

AO DRAFT COMMENT PROCEDURES

The Commission permits the submission of written public comments on draft advisory opinions when on the agenda for a Commission meeting.

DRAFT ADVISORY OPINION 2009-14 is available for public comments under this procedure. It was requested by Jan Baran, Esq., and Caleb Burns, Esq., on behalf of Mercedes-Benz USA LLC and Sterling Truck Corporation

Draft Advisory Opinion 2009-14 is scheduled to be on the Commission's agenda for its public meeting of Tuesday, July 28, 2009.

Please note the following requirements for submitting comments:

1) Comments must be submitted in writing to the Commission Secretary with a duplicate copy to the Office of General Counsel. Comments in legible and complete form may be submitted by fax machine to the Secretary at (202) 208-3333 and to OGC at (202) 219-3923.

2) The deadline for the submission of comments is 12:00pm noon (Eastern Time) on Monday, July 27, 2009.

3) No comments will be accepted or considered if received after the deadline. Late comments will be rejected and returned to the commenter. Requests to extend the comment period are discouraged and unwelcome. An extension request will be considered only if received before the comment deadline and then only on a case-by-case basis in special circumstances.

4) All timely received comments will be distributed to the Commission and the Office of General Counsel. They will also be made available to the public at the Commission's Public Records Office.

CONTACTS

Press inquiries: Judith Ingram (202) 694-1220

Commission Secretary: Mary Dove (202) 694-1040

Other inquiries:

To obtain copies of documents related to AO 2009-14, contact the Public Records Office at (202) 694-1120 or (800) 424-9530 or visit the Commission's website at www.fec.gov.

For questions about comment submission procedures, contact Rosemary C. Smith, Associate General Counsel, at (202) 694-1650.

MAILING ADDRESSES

Commission Secretary
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

Rosemary C. Smith
Associate General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
SECRETARIAT



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20463

2009 JUL 22 P 5: 28

AGENDA ITEM
For Meeting of: ~~07-28-09~~

SUBMITTED LATE

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Commission

FROM: Thomasenia P. Duncan *JPD*
General Counsel

Rosemary C. Smith *ACS*
Associate General Counsel

Amy L. Rothstein *ARR*
Assistant General Counsel

David C. Adkins *DCA*
Attorney

Subject: Draft AO 2009-14 (Mercedes-Benz USA LLC and Sterling Truck Corporation)

Attached is a proposed draft of the subject advisory opinion. We request that this draft be placed on the agenda for July 28, 2009.

Attachment

1 ADVISORY OPINION 2009-14

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Jan Witold Baran
Caleb P. Burns
Wiley Rein LLP
1776 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

DRAFT

10 Dear Mr. Baran and Mr. Burns:

11 We are responding to your advisory opinion request on behalf of Mercedes-Benz
12 USA LLC (“MBUSA LLC”) and Sterling Truck Corporation (“Sterling Corp.”),
13 concerning the application of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended
14 (the “Act”), and Commission regulations to MBUSA LLC’s proposal to pay the
15 administrative costs of a separate segregated fund (“SSF”) to be established by Sterling
16 Corp., and whether the SSF may be referred to as “Daimler PAC.”

17 The Commission concludes that MBUSA LLC may administer an SSF to be
18 established by Sterling Corp., and that the name of the SSF may be abbreviated to
19 “Daimler PAC.”

20 ***Background***

21 The facts presented in this advisory opinion are based on your letter received on
22 May 27, 2009, your email received on June 5, 2009, and conversations with Commission
23 attorneys.

24 MBUSA LLC is a limited liability company (“LLC”) organized under the laws of
25 the State of Delaware and headquartered in New Jersey. MBUSA LLC markets and
26 distributes Mercedes-Benz and Maybach vehicles and products throughout the United
27 States. MBUSA LLC’s sole member is Daimler North America Corporation (“DNAC”).

1 Sterling Corp. is a Delaware corporation, headquartered in Oregon. It markets
2 and distributes heavy- and medium-duty trucks and parts throughout North America.
3 Sterling Corp. is the wholly owned subsidiary of Daimler Trucks North America LLC
4 (“DTNA LLC”), the sole member of which is DNAC.

5 DNAC is a Delaware corporation that is headquartered in New Jersey. It is the
6 wholly owned subsidiary of Daimler AG, a German company that is the ultimate parent
7 of the Daimler-related companies.

8 Sterling Corp. intends to establish an SSF, and MBUSA LLC would like to use its
9 personnel and resources to administer it, including paying the administrative and
10 solicitation expenses of the SSF. Specifically, MBUSA LLC would pay the SSF’s
11 expenses out of its External Affairs and Public Policy-Americas (“EAPP”) cost center.¹
12 MBUSA LLC would, however, invoice Daimler AG for EAPP expenses, which MBUSA
13 LLC pays from U.S.-generated funds, per the terms of an agreement between MBUSA
14 and Daimler AG for the provision of and payment for such services (the “Service Level
15 Agreement”). Rather than reimburse MBUSA LLC directly for EAPP expenses, Daimler
16 AG permits MBUSA LLC to credit those expenses against the amount it owes Daimler
17 AG for vehicles and products. This payment arrangement is detailed in the Service Level
18 Agreement between MBUSA LLC and Daimler AG.

¹ The Daimler-related companies have numerous “cost-centers,” some of which benefit multiple business units. MBUSA LLC, for example, includes the EAPP cost center, which funds the government affairs operations conducted by MBUSA LLC on behalf of all of Daimler AG’s U.S. companies. EAPP expenses are paid from MBUSA LLC’s general treasury, which consists of U.S.-generated funds, or using its short-term credit line with Daimler North America Finance Corporation (“DNAFC”), which MBUSA LLC repays from domestic revenues.

1 Under the Service Level Agreement, Daimler AG authorizes annual spending
2 levels for the EAPP cost center and “approve[s] the [EAPP] services to be provided by
3 [MBUSA LLC] via the Budgeting and Planning procedures of the Daimler Group.”
4 Service Level Agreement, Section 4.2. Daimler AG does not otherwise guide or
5 prioritize how MBUSA LLC must spend EAPP funds. Counsel for requestors has also
6 represented that the SSF would be administered in a manner consistent with Commission
7 regulations as interpreted in prior advisory opinions, including that all decision-making
8 regarding the SSF would be made exclusively by executive or administrative personnel of
9 MBUSA LLC or Sterling Corp. who are U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents.
10 Further, contributions to the SSF would not be solicited or accepted from persons who
11 are foreign nationals.

12 MBUSA LLC and Sterling Corp. propose a number of official names for the SSF,
13 including Daimler U.S. Employees Political Action Committee, Daimler North America
14 Corporation U.S. Employees Political Action Committee, Sterling Truck
15 Corporation/Daimler U.S. Employees Political Action Committee, and Sterling Truck
16 Corporation/Daimler North America Corporation U.S. Employees Political Action
17 Committee. Regardless of which of these names is chosen, they would like to abbreviate
18 the name of the SSF to “Daimler PAC.”

19 ***Questions Presented***

- 20 1. *May Sterling Corp. serve as the connected organization for the proposed SSF?*
21 2. *May MBUSA LLC use its personnel and resources to administer the SSF?*
22 3. *May payment of the administrative costs associated with the SSF come from*
23 *MBUSA LLC's EAPP cost center?*

1 4. *May Sterling Corp. and MBUSA LLC abbreviate the name of the SSF to Daimler*
2 *PAC?*

3 ***Legal Analysis and Conclusions***

4 1. *May Sterling Corp. serve as the connected organization for the proposed SSF?*

5 Yes, Sterling Corp. may serve as the connected organization for the proposed
6 SSF.

7 A connected organization is any organization that is not a political committee and
8 that directly or indirectly establishes, administers, or financially supports a political
9 committee. *See* 2 U.S.C. 431(7) and 11 CFR 100.6(a). Corporations, labor
10 organizations, membership organizations, cooperatives, and trade associations may serve
11 as connected organizations of their SSFs. *Id.* Payments by a connected organization for
12 the establishment, administration, or solicitation of contributions to its SSF are exempt
13 from the definition of contribution and expenditure. *See* 2 U.S.C. 441b(b)(2)(C); 11 CFR
14 114.1(a)(2)(iii); *see also* 2 U.S.C. 431(8)(B)(vi) and (9)(B)(v).

15 The Commission has held that foreign nationals² may not serve as an SSF's
16 connected organization. *See, e.g.,* Advisory Opinions 1977-53 (APCAC); *see also* 1982-
17 34 (Sonat) (stating that a foreign national corporation may not establish and administer its
18 own SSF). However, domestic subsidiaries of foreign corporations may establish and
19 administer SSFs if they are discrete entities whose principal place of business is the

² The Act and Commission regulations define "foreign national" to include "foreign principals," as defined in 22 U.S.C. 611(b). 2 U.S.C. 441e(b); 11 CFR 110.20(a)(3). Under 22 U.S.C. 611(b)(3), "foreign principal" includes corporations organized under the laws of or having their principal place of business in a foreign country.

1 United States,³ and if those exercising decision-making authority over the SSF are not
2 foreign nationals. *See* Advisory Opinions 1980-100 (Revere Sugar), 1980-111 (Portland
3 Cement). Recent amendments to the Act and to Commission regulations expanding the
4 scope of the restrictions on foreign national involvement in U.S. elections were not
5 intended “to cover U.S. subsidiaries of foreign corporations” and did not prohibit “the
6 participation of such subsidiaries in elections in the United States . . . through separate
7 segregated funds.”⁴ *See* Explanation and Justification for Final Rules on Contribution
8 Limitations and Prohibitions, 67 FR 69928, 69943 (Nov. 19, 2002); *see also* Advisory
9 Opinion 2006-15 (TransCanada).

10 Sterling Corp.’s ultimate parent – Daimler AG – is a German company that
11 qualifies as a foreign principal under 22 U.S.C. 611(b) and a foreign national under 2
12 U.S.C. 441e(b). Nevertheless, Sterling Corp. itself is a discrete operating domestic entity
13 that is organized under the laws of Delaware and is headquartered in Oregon. As such,
14 and given that requestors have represented that foreign nationals will not have decision-
15 making authority regarding the proposed SSF, Sterling Corp. may serve as its connected
16 organization.

17 2. *May MBUSA LLC use its personnel and resources to administer the proposed SSF?*

18 Yes, MBUSA LLC may use its personnel and resources to administer the
19 proposed SSF.

³ Under 22 U.S.C. 611(b), a domestic corporation whose principal place of business is within the United States is not a “foreign principal” and hence not a “foreign national” under 2 U.S.C. 441e.

⁴ In the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-155, 116 Stat. 81 (“BCRA”), Congress amended the Act to clarify, strengthen and expand the ban on campaign contributions and donations by foreign nationals. *See* BCRA Section 303, 116 Stat. at 96. Among other changes, BCRA amended 2 U.S.C. 441e to prohibit foreign national contributions and donations that are made “directly or indirectly.”

1 The Act does not extend to a partnership, or an LLC that is treated as a
2 partnership under Commission regulations, the ability granted to a corporation to serve as
3 a connected organization. *See* 2 U.S.C. 431(7) and 11 CFR 100.6(a) (definition of
4 “connected organization” does not include partnerships or LLCs); *see also* Advisory
5 Opinion 2004-42 (Pharmavite). Instead, partnerships and other unincorporated entities
6 may make contributions to Federal candidates and political committees directly. *See* 11
7 CFR 110.1(e).

8 Nonetheless, partnerships and LLCs treated as partnerships that are owned
9 entirely by corporations, like MBUSA LLC, warrant special consideration. Under the
10 dual attribution principle for partnership contributions at 11 CFR 110.1(e), contributions
11 by partnerships are attributed not only to the partnership as a whole but also to its
12 partners. Thus, a partnership owned entirely by corporations may not make
13 contributions, either. *See, e.g.*, Advisory Opinion 2001-07 (NMC PAC) (LLC electing
14 partnership status, all of whose members are corporations, may not make contributions
15 to, or otherwise support, a non-connected political committee).

16 To avoid prohibiting these types of partnerships from making contributions and
17 from establishing and administering an SSF, the Commission has interpreted the Act and
18 Commission regulations to permit a partnership (or an LLC electing partnership status) to
19 pay the administrative and solicitation costs of an SSF established by the partnership’s
20 corporate owner, but only when the partnership is wholly owned by corporations and
21 affiliated with at least one of the corporations.⁵ The administrative and solicitation

⁵ *See* Advisory Opinions 2004-42 (Pharmavite) (LLC treated as partnership was wholly owned by a corporation), 2003-28 (Horizon Lines) (LLC treated as a partnership was “owned entirely by corporations” where it was owned by two corporations and another LLC treated as a partnership, which was itself owned

1 support provided by a partnership wholly owned by affiliated corporations “may be
2 construed as coming from the affiliated corporations.” Advisory Opinion 1992-17 (Du
3 Pont Merck PAC).

4 MBUSA LLC is treated as a partnership under Commission regulations because it
5 is a non-publicly traded LLC that has not affirmatively elected treatment as a corporation
6 for tax purposes.⁶ 11 CFR 110.1(g)(2) and (3); *see also* Advisory Opinion 2004-42
7 (Pharmavite). In addition, MBUSA is wholly owned by – and affiliated with – DNAC.
8 11 CFR 100.5(g)(3)(i) and 110.3(a)(2)(i). Therefore, MBUSA LLC would be able to
9 perform the functions of a connected organization for an SSF connected to DNAC,
10 including paying the SSF’s administrative and solicitation costs. *See* Advisory Opinions
11 2004-42 (Pharmavite) and 1997-13 (USA PAC). For internal business reasons, though,
12 DNAC has chosen not to serve as the connected organization for the proposed SSF;
13 instead, Sterling Corp. will fill that role.

14 Through DNAC, MBUSA is also affiliated with DNAC’s wholly owned
15 subsidiary Sterling Corp. Although previous Commission advisory opinions have not
16 addressed an arrangement whereby an LLC that is wholly owned by and affiliated with
17 one corporation pays the administrative and solicitation costs of another affiliated

by a corporation), 2001-18 (BellSouth) (joint venture LLC treated as partnership was owned entirely by corporations), 1997-13 (USA PAC) (joint venture LLC treated as partnership was “entirely owned by corporations, whose control over [the LLC] is essentially the same as corporate joint venture partners”), 1996-49 (PrimeCo) (joint venture partnership owned entirely by corporations), 1994-11 (FMC) (limited partnership owned by corporations), 1992-17 (Du Pont Merck) (partnership owned by two corporations), and 1987-34 (Telenet) (two corporations formed a joint venture partnership and temporarily conveyed to it ownership of a subsidiary corporation).

⁶ As an LLC with a single corporate member, MBUSA LLC is precluded from electing treatment as a partnership for tax purposes; however, MBUSA LLC has not affirmatively elected treatment as a corporation either. 26 CFR 301.7701-3(a). Per Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) regulations, then, MBUSA LLC is considered a “disregarded entity” and is viewed by the IRS as the functional equivalent of a branch or division of the LLC’s single member.

1 corporation's SSF, the Commission finds no material difference in the proposed
2 arrangement that would affect the ability of MBUSA LLC to use its resources and
3 personnel to administer Sterling Corp.'s SSF. Given that DNAC could pay the
4 administrative and solicitation costs of Sterling Corp.'s SSF, and that MBUSA LLC
5 could pay the administrative and solicitation costs of DNAC's SSF, it therefore follows
6 that MBUSA LLC may pay the administrative and solicitation costs of Sterling Corp.'s
7 SSF.⁷

8 *3. May payment of the administrative costs associated with the SSF come from MBUSA*
9 *LLC's EAPP cost center?*

10 Yes, MBUSA LLC may pay the SSF's administrative costs from its EAPP cost center
11 even though MBUSA LLC is a domestic limited liability company⁸ whose sole member
12 (DNAC) is entirely owned by a foreign corporation (Daimler AG).

13 The Act and Commission regulations prohibit a foreign national from "directly or
14 indirectly" making "a contribution or donation of money or other thing of value . . . in
15 connection with a Federal, State, or local election." 2 U.S.C. 441e(a)(1)(A); 11 CFR
16 110.20(b). In addition, the Act and Commission regulations prohibit a foreign national from
17 directly or indirectly making an expenditure, an independent expenditure, or a disbursement
18 in connection with a Federal, State, or local election. 2 U.S.C. 441e(a)(1)(C)⁹; 11 CFR
19 110.20(e)-(f).

⁷ Notwithstanding MBUSA LLC's ability to pay administrative and solicitation costs, the SSF still must identify Sterling Corp. as its connected organization on its statement of organization. 2 U.S.C. 433(b)(2) and 11 CFR 102.2(a)(1)(ii); see Advisory Opinions 1997-13 (USA PAC) and 1996-49 (PrimeCo).

⁸ As discussed above, MBUSA LLC is treated as a partnership under Commission regulations. See *supra* note 6.

⁹ Section 441e(a)(1)(C) of FECA specifically covers "disbursement[s] for an electioneering communication;" 11 CFR 110.20(f) extended the prohibition to disbursements generally to reflect BCRA's

1 The Commission has, however, recognized that a domestic subsidiary of a foreign
2 corporation may use its own general treasury funds to pay costs associated with establishing,
3 administering, and soliciting funds for an SSF. *See* Explanation and Justification for Final
4 Rules on Contribution Limitations and Prohibitions, 67 FR 69928, 69943 (Nov. 19, 2002).
5 *See also* Advisory Opinion 1980-100 (Revere). Additionally, the Commission has
6 recognized that domestic corporations may use funds from foreign sources to pay for
7 administrative and solicitation costs, because the payment of such costs are not considered
8 contributions. *See* Advisory Opinions 1980-111 (Portland Cement) (concluding that a
9 domestic trade association may support its SSF with general treasury funds that were made
10 up in part by monies derived from dues paid by foreign nationals); 1982-34 (Sonat)
11 (concluding that a domestic corporation may support its SSF with funds from foreign
12 subsidiaries). In these situations, the Commission's focus has not been on the source of
13 funds used to pay administrative and solicitation costs, but rather on the status of the entity
14 making the payments.¹⁰ *See id.*

intention to extend the ban on foreign money to State and local elections to which the term "contributions" does not apply. *See* Explanation and Justification for Final Rules, Contribution Limitations and Prohibitions, 67 FR 69928, 69945 (Nov. 19, 2002).

¹⁰ The Commission has not addressed the issue of payment of administrative and solicitation costs subsequent to enactment of BCRA's amendment of the Act with respect to foreign national contributions and expenditures at 2 U.S.C. 441e(a)(1). However, in the Explanation and Justification accompanying the Commission's rules implementing the statutory changes, the Commission determined that Congressional intent was to ensure that State and local elections were clearly covered by the ban. *See* Contribution Limitations and Prohibitions, 67 FR at 69943. The Commission expressly rejected the notion that BCRA meant to address the role of domestic subsidiaries of foreign corporations, given the "substantial policy reasons set forth in the long line of Commission advisory opinions that have permitted U.S. subsidiaries to administer separate segregated funds." *Id.* Moreover, the Commission concluded that the addition of "donation" to the prohibitions at 441e(a)(1) was meant to address so-called "soft money donations," such as donations to a political party committee which heretofore had been made outside of the contribution limits. *Id.* at 69944. Because administrative and solicitation costs for SSFs are neither contributions nor donations, nor are they disbursements for an electioneering communication, nor are they disbursements for State and local elections (*see supra* note 9), the Commission concludes that BCRA's amendment of the ban on foreign money did not address this matter.

1 MBUSA LLC is a Delaware LLC that is headquartered in New Jersey. As such,
2 it is not a foreign national, and it may pay the costs associated with the administration of
3 and solicitation for the proposed SSF. The fact that MBUSA LLC plans to pay such
4 costs from its EAPP cost center, and that the costs of the EAPP cost center will be offset
5 against monies owed to Daimler AG by MBUSA LLC, does not affect this analysis.

6 This conclusion is conditioned on the representation by requestor's counsel that
7 no foreign national will direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the
8 SSF's decision-making processes, including decisions concerning the making of
9 contributions, donations, expenditures, or disbursements in connection with any elections for
10 any Federal, State, or local office or decisions concerning the administration of the SSF. 11
11 CFR 110.20(i); *see also* Advisory Opinions 1980-111 (Portland Cement); 1982-34 (Sonat);
12 2000-17 (Extendicare). Contributions to the proposed SSF also must not be solicited or
13 accepted from persons who are foreign nationals, which would be prohibited under 2 U.S.C.
14 441e.

15 *4. May Sterling Corp. and MBUSA LLC abbreviate the name of the SSF to Daimler*
16 *PAC?*

17 Yes, the name of the SSF may be abbreviated to Daimler PAC.

18 The Act and Commission regulations require the name of an SSF to include the
19 full name of its connected organization. 2 U.S.C. 432(e)(5); 11 CFR 102.14(c). An SSF
20 established by a subsidiary may, but need not, include in its name the name of the
21 subsidiary's parent or another subsidiary of its parent. 11 CFR 102.14(c).

22 In limited circumstances, the Commission has allowed the name of an SSF to
23 include only the name of an LLC that is in virtually the same position as a corporate

1 subsidiary of the connected corporation that owns the LLC. For example, the
2 Commission concluded that an SSF's name could include only the name of a joint
3 venture LLC that was treated as a partnership under Commission regulations, where the
4 LLC was performing the functions of the SSF's connected organization. *See* Advisory
5 Opinions 2003-28 (Horizon Lines) and 1997-13 (USA PAC). The Commission has also
6 concluded that an SSF could be named after an LLC that is wholly owned by the
7 corporate entity serving as the SSF's connected organization, where naming the SSF after
8 the LLC "would provide the public with a more accurate understanding of the PAC's
9 funding and purpose." *See* Advisory Opinion 2004-42 (Pharmavite).

10 Here, Sterling Corp. will serve as the connected organization for the proposed
11 SSF, and funding for the administration of and solicitation for the SSF will come from
12 MBUSA LLC. Unlike the facts underlying the advisory opinions cited above, MBUSA
13 LLC is not "in virtually the same position as a corporate subsidiary" of Sterling Corp., so
14 naming the SSF after MBUSA LLC would not be permissible. Rather, the name of the
15 proposed SSF must include the name of the connected organization – Sterling Corp. –
16 and may, but need not, include the names of Sterling Corp.'s parent – DNAC – and a
17 subsidiary of its parent, including MBUSA. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that
18 only one of the names proposed¹¹ by requestors would be permissible: Sterling Truck
19 Corporation/Daimler North America Corporation U.S. Employees Political Action
20 Committee.

¹¹ Sterling Corp. proposes a number of official names for the proposed SSF, including Daimler U.S. Employees Political Action Committee, Daimler North America Corporation U.S. Employees Political Action Committee, Sterling Truck Corporation/Daimler U.S. Employees Political Action Committee, and Sterling Truck Corporation/Daimler North America Corporation U.S. Employees Political Action Committee.

1 Commission regulations also permit an SSF to use a “clearly recognized
2 abbreviation or acronym by which the connected organization is commonly known.” *See*
3 11 CFR 102.14(c). In determining whether specific terms or names meet this
4 requirement, the Commission has examined whether they give adequate notice to the
5 public as to the identity and sponsorship of the SSF. *See* Advisory Opinions 2004-42
6 (Pharmavite), 2004-04 (AirPAC), 2000-34 n.4 (SAPPI Paper), 1987-26 (Principal
7 Mutual), and 1980-23 (ADEPT).

8 The Commission concludes that the proposal to abbreviate the name of the SSF as
9 “Daimler PAC” would, indeed, provide the public with adequate notice as to the identity
10 and sponsorship of the SSF and is therefore permissible. Sterling Corp.’s affiliation with
11 the Daimler family of companies is readily apparent on its web site. Furthermore, while
12 the SSF will be connected to Sterling Corp., it will receive administrative support from
13 MBUSA LLC by virtue of that organization’s affiliation with Sterling Corp. through
14 DNAC. Perhaps most importantly, requestors have indicated that while the proposed
15 SSF will be connected to Sterling Corp. and funded by MBUSA LLC, it will operate on
16 behalf of all the Daimler-related companies.

17 Finally, it is important to note that use of the abbreviation Daimler PAC will not
18 obscure from the public any relevant information regarding the funding or operation of
19 the proposed SSF. The SSF must use both the abbreviation and the full name on the
20 statement of organization, on all filed reports with the Commission, and on all disclaimer
21 notices required by Commission regulations. In addition, Sterling Corp. will be disclosed
22 as the SSF’s connected organization on the statement of organization.

1 This response constitutes an advisory opinion concerning the application of the
2 Act and Commission regulations to the specific transaction or activity set forth in your
3 request. *See* 2 U.S.C. 437f. The Commission emphasizes that, if there is a change in any
4 of the facts or assumptions presented, and such facts or assumptions are material to a
5 conclusion presented in this advisory opinion, then the requestor may not rely on that
6 conclusion as support for its proposed activity. Any person involved in any specific
7 transaction or activity which is indistinguishable in all its material aspects from the
8 transaction or activity with respect to which this advisory opinion is rendered may rely on
9 this advisory opinion. *See* 2 U.S.C. 437f(c)(1)(B). Please note the analysis or
10 conclusions in this advisory opinion may be affected by subsequent developments in the
11 law including, but not limited to, statutes, regulations, advisory opinions, and case law.
12 The cited advisory opinions are available on the Commission's Web site at
13 <http://saos.nictusa.com/saos/searchao>.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

On behalf of the Commission,

Steven T. Walther
Chairman