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This report is submitted pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended. This Executive Summary provides a brief synopsis of accomplishments and general activities pertaining to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the period October 1, 2000 through March 31, 2001.

During this semiannual reporting period, the Office of Inspector General continued to work on the audit entitled, *Procurement Operations (OIG-00-03)*. The primary objectives of this audit are to 1) determine whether or not the FEC has an efficient and effective procurement system in place; and 2) determine whether the FEC’s procurement process complies with statutory and regulatory requirements. The audit is being conducted to see if the Commission has implemented the key acquisition reforms contained in the *Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) of 1994*.

In order to achieve the audit objectives, steps taken to complete the audit have included reviewing records and selecting the audit sample. Additional information regarding this audit is located on page 10, the Audit section of this report.

The Office of Inspector General released one follow-up report during this reporting period. The original audit report entitled, *Review of*
Commission’s Employee Appraisal Process (OIG-97-02), was released January, 1998. The primary objectives of the audit were to 1) determine whether the Commission’s Employee Appraisal Process was in compliance with applicable Federal regulations and Commission Personnel instructions; and 2) determine whether the Commission’s monetary incentive process was in compliance with applicable Federal regulations and Commission Personnel instructions. The original report contained four audit recommendations. Three recommendations have been closed during previous reporting periods.

After completion of the follow-up work, the OIG determined that the Personnel Office has taken sufficient steps to address the weaknesses identified in our audit report. All four recommendations have been addressed by management and are now closed. The Audit Follow-up section, located on page 12, contains further information regarding this report.

During this reporting period, the OIG began work on three inspections. The first one entitled, Inspection of the Commission’s Web Site Privacy Practices (OIG-01-02), was in response to a statutory requirement with regards to Section 646 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act 2001, which requires each Federal Inspector General to report to Congress on Agency practices/policies with respect to personally identifiable information collected via the agencies’ Web site.
Actions taken to assist in completing the inspection include meeting with FEC management and conducting tests to determine whether the FEC’s Web site uses Internet cookies or Web bugs. Significant information pertaining to this inspection is located on page 15, the *Inspections* section of this report.

The second inspection entitled, *Inspection of the Commission’s Compliance with the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982 (OIG-01-03)*, is being conducted to determine whether or not the FEC is in compliance with the *FMFIA Act of 1982*.

An inspection guide was developed using information obtained during the research phase of the inspection. Meetings were conducted with the FMFIA program manager, who is responsible for preparing the annual assurance statement to the President. Information received from management has been reviewed and analyzed. Further details regarding this inspection can be found on page 16, the section entitled *Inspections*.

The OIG is also conducting an inspection of the FEC’s Westlaw Service entitled *Inspection of the Commission’s Westlaw Database Service (OIG-01-05)*. The Westlaw service provides commission staff with on-line research information and is administered by the FEC library.
Located on page 18, the **Inspections** section of this report, is more information relating to this topic.

Listed below are highlights of additional activities conducted by the Office of Inspector General during this reporting period. Items are described in greater detail, starting on page 20, the section entitled **Additional Office of Inspector General Activity.**

- Congress enacted the *Omnibus Consolidated Appropriation Act* on December 21, 2000. There was a requirement included in the Act that stated each Federal Inspector General provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations analyzing the promptness of payment for water and sanitary sewer services received by Federal agencies from the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (WASA). After further research, we concluded that the reporting requirement does not apply to our office. The Senate and House Appropriations Committees were notified of our findings.

- The OIG responded to a request from the Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform regarding recovery auditing. The Chairman requested that each Office of Inspector General provide significant examples of instances where their agency has
overpaid or not been credited properly on a contract for goods and services.

Our response indicated that the OIG did not have any significant instances where the FEC has overpaid or has not been credited properly on a contract for goods or services within the past three to five years.

- The OIG also responded to an issue raised by the FEC’s Personnel Director, with respect to Federal law, regulations, and other guidance applicable to the safeguarding of Commission property, specifically laptop computers.

- The Data Systems Development Division (DSDD), asked the OIG to attend and provide comments on a training program being developed by DSDD on information systems security. The training will eventually be presented to all Commission staff.

- Also during this reporting period, the OIG provided comments on the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency/Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency’s (PCIE/ECIE) Strategic Plan. Suggestions provided by the OIG focused on projects that may be beneficial for the OIG community to undertake. These suggestions
were forwarded to the PCIE/ECIE Strategic Plan Committee for their consideration.

- Given the amount of publicity aimed at the Florida election, during this reporting period, the OIG received over 400 inquiries regarding the Presidential voting procedures in Florida.

  A staff member responded to the inquiries with a brief reply that stated their correspondence had been forwarded to the FEC’s Office of Election Administration.

- The Special Assistant to the Inspector General is assigned to conduct quarterly cash counts of the Agency’s imprest fund. Three cash counts were performed during this reporting period (OIG-00-07, OIG-01-01 and OIG-01-04).
THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

The Federal Election Commission (FEC) is an independent, regulatory agency responsible for administering and implementing the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA). The FEC is composed of six Commissioners who are appointed for six year terms by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The FECA likewise established the positions of Staff Director and General Counsel, who are appointed by the Commissioners.

During this reporting period, the Commission elected Danny L. McDonald to be its Chairman and David M. Mason to be its Vice Chairman. Currently, the FEC has a full compliment of Commissioners.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The Federal Election Commission is one of the thirty-three designated agencies required to have an Inspector General under the 1988 amendments to the Inspector General Act of 1978 (P.L. 100-504).

The responsibilities of the Inspector General as stated in P.L. 100-504 are as follows:
• conduct and supervise audits and investigations relating to
  the Federal Election Commission’s programs and operations;

• provide leadership, coordination, and to recommend policies
  for activities designed to promote economy, efficiency and
  effectiveness in the administration of Commission programs
  and operations. To prevent and detect fraud, waste and
  abuse in these programs and operations, and;

• keep the Commissioners and Congress fully and currently
  informed about problems and deficiencies and the need for
  and progress of corrective actions.

The OIG is under the supervision of the Inspector General who
provides overall direction to the staff. One of the two OIG auditors resigned
in November, 2000 which left the OIG at 50% of its auditing capability for
half of the reporting period. A new auditor was hired in February, 2001
bringing the OIG to its full compliment of four full time employees. The staff
consists of the Inspector General, the Special Assistant to the Inspector
General and two Senior Auditors.

In FY’01, the Inspector General requested an additional auditor
position. At the request of the FEC’s Finance Committee, the Inspector
General researched the feasibility of using contracting services instead of receiving an additional staff position. A conclusion was reached that the use of contracting funds was a reasonable alternative to the additional position. $65,000 in contracting funds was requested for FY’01. When the FY’01 management plan was developed a request for $65,000 was again made, with the understanding that the minimum amount needed for contracting was $30,000. No contracting funds were able to be provided to the OIG for FY’01. For the FY’02 Budget, the IG requested an upgrade of one auditor position and $65,000 in contract funds.
The primary objectives of this audit are to 1) determine whether or not the FEC has an efficient and effective procurement system in place; and 2) determine whether the FEC’s procurement process complies with statutory and regulatory requirements.

The audit is being performed to determine if the Commission has implemented the key acquisition reforms contained in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) of 1994. The audit will include soliciting feedback from Commission divisions on the positive and negative aspects of the Commission’s process to purchase goods and services. The OIG is also interested in knowing if the goods and services are delivered in a timely manner; would written guidelines on how to order goods and services be helpful; and is there a need for additional staff training to address the procedures for acquiring goods and services.
Steps taken to complete the audit have included conducting interviews, reviewing records, and selecting the audit sample. Review of the audit sample has started and is continuing.
TITLE: Review of Commission’s Employee Appraisal Process

ASSIGNMENT #: OIG-97-02

RELEASE DATE: January, 1998

PURPOSE: During this reporting period, the OIG continued to follow-up on the status of this report. Follow-up work conducted during previous reporting periods revealed that the Personnel Office had resolved three of the four recommendations contained in the original audit report - OIG-97-02, Review of the Commission’s Employee Appraisal Process, released January, 1998. We continued to monitor the progress of the Personnel Office’s actions to address the one outstanding audit finding and recommendation.

The primary objectives of the audit were to determine whether or not the Commission’s employee appraisal process and the monetary incentive process were in compliance with applicable Federal regulations and Commission Personnel Instructions.

The remaining outstanding recommendation recommended the Personnel Office take measures to ensure that all performance standards
used to evaluate employees are written in accordance with employee performance management requirements contained in Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). In addition, the OIG recommended the Personnel Office develop a system to review all new performance standards prepared by supervisors to ensure standards are written in compliance with regulation and Commission policy.

A Personnel Office Standard Operating Procedures on Performance Standards Management has been issued to document the Personnel Office’s procedures for ensuring that the performance standards are in compliance with Commission policy and Title 5 of the CFR. The Personnel Office has agreed to a process that will include reviewing performance standards on file upon receipt of employee appraisals. In addition, the appraisal and performance plan will be compared to ensure employees are properly evaluated based on the expectations contained in the performance plan on file in the Personnel Office.

The OIG concluded that the Personnel Office has taken sufficient steps to address the weaknesses identified in our 1998 audit report. Therefore, the OIG closed the outstanding recommendation and all four audit
recommendations contained in the January, 1998 audit report have been addressed by management and are now closed.
TITLE: Inspection of the Commission’s Web Site
Privacy Practices

ASSIGNMENT #: OIG-01-02

RELEASE DATE: In Progress

PURPOSE: This inspection is being conducted due to a statutory requirement with regards to Section 646 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001. The Act requires each Federal Inspector General to report to Congress on Agency practices/policies with respect to personal and identifiable information collected via the agencies’ Web site.

Tests were conducted to determine whether the FEC’s Web site uses Internet cookies or Web bugs. Internet cookies and Web bugs are methods used by some Web sites to track and/or record personal information about Web users. Meetings were held with FEC management, criteria applicable to the inspection was reviewed and external parties were contacted.

The OIG sent letters to the Subcommittees on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, stating that the FEC OIG is actively working on the issue.
TITLE:  
*Inspection of the Commission’s Compliance with the Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982*

ASSIGNMENT #:  
OIG-01-03

RELEASE DATE:  
In Progress

PURPOSE:  
The inspection is being conducted to ensure that the Commission is meeting the requirements of the *Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act of 1982*. The Act requires all federal agencies to establish internal accounting and administrative controls in accordance with standards prescribed by the Comptroller General. In addition, Agency heads are required to submit an annual statement of assurance to the President on the adequacy of internal controls and actions taken to correct any identified weaknesses.

The primary objectives of the inspection are to 1) evaluate the Commission’s compliance with the provisions of the *FMFIA Act of 1982*, GAO Standards, OMB policies, and Commission directives; 2) determine whether the Commission adequately implemented agency policies and procedures to assess, as well as strengthen the internal control environment; 3) determine whether the Commission’s Annual FMFIA report of 2000 to the President accurately represented the adequacy of the review process.
within the Commission; and 4) follow-up on issues addressed during the 1991 audit of the Commission FMFIA program.

The work on this inspection is on-going, with an anticipated completion date during the next reporting period.
TITLE: Inspection of the Commission’s Westlaw Database Service

ASSIGNMENT #: OIG-01-05

RELEASE DATE: In Progress

PURPOSE: The Westlaw service provides Commission staff with on-line research information and is administered by the FEC Library. The inspection has included a review of a fiscal year 2001 duplicate payment paid to the Westlaw vendor by the Commission in the amount of $10,908. The OIG has interviewed staff from the Administrative, Accounting, and Library divisions to determine the cause of the duplicate payment and the likelihood of a re-occurrence. Accounting and administrative documents related to the Westlaw account are also being reviewed. Additional work performed on the inspection of the Westlaw service will be detailed in the final inspection report to be released by the OIG.
At the request of the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, the Office of Inspector General assisted in an investigation of a FEC employee. The OIG confirmed that the subject of their investigation was an employee and provided requested information such as his location in the agency, work hours, computer access, and other details.

The OIG was also present when the special agents from the Postal Inspection Service executed their search warrant for the employee’s work station and the computer assigned to the employee.

The OIG has also periodically contacted the special agent in charge to ascertain the status of the case. The case is still open and the employee has yet to be indicted.
ADDITIONAL OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL ACTIVITY

All legislation, as compiled by the Commission’s Congressional Affairs Office, was reviewed by the Inspector General, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended. The Inspector General reviews and comments, when appropriate, on all legislation provided by the PCIE Legislative Committee. In addition, the Inspector General routinely reads all Commission agenda items and attends Finance Committee meetings.

On December 21, 2000, Congress enacted the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act. There was a requirement contained in the Act that states each Federal Inspector General is to provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations, analyzing the promptness of payment for water and sanitary sewer services received by Federal agencies from the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (WASA).

During the research conducted to comply with this requirement, the OIG found that both locations occupied by FEC staff receive services from the DC WASA, but the cost of these services is included in the monthly rent paid by the FEC to the General Services Administration (GSA). The GSA is responsible for the payment of rent to the property management/building owner who in turn is responsible for the payment to the DC WASA for water and sanitary services. Consequently, we concluded that the reporting
requirement does not apply to the agency since the FEC does not pay water and sanitary services directly to the DC WASA. Both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees were notified on January 11, 2001 on the results of our review.

We also responded to a request by the Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform regarding recovery auditing. This request was sent to all IGs. The Chairman requested examples of significant instances in which government agencies have overpaid or not been credited properly on a contract for goods or services within the past three to five years. The OIG responded that the FEC OIG did not have any significant instances uncovered by the OIG in the past five years where the FEC has overpaid or has not been credited properly on a contract for goods or services.

The OIG responded to a request for assistance from the FEC’s Director of Personnel. The Director of Personnel raised an issue with the OIG in regards to Federal law, regulations, and other guidance applicable to the safeguarding of Commission property, specifically laptop computers. In order to ensure the Commission’s computer assets and the computer data stored on those assets are protected, management and staff must both play an active role to safeguard computer equipment and data. Management’s primary responsibilities include the establishment of adequate policies and procedures, and provide the training necessary to educate computer users on their
responsibilities and the risks associated with the use of computer equipment. The Director of Personnel was provided with several criteria that the OIG felt would give him a better understanding of the duties Federal employees have to protect government property.

The Data Systems Development Division training staff invited the OIG to attend a training program being developed by the DSDD on information systems security. The training will eventually be presented to all Commission staff. The OIG provided not only our verbal comments during and after the presentation, but gave written comments to DSDD training staff on improvements to the oral presentation and the written guidelines to be provided to staff.

The OIG provided comments on the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency/Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency’s (PCIE/ECIE) Strategic Plan. Two suggestions were provided, which the OIG believes would be beneficial for the OIG community to undertake.

The first suggestion was to develop an Internet search capability to enable the OIG community, the Congress, and the public to easily locate OIG documents, including audit, inspection, and evaluation reports. There are several groups which would benefit from the creation of an OIG search capability. The OIG community would be one of the primary beneficiaries of
the technology. One benefit would be the ability to identify from other OIG’s work potential government-wide problems dealing with a particular audit subject.

Another potential beneficiary of a search capability of OIG work is the Congress. Members of Congress and their staffs would be able to quickly and efficiently locate and obtain OIG work by subject matter or work performed by a particular OIG.

The public could also benefit from a search capability of OIG work. A common complaint by the public was the inability to determine which government department or agency is responsible for a particular program. FirstGov.gov was created to solve this problem and enable citizens to search by subject and quickly identify the department/agency responsible for that program. An OIG search engine would provide a similar benefit to parties interested in OIG work.

The second suggestion involved distributing a periodic OIG community newsletter summarizing activities of the OIG community. The newsletter would provide a brief synopsis of events and/or activities of the OIG community. The primary benefit of a newsletter is to ensure the OIG community is informed of past and future events, projects and issues, and to
maximize participation in OIG events, such as training and working group meetings.

This reporting period, the OIG received numerous e-mails and correspondence regarding the Presidential voting procedures in Florida. Our office responded to the inquiries with a brief reply that stated their correspondence had been forwarded to the FEC’s Office of Election Administration Division.

In addition to the 400 plus communications regarding the Florida election, we also received complaints pertaining to other election matters such as, immigrants voting in California, cigarettes being handed out to woo voters to the polls, and the illegal disposal of ballots. These issues were forwarded to the appropriate FEC offices.

As an ongoing task, the Special Assistant to the Inspector General is assigned to conduct quarterly cash counts of the Agency’s impest fund. Three unannounced cash counts of the FEC’s impest fund were performed this reporting period (OIG-00-07, OIG-01-01, and OIG 01-04). The impest fund consist of three drawers totaling $2,500. The results of the cash counts revealed that all cash was accounted for and cash disbursements from the impest were reasonable and consistent with FEC impest fund policy.
There have been several discussions pertaining to the abolishment of the imprest fund since most transactions by the Commission are electronic, however a final decision has not been made.
ECIE AND PCIE ACTIVITY

The Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency was established by Executive Order on May 11, 1992. It consists of Designated Federal Entity Inspectors General and representatives of the Office of Government Ethics, the Office of Special Counsel, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Office of Management and Budget.

The Inspector General (or staff) attended the following training, programs and/or conferences during this reporting period:

- ECIE - *Monthly Meetings*
- PCIE/ECIE - *Joint Quarterly Meeting*
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration - *Webmasters Meeting*
- Inspector General Auditor Training Institute - *GPRA Strategic Plans, Performance Plans, and Performance Reports*
- Institute of Internal Auditors - *Internal Auditing: New Knight of the Board and CEO Roundtable*
- U.S. Postal Service - *Directors of Investigation Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia*
- Inspectors General Meeting - *Discussion by Virginia Thomas, Heritage Foundation, concerning the new administration and the role of IGs*
- Institute of Internal Auditors - *21st Annual Conference: Maximizing the Power of Information, Technology and Human Capitol*
• Association of Government Accountants - *Auditor Independence and other “Yellow Book” issues*


• Federal Audit Executive Council - *Government Information Security Reform Act Conference*

• Department of Commerce - *Semiannual Report Coordinators’ (SARC) meeting*

• Federal Election Commission - *Ethical Conduct for Executive Branch Employees*

• Federal Election Commission - *Administrative Liaisons Meeting*

• Federal Election Commission - *FEC provided computer training classes*

• Office of Government Ethics - “*Brown Bag* session on preparing for an ethics program review*

• OIG Liaisons Meeting - *Discussion of IGnet Statistician Advisory Group - OIG wide meeting of statistician advisory group*

• Certified Internal Auditors Review Class - *Review course offered by the Inspector General Auditor Training Institute in cooperation with Institute of Internal Auditing*
IG ACT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS PAGE

Reporting requirements required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988 are listed below:

Section 4(a)(2) Review of Legislation-----------------------------20

Section 5(a)(1) Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies-----------------------------------None

Section 5(a)(2) Recommendations with Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies-----------------------------------None

Section 5(a)(3) Recommendations Included in Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed-----------------------------------31

Section 5(a)(4) Matters Referred to Prosecutive Authorities-----------------------------------None

Section 5(a)(5) Summary of Instances Where Information was Refused-----------------------------------None

Section 5(a)(6) List of Audit Reports-----------------------------------10

Section 5(a)(7) Summary of Significant Reports-----------------------------------10

Section 5(a)(8) Questioned and Unsupported Costs-----------------------------------29

Section 5(a)(9) Recommendations that Funds be put to Better Use-----------------------------------30

Section 5(a)(10) Summary of Audit Reports issued before the start of the Reporting Period for which no Management Decision has been made-----------------------------------N/A

Section 5(a)(11) Significant revised Management Decisions-----------------------------------N/A

Section 5(a)(12) Management Decisions with which the Inspector General is in Disagreement-----------------------------------None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOLLAR VALUE (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. For which no management decision has been made by commencement of the reporting period

   0 0 [0]

B. Which were issued during the reporting period

   0 0 [0]

   Sub-Totals (A&B) 0 0 [0]

C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period

   0 0 [0]

   (i) Dollar value of disallowed costs

   0 0 [0]

   (ii) Dollar value of costs not disallowed

   0 0 [0]

D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period

   0 0 [0]

E. Reports for which no management decision was made within six months of issuance

   0 0 [0]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DOLLAR VALUE (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Which were issued during the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>For which a management decision was made during the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) dollar value of recommendations were agreed to by management</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on proposed management action</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on proposed legislative action</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Reports for which no management decision was made within six months of issuance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III

SUMMARY OF AUDIT REPORTS WITH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS OUTSTANDING FOR MORE THAN SIX MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Report Number</th>
<th>Report Issue Date</th>
<th>Management Response Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-02</td>
<td>01/98</td>
<td>01/98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-08</td>
<td>05/99</td>
<td>04/99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>09/00</td>
<td>06/00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective A:** Deliver timely, high-quality products and services that promote positive change.

**Strategy:**
- establish common OIG standards for communicating results;
- conduct quality assurance programs;
- solicit appropriate internal and external review and comment;
- comply with applicable statutory guidelines and standards;
- set realistic and appropriate milestones.

**Objective B:** Address priority issues and concerns of the Commission, Congress, and Management.

**Strategy:**
- Perform work that supports;
  - Federal Election Commission and Congressional priorities;
  - National Performance Review objectives;
  - Strategic Management Initiative efforts;

Focus OIG attention in the following areas of emphasis:
- managing change;
- resource allocation in relation to policy objectives;
- delivery of client service;
- causes of fraud and inefficiency; and,
- automation and communication.

**Objective C:** Follow-up and evaluate results of OIG products and services to assess their effectiveness in promoting positive change.

**Strategy:**
- Identify, as appropriate, lessons learned to improve timeliness and quality; and,
- conduct follow-up reviews to determine if intended results have been achieved.

**Objective D:** Satisfy customers, consistent with the independent nature of the OIG.

**Strategy:**
- establish professional communication and interaction with customers to promote the open exchange of ideas;
- incorporate customer feedback, as appropriate; and,
- be open to customer-generated solutions and options.

**Objective E:** Establish a positive and productive working environment.

**Strategy:**
- reengineer or streamline OIG procedures to achieve the most effective use of resources; and,
- ensure that necessary technologies, evolving and otherwise, are made available to staff as needed.

**Performance Measures:** Determine the timeliness and quality of products and services; their effectiveness in promoting positive change; and, reach agreement with management on at least 90% of recommendations within six months of the report issue date.

---

**Objective A:** Maintain a dynamic strategic planning process.

**Strategy:**
- periodically review and update the strategic plan to address changing OIG and FEC priorities; and,
- identify factors that influence organizational change and develop short and long term plans to address them.

**Objective B:** Plan and conduct cost-effective work that address critical issues and results in positive change.

**Strategy:**
- solicit FEC and Congressional input in planning OIG activities;
- develop internal planning mechanisms to support FEC goals and priorities;
- ensure that priorities of IG are effectively communicated; and,
- identify specific targets for OIG review that are the most cost-effective

**Performance Measures:** An annual audit plan is issued; strategic plan is periodically reviewed; and, necessary technology is provided to staff to enable them to most efficiently perform their duties.

---

**Objective A:** Attract and retain well-qualified, diverse and motivated employees.

**Strategy:**
- develop and implement a comprehensive recruiting program that attracts a broad population with the knowledge, skills, abilities, and expertise necessary to make meaningful contributions to the OIG;
- assess employee satisfaction and develop strategies to address employee concerns;
- identify reasons for staff departures and develop plans to foster greater staff retention; and,
- adhere to EEO principles and strive to maintain a diverse work force.

**Performance Measures:** All employees meet the training requirements; all employees have performance standards; and, all employees meet the basic requirements for the position in which they were hired to perform.

---

**Objective B:** Provide training and developmental opportunities to employees.

**Strategy:**
- assess training needs in relation not only to employee but also office needs as well;
- ensure that Government Auditing Standards in relation to training are adhered to; and,
- maintain a reporting system to ensure that educational requirements are met.

**Objective C:** Assess, recognize, and reward, when possible, performance that contributes to achieving the OIG mission.

**Strategy:**
- develop and articulate expectations for each employee’s performance, including contributions in meeting the mission & requirements are met.
- consider and evaluate customers feedback when addressing changing OIG and FEC priorities; and,
- periodically review and update the strategic plan

**Performance Measures:** Determine the timeliness and quality of products and services; their effectiveness in promoting positive change; and, reach agreement with management on at least 90% of recommendations within six months of the report issue date.

---

**Objective A:** To provide products and services that promote positive change in FEC policies, programs, and operations.

**Objective B:** To develop and implement processes, policies, and procedures to ensure the most effective and appropriate use of OIG resources in support of our people and products.

**Objective C:** To maintain a skilled and motivated work force in an environment that fosters accountability, communications, teamwork, and personal and professional growth.

---

**FEC / OIG Strategic Plan**
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CONTACTING THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The success of the OIG mission to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse depends on the cooperation of FEC employees (and the public). There are several ways to report questionable activity.

Call us at 202-694-1015 or toll-free 1-800-424-9530. A confidential or anonymous message can be left 24 hours a day / 7 days a week.

Write or visit us - we are located at: Federal Election Commission
Office of Inspector General
999 E Street, N.W., Suite 940
Washington, DC 20463

Mail is opened by OIG staff members only.

You can also contact us by e-mail at: oig@fec.gov.

Individuals may be subject to disciplinary or criminal action for knowingly making a false complaint or providing false information.