

If the Commissioners do not approve the General Counsel report on a tally vote, the Commissioners discuss objections with Enforcement. Enforcement generates and circulates an Objection Memo and schedules and participates in a Commission Executive Session. If the Commissioners approve the report, CED notifies complainants and respondents. CED closes the case in EPS and MTS, enters the case in the MUR coding system, and transfers the files to the Freedom of Information Act section. At this point, the defendant can sue the FEC, which would trigger the Defensive Litigation process.

If the Commissioners do not approve the General Counsel recommendation, Enforcement holds the MUR(s) in CED.

If the case rates above the threshold, CED compiles, prepares, and circulates summary information on CED cases for the monthly CED meeting. Included in these data are team leader input on staff availability for cases and team leader reports on case load and projects. Enforcement holds the monthly meeting during which cases and workload are reviewed, staff availability is identified, and new cases are activated and assigned to staff attorneys.

Cases that are not activated are left in CED. If the case is activated, paralegals update the systems and pull case files

and the master file. They conduct a page-by-page comparison of the case file information with the master file information; return the master file; and send other copies to team leader, staff attorney, and investigator. In addition, CED creates an EPS Status Report, which is forwarded to the Associate General Counsel for review. When the report is approved, it is placed on the agenda for Commissioner review. The Commissioners can decide to pursue or not pursue the cases.

5.3.3 Statements of Reason process begins when the Commissioners fail to approve the General Counsel's recommendation to go forward with a case. Enforcement drafts a Statement of Reasons with a cover memo if the vote was a majority one. If the vote was a split one, then Enforcement writes only a cover memo. The Assistant General Counsel reviews the report and memo. Once the Assistant General Counsel approves the documents, the Associate General Counsel reviews them. Once the Associate General Counsel approves the documents, the General Counsel reviews and signs them and sends them to the Commission. The Commission issues a Final Statement of Reasons, which OGC files and sends to complainant when case closes.

5.3.4 Dismissing Low Rated and Stale Cases begins when a case is identified for closing. CED generates a report recommending closing, which is reviewed by the CED Leader. When the CED Leader approves the report, the

Associate General Counsel reviews the report. When the Associate General Counsel approves the report, the General Counsel reviews the report. When the General Counsel approves the report, the report is sent to the Commission for a tally vote. If the Commission votes to close the case, CED closes the case, inputs case data into the system, notifies all respondents and complainant of the decision, and sends the case file to FOIA. If the Commission decides not to close the case, it is returned to CED.

5.3.5 Maintaining the Permanent File process begins when CED receives a document relating to a MUR. CED matches the document with the MUR and determines to whom the cases is assigned. CED generates four copies, returns the original to permanent administrative file, and distributes other copies.

5.3.6 Coordinating Executive Session Agenda process begins when a report is sent to CED for circulation and is forwarded to the Office of the Secretary to the Commission. If no Commissioner objects, then the Secretary's Office prepares and CED distributes a certification of the Commission vote. If any Commissioner objects, CED distributes vote sheets showing objections, prepares draft of agenda for comment, and circulates agenda to participants. CED revises the agenda as necessary, and sends the final agenda to the Office of the Secretary to the Commission.


5.3.7 Tracking Civil Penalties begins when CED receives from Administration a copy of a check, which is considered part of the case file. Enforcement updates the Civil Penalty Tracking database and generates a two-way memo to Administration regarding disposition of the check. Then CED distributes copies of the two-way memo and check.

5.3.8 Archiving begins when a case file has been held for a certain period of time. CED collects files and stages them for retirement in the National Archives. Staff packs, indexes, and labels boxes for archiving. CED sends indexes to Administration to schedule pickup, and Administration provides accession number to the docket. CED adds the accession numbers to the labels, seals the boxes, and sends them to Administration to ship.


5.4 Litigation is responsible for offensive and defensive litigation processes. However, these processes are very complicated with so many paths that to try to commit the processes to paper would not add value to this analysis.

5.0 Office of General Counsel


OGC 1




5.1 Public Financing, Ethics and Special Projects




5.2 Policy



5.3 Enforcement




5.4 Litigation



5.1 PFESP

OGC 2

5.1.1 Prosecuting Violations




5.1 PFESP


5.1.2 Conducting Legal Review of Public Financing

5.1.2.1 Reviewing Eligibility for Matching Funds

5.1.2.1A Reviewing Eligibility for Matching Funds




5.1.2.1B Reviewing an Ineligibility Determination After Candidate Has Been Determined Eligible



¹If Candidate challenges ineligibility date determination, the process is followed again for final determination after receipt of challenge.


5.1.2.1 Determining Eligibility for Matching Funds

5.1.2.1C Reviewing Ineligibility Prior to Candidate Being Determined Eligible




5.1.2 Conducting Legal Review of Public Financing

5.1.2.2 Reviewing Entitlement Recommendations



5.1.2 Conducting Legal Review of Public Financing


5.1.2.3 Conducting Legal Review of Audit Reports



5.1.2 Conducting Legal Review of Public Financing

OGC 7


5.1.2.4 Reviewing Repayment Recommendation



5.2 Policy Division

OGC 8


5.2.1 Rendering Advisory Opinions




5.2 Policy Division

OGC 9

5.2.1 Rendering Advisory Opinions, continued




5.2.1.1 Reconsideration



5.2 Policy Division


OGC 10

5.2.1 Reviewing Regulations



5.2 Policy Division

5.2.3 Conducting Legal Review of Federal Election Commission Act




¹Publications include *Record*, *Annual Report* and *Guide and Brochure* series.

² *FEC Record* and other publications often have multiple drafts and if so, would go through the cycle multiple times.

5.3 Enforcement Division

OGC 12


5.3.1 Enforcement Process



5.3 Enforcement Division


OGC 13

5.3.1 Enforcement Process, continued




5.3 Enforcement Division

5.3.1 Enforcement Process, continued



5.3 Enforcement Division

5.3.1 Enforcement Process, continued




² This may involve report generation, approval, circulation to Commissioners processes

5.3 Enforcement Division

OGC 16


5.3.1 Enforcement Process, continued



5.3 Enforcement Division

OGC 17


5.3.1 Enforcement Process, continued




5.3 Enforcement Division

OGC 18

5.3.1 Enforcement Process, continued




If Probable Cause to Believe Agreement Not Reached...



5.3 Enforcement Division


5.3.2 Central Enforcement Docket



5.3 Enforcement Division


OGC 20

5.3.2 Central Enforcement Docket



5.3 Enforcement Division


5.3.2 Central Enforcement Docket, continued



5.3 Enforcement Division

OGC 22


5.3.3 Statements of Reason



5.3 Enforcement Division

OGC 23


5.3.4 Dismissing Low Rated and Stale Cases




5.3 Enforcement Division

OGC 24

5.3.5 Maintaining the Permanent File




5.3.6 Coordinating Executive Session Agenda




5.3 Enforcement Division

OGC 25

5.3.7 Tracking Civil Penalties



5.3.8 Archiving



6.0 Office of Planning and Management (OPM)

Process Customers

Internal: All FEC offices

External: Congress, OMB

Process Descriptions

Within the Office of Planning and Management, four processes were mapped.

6.1 Budget Formulation process begins with a meeting between the Staff Director, Data Systems, and the Finance Committee to formulate the basic tenor and policy of budget. Then in April or May, the Planning and Management Director, Staff Director, and Deputy Staff Director develop guidance for managers and provide the managers with the guidance and accompanying schedule. In June, the Division Managers prepare individual budgets and memos for the Planning and Management Division. In early July, the Planning and Management Director uses these data to prepare draft budget. The Finance Committee and Division Managers review the draft budget in mid-July, and Division Managers prepare memos for Planning and Management Division. From the feedback, the Planning and Management Director prepares a revised budget.

In early August, the Staff Director and Deputy Staff Director review and approve the budget. The Finance Committee again reviews the budget and offers revision suggestions to the Planning and Management Director, who revises the budget as indicated. During the month of August, the Division Managers review, and the Finance Committee approves, the revised budget. In September, the FEC submits the budget to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and to Congress for approval. In November, Planning and Management negotiates and reaches an agreement with OMB on passback. In November/December, the Planning and Management Director and the Finance Committee amend the FEC request based on the OMB passback, and the Planning and Management Director prepares testimony throughout January. Between January and February, the Planning and Management Director prepares justification for Congress. The Division Managers and the Finance Committee review and approve the justification.

In June and July, the Planning and Management Director reallocates funds as necessary to account for cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) changes, grade and step changes, etc. In July, the Planning and Management Director develops the management plan and provides schedule and guidance to the managers. In August/September, the Finance Committee reviews and approves the management plan, and by October, the Commission reviews and agrees on the management plan.

6.2 Budget Management process begins in June or July when the Planning and Management Director reallocates funds as necessary, accounting for cost-of-living changes, grade and step changes, etc. In July he or she develops the management plan and provides the schedule and guidance to managers. The division managers then prepare memos for OPM. During August and September, the Finance Committee reviews and approves the management plan and forwards it to the Commission for review. By October, the Commission reviews and approves the plan.

Category A: Quarterly Adjustments begins when the Planning and Management Director prepares and distributes monthly MIS reports. To prepare this report, he incorporates MIS data, the monthly budget execution report, accounting system data, and Reports Status System data. Then, every quarter, Accounting makes monthly reallocations, and the Planning and Management Director prepares a quarterly adjustment request. If the request is less than \$500,000, then the Finance Committee and the Commission review and approve the request. If the request is more than \$500,000, the Finance Committee and the Commission review and approve the request, and the Appropriations Committee requests reprogramming.

Category B: Earmarked Funding Reallocation begins when the FEC prepares a request to the Appropriations Committee to reallocate funds from Category B to Category A. The Appropriations Committee reviews and approves the request

to move funds. This process is very rare; it has only occurred once.


6.3 Monthly Budget Reporting begins when the Planning and Management Director prepares a monthly report of obligations versus budgeted expenditures and sends the report to the Budget Officer and Staff Director for review. The Planning and Management Director incorporates the Budget Officer and Staff Director's comments into the report and distributes it to FEC offices for review. The Director revises the report based on these comments.

6.4 Developing FY 2000 Performance Plan begins when the Director of Planning and Management develops a draft of the FY 2000 Performance Plan and sends the draft plan to staff for review. The staff reviews the draft plan and returns it with comments. OPM revises the plan based on the comments and sends the revised plan to the Finance Committee for review. OPM revises the plan, incorporating the Finance Committee comments, and returns the revised plan to the Finance Committee for review and approval. Once approved, the final plan is forwarded to the Commission for review and approval. Once approved, FEC forwards the plan to the Office of Management and Budget and Congress.

6.0 Office of Planning and Management

6.1 Budget Formulation


(timing indicated is for a "normal" year)




6.0 Office of Planning and Management

6.2 Budget Management Process


(timeframe assumes a "normal" year)



Category A: Quarterly adjustments



Category B: Earmarked funding reallocation*




* very rare: only happened once


6.0 Office of Planning and Management

OPM 3

6.3 Monthly Budget Reporting



6.4 Developing FY 2000 Performance Plan



7.0 Administration

Process Customers

Internal: All FEC offices

External: Department of Treasury

Process Descriptions

Within the Administration, five processes were mapped.

7.1 Accounts Payable process begins when an accounting technician inputs vendor data into vendor file. These data include vendor name, address, account number, and routing number. The vendor file feeds into the payment system. Then weekly, an administrative assistant reviews system changes and notifies the accounting officer of security violations.

7.2 Procurement process begins when an FEC employee prepares a Purchase Requisition Form (PRF) and receives his or her manager's approval for the purchase. The employee sends the PRF to the Budget Officer, who reviews it for reasonableness and to ensure that the request is within budget guidelines. Then Administration reviews and approves the requisition, assigns it a cost code, prepares a purchase order (PO), and manually distributes eight copies. At this point, the process splits: the 7.3 Vouchering process

begins, and the receiving unit fills the order, accepts the goods, matches the PO to the packing slip, completes and forwards the Receiving Report to Accounting, and files the PO and Receiving Report.

7.3 Vouchering begins when Administration files the invoice, PO, and Receiving Report seven days prior to the payment due date and sorts payments into batches according to type of electronic payment.

For electronic fund transfer payments, an accounts payable technician inputs into the accounting system the payment data, including amount, date, schedule, and DAC. Then the technician runs a program to create information on a floppy disk. An accounting officer logs onto the Treasury Payment system, and an accounts payable technician loads payment information from floppy disk onto system. A certifying officer verifies and certifies payment information and forwards the payment document to the Accounting Director. The accounts payable technician files invoices, PO, and Receiving Report in Paid file. Treasury reviews payment data and transfers funds into the vendor's bank.

For check payments, an accounts payable technician enters check payment information into OBL-12 and prints screen. A different technician copies payment information onto a floppy disk. An accounting officer logs onto the Treasury Payment system, and the technician loads the payment information from the floppy disk onto the system. The

certifying officer verifies and certifies payment information and forwards invoices to Accounting, where they are filed along with the PO and Receiving Report, in the Paid file. Treasury reviews payment data, issues checks, and mails the check to the vendors.

7.4 Monthly Reconciliation begins when Administration prints the reconciliation report from the Armour system and reconciles the report with the General Ledger trial balance and Treasury's bank statement. In addition, Administration reviews the account status and notifies account holder of low balances or of the option of closing his or her account.

7.5 Cash Receipt System has three subprocesses. **7.5.1 Cash Receipt System – Daily Operations** begins when a sales transaction in Public Records occurs. Sales can be paid for by cash, check or credit card or by using a prepaid customer account. Public Records runs a daily batch report of daily transactions and reconciles the batch report with the cash and receipts in cash drawer. Once reconciled, Public Records takes the report, cash, and receipts to Accounting. Accounting reviews the report, counts the cash and receipts, and provides Public Records with a receipt. In addition, Accounting inputs the receipt data into the Accounting system and deposits the money into Treasury's bank account via courier service.


7.5.2 Cash Receipt System – Opening a Customer Account begins when a customer completes the paperwork and

makes a payment, which is entered into the Armour system. The payment is considered a daily transaction, and this process feeds into 7.5.1 Daily Operations process.

7.5.3 Cash Receipt System – Replenishing a Customer Account begins when the Mailroom receives and routes payment to Accounting, which sends it to Public Records. Accounting prepares remittance and forwards to Public Records, which holds the receipts in a safe, enters them daily into the Armour system, and deposits them twice a week into Treasury's bank account via courier service. The payment is considered a daily transaction, and this process feeds into 7.5.1 Daily Operations process.


7.0 Administration

7.1 Accounts Payable



¹ Input name, address, account number, routing number


7.2 Procurement



7.0 Administration


ADM 2

7.3 Vouchering




7.0 Administration


7.4 Monthly Reconciliation



7.5 Cash Receipt System




7.5.1 Cash Receipt System Daily Operations



7.0 Administration

ADM 4

7.5.2 Cash Receipt System - Opening a Customer Account



7.5.3 Cash Receipt System - Replenishing a Customer Account

