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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY


The objectives of the Office of Inspector General are to 1) conduct and supervise audits and investigations relating to the Federal Election Commission’s programs and operations; 2) detect and preventing fraud, waste, and abuse of agency programs and operations while providing leadership and coordination; 3) recommend policies designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the establishment; and 4) keep the Commissioners and Congress fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies in FEC agency programs and operations, and the need for corrective action. In order to accomplish these objectives and improve the accountability and performance of the Federal Election Commission, the OIG relies on audits, investigations, and inspections conducted by the OIG staff.

Major activities and accomplishments relevant to the Federal Election Commission, Office of Inspector General are summarized in the Executive Summary. Detailed information on a specific topic can be found in subsequent sections of this report.
The audit entitled **Audit of the FEC’s Public Disclosure Process – \textit{(OIG-02-03)}** was originated during a previous reporting period. The two major objectives associated with the audit are 1) to determine the extent, if any, of disclosure differences between candidate contributions reported by political committees and related committee contributions reported received by candidates; and 2) determine whether an adequate process is in place to remedy reporting discrepancies.

During this reporting period the Office of Inspector General has made significant progress in executing the audit pertaining to the FEC public disclosure system. The auditors met and discussed the results of a preliminary review of various campaign finance transactions with a dollar value difference between what the political action committee (PAC) reported vs. what the candidate reported. Based on this discussion the auditors selected and tracked additional transactions to include only those with a difference of $10,000-$20,000. Pertinent information from each transaction was documented to include the amount of the transaction and date reported by the committee/PAC and date recorded by the candidate.

Additional work related to the audit included randomly selecting one candidate (incumbent only) to compare balances of candidate receipts vs. political committee disbursement. The OIG has reviewed a large quantity of material such as quarterly reports and amendments (if applicable), as well as
mid-year and year-end reports filed by candidates. The auditors also obtained and evaluated the summary report of committees who gave to the candidates - the summary report summarizes campaign finance transactions reported by the PAC or Non-Party committees. The auditors then traced each transaction, as reported by the committee/PAC, to the corresponding quarterly report filed by the candidate. The OIG auditors met to discuss the audit objectives, the related audit steps, and work completed thus far.

A significant amount of time has been and continues to be devoted to completing this assignment. The section entitled **Audit**, starting on page 9, contains more detailed information.

For many years improving financial management and information security has been an important priority of the federal Government. On November 7, 2002, the President signed Public Law 107-289, *The Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002*, which states that Federal entities are required to have their financial statements audited annually by the agency Inspector General. Starting with fiscal year 2004, and annually thereafter, the FEC Inspector General is required to perform an audit of the agency’s financial statements.

The President’s goal is to ensure that federal financial management systems produce accurate and timely information to support operating, budget, and policy decisions. The OIG’s goal is to ensure that the agency’s financial operations are properly conducted, financial statements are presented fairly, and
applicable laws and regulations are being followed. The OIG is preparing to meet this obligation and has contracted with an independent certified public accounting (CPA) firm to conduct the audit of the FEC’s financial statements. Additional information pertaining to this topic is located on page 12, the **Financial Statement Audit Planning** section of this report.

Prior to the end of this reporting period, the OIG received a congressional request from Senator Jack Reed regarding electronic voting machines. The letter from Senator Reed stated that he was writing on behalf of his constituents in Rhode Island. In order to accurately respond to the concerns of the constituents, Senator Reed contacted the OIG for assistance.

The auditor responsible for this assignment provided Senator Reed with background information about the FEC and its purpose for being established. Additional information was also given pertaining to the Commission’s Office of Election Administration (OEA – the OEA transferred to the EAC on April 1, 2004) and the newly created Election Assistance Commission (EAC) along with information concerning electronic voting machines. For detailed information see the **Congressional Request** section located on page 15.

Inspectors General are responsible for ensuring efficiency and integrity in the programs and operations of the agencies they oversee. The OIG hotline provides a prompt, effective, and confidential channel for reporting fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement to the Inspector General. Individuals with
information regarding the manner in which the FEC executes its programs and operations are encouraged to contact the Office of Inspector General by calling, visiting, e-mailing or sending correspondence to our office.

The OIG is currently addressing a hotline complaint received from an individual who requested confidentiality. The complaint was recorded on the OIG’s Procedures for Processing Hotline Calls form, which states a preliminary inquiry must be conducted on all allegations reported to the OIG. During this reporting period, the OIG conducted a preliminary inquiry pertaining to the hotline complaint. Once the preliminary inquiry is completed, the OIG will determine whether or not a full investigation is warranted. For complete details, see the section entitled Hotline Complaint, which is on page 17.

In addition to audits, investigations, and reviews, the OIG also performs an array of other activities. This section is intended to provide a brief synopsis of the general activities pertaining to the OIG. Starting with page 18, in the section entitled Additional Office of Inspector General Activities, detailed information regarding the additional activities of the FEC/OIG can be found.

- The FY 2004 Omnibus Appropriations Bill requires all Inspectors General to submit a report to Congress on the implementation of the Rural Development Act of 1972. Research as been conducted and the report will be finalized in June (see page 18).
The Commission’s Policy Legal Review Administrative Law office contacted the OIG regarding the OIG’s contract authority. FEC management asked the Administrative Law office to provide a legal opinion on whether the FEC OIG may enter into contracts absent Commission approval. To discuss the issue the OIG met with an attorney representing the Administrative Law office (see page 18).
THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

The Federal Election Commission is an independent, regulatory agency responsible for administering and implementing the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA). The FEC is governed by a six member commission 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.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (P.L. 100-504), as amended in 1988, states that the Inspector General is responsible for: 1) conducting and supervising audits and investigations relating to the Federal Election Commission’s programs and operations; 2) detecting and preventing fraud, waste, and abuse of agency programs and operations while providing leadership and coordination; 3) recommending policies designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the establishment; and 4) keeping the Commissioners and Congress fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies in FEC agency programs and operations, and the need for corrective action.
One of the goals of the Office of Inspector General is to assist the FEC in operating more efficiently and effectively by identifying ways to improve the FEC’s programs. To accomplish this goal the OIG conducts audits, inspections, and investigations, and makes recommendations to and consults with FEC management on findings and conclusions. Including the Inspector General, Lynne A. McFarland - the OIG staff consists of four (4) employees - two Auditors, and a Special Assistant to the Inspector General.
TITLE: Audit of the FEC’s Public Disclosure Process

ASSIGNMENT #: OIG – 02-03

RELEASE DATE: In Progress

PURPOSE: The OIG’s reason for conducting the audit is to review how the Commission carries out its disclosure responsibilities; and how the use of technology and controls to monitor and remedy reporting discrepancies can be improved. The primary objectives of the audit are to: 1) determine the extent, if any, of disclosure differences between candidate contributions reported by political committees and related committee contributions reported received by candidates; and 2) determine whether an adequate process is in place to remedy any reporting discrepancies.

At the start of this reporting period, the OIG auditors met to discuss the results of the preliminary review of various campaign finance transactions with a dollar value difference between what the committee reported vs. what the candidate reported. Based on this discussion, the auditors refined the search criteria to include only those transactions with a difference of $10,000 to $20,000.

Other work related to this audit included randomly selecting one candidate (incumbent only) to compare balances of candidate receipts vs.
political committee disbursements. The auditors retrieved and printed a summary listing of all reports filed by or for the candidate. They also retrieved and printed the summary report of committees who gave to the candidate; this report summarizes campaign finance transactions reported by the PAC or Non-Party committees. Quarterly reports and amendments (if applicable), as well as mid year and year end reports filed by the candidate were obtained and reviewed by the auditors. The auditors then traced each transaction, as reported by the committee/PAC, to the corresponding quarterly report filed by the candidate.

Pertinent information from each transaction was documented to include the amount of the transaction and date reported by the committee/PAC and date recorded by the candidate. Based on this data, the average number of days between financial transactions reported by the committee/PAC vs. candidate reported was determined and summarized in the work papers.

To determine what types of issues are given high priority or consideration within the review and referral process, the OIG examined the FEC Reports Analysis Division’s (RAD) electronic review requirements process documents. To obtain information regarding the new client server disclosure system and the electronic review process, the Commission’s IT Strategic & Performance Plan for FY 2004-2008 was obtained and reviewed and the pertinent information was documented and included in the audit work papers.
TITLE: Agency Controls Governing the Process for Procurement of Vendor Training Services

ASSIGNMENT #: OIG – 00-01

RELEASE DATE: September, 2000

WEBSITE ADDRESS: http://www.fec.gov/fecig/training.pdf

PURPOSE: This audit was originally conducted to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of management controls governing the procedures for the procurement of training services from outside vendors.

The Acting Personnel Director contacted the IG office to obtain our opinion on the disposition of training records when an employee separates from the Federal Election Commission. To address the question, the OIG reviewed the audit report and the Code of Federal Regulations on record retention for training records. The OIG also consulted the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) Website for guidance on Federal agency records management.

Although management provided the OIG with draft procedures during the previous reporting period, the final version of the training procedures must be finalized before the OIG considers the four (4) outstanding recommendations closed.
For many years improving financial management and information security has been an important priority of the federal Government. On November 7, 2002, the President signed Public Law 107-289, *The Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002*, which states that Federal entities are required to have their financial statements audited annually by the agency Inspector General. Starting with fiscal year 2004, and annually thereafter, the FEC Inspector General is required to perform and/or oversee the audit of the agency’s financial statements.

The President’s goal is to ensure that federal financial management systems produce accurate and timely information to support operating, budget, and policy decisions. The OIG’s goal is to ensure that the agency’s financial operations are properly conducted, financial statements are presented fairly, and applicable laws and regulations are being followed.

To prepare for and meet this obligation, the OIG consulted other Inspectors General, as well as the General Services Administration (GSA) to obtain guidance on the contracting process. The OIG contacted the Accounting Office and the Planning and Management Director to obtain information on the FEC’s accounting and budget system to incorporate into the statement of work. A considerable amount of time was spent preparing the statement of work which was used to procure the independent public accounting (IPA) firm.
An evaluation panel, consisting of the Inspector General and both OIG auditors, evaluated each of the technical proposals received from the offerors in order to select a certified public accounting (CPA) firm that offered the best overall value. Each proposal was analyzed based on the requirements listed in the Statement of Work. Each panel member awarded points to the offerors based on their proposals and summary evaluation worksheets of technical and past performance were completed for each proposal. After each vendor had been evaluated separately by the panel, the panel met to discuss and perform an overall analysis of the contract proposals.

The OIG reviewed the legal offers submitted by each of the vendors. The legal offers included evidence of continuing professional education credits for contractor personnel, as well as documentation of a recent positive peer review. One of the panel members reviewed the signed statements by the CPA firms, attesting that no actual or potential conflicts of interest exist between the vendor and the FEC.

A meeting was held with the FEC’s contracting officer, at which time the proposals received from the CPA firms were discussed. The firm that presented the best, overall value was selected. The FEC/OIG elected to award the contract to Clifton Gunderson LLP, the 12th largest CPA and consulting firm in the United States, with a staff exceeding 1,400 and offices in 13 states – including the District of Columbia.
An entrance conference was arranged with management to discuss the audit objectives and also provided an opportunity for management to meet some of the Clifton Gunderson employees, as well as ask questions and discuss any issues relevant to the audit. The contractors and the OIG intend to meet regularly, and plan to keep Management apprised of the firm’s work throughout the audit.
During this reporting period, the OIG received a congressional request from Senator Jack Reed regarding electronic voting machines. The letter from Senator Reed stated that he was writing on behalf of his constituents in Rhode Island.

The OIG responded to the request and provided Senator Reed with background information about the Federal Election Commission (FEC) and its purpose for being established. Additional information pertaining to the Commission’s Office of Election Administration (OEA – the OEA transferred to the EAC on April 1, 2004) and the newly created Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was also provided. The OEA transferred to the EAC on April 1, 2004.

The Federal Election Commission was established in 1975 to administer and enforce the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA). The FEC administers and enforces the FECA through four core programs – 1) promoting disclosure of campaign finance reports; 2) enforcing limitation provisions of FECA; 3) implementing the presidential public funding provisions; and 4) enhancing federal election administration.

The Commission’s Office of Election Administration (OEA) was created to assist state and local election officials charged with administering federal
elections. The OEA provided for the compilation and distribution of information and research on all matters related to election administration. The office helped states implement the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA), which Congress enacted to facilitate and increase voter registration by providing opportunities to register at a number of state agencies, using a number of registration methods.

In addition, the OEA issued Voting Systems Standards for release and publication. The standards are intended to ensure that computer-based election equipment certified for purchase by participating states will be accurate, reliable and dependable. To assist and provide guidance to states, voting system vendors and local jurisdictions in the transition to the 2002 standards, the Commission also approved an Implementation Plan for the Voting System Standards.

Public Law 107-252 – Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), required the establishment of a new agency, The Election Assistance Commission. Under HAVA, the EAC is responsible for developing voluntary voting machine standards, certifying voting systems, auditing grant recipients, and studying a number of issues in election administration. The EAC is also responsible for the distribution of more than $2 billion to states for the purchase of new voting machines and new voter education programs, as well as monitoring and publicizing each state’s HAVA planning and implementation.
HOTLINE COMPLAINT

Inspectors General are responsible for ensuring efficiency and integrity in the programs and operations of the agencies they oversee. The OIG hotline provides a prompt, effective, and confidential channel for reporting fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement to the Inspector General. Individuals with information regarding the manner in which the FEC executes its programs and operations are encouraged to contact the Office of Inspector General by calling, visiting, e-mailing or sending correspondence to our office. Regardless of the method, all information received is handled promptly and efficiently.

Currently being addressed during this reporting period is a hotline complaint the OIG received from an individual who requested confidentiality. The OIG commenced a preliminary inquiry which included obtaining and reviewing records from the Accounting Office. Once further research is completed, the OIG will make a determination as to whether or not a full investigation is necessary.
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/ECIE Legislative Committee. In addition, the Inspector General routinely reads all Commission agenda items and attends the Finance Committee meetings.

- The FY 2004 Omnibus Appropriations Bill requires all Inspectors General to submit a report to Congress on the implementation of the Rural Development Act of 1972. The OIG has started researching this area. In addition, reports from other OIGs have been reviewed and a draft report on the FEC’s implementation has been initiated. Once all the research has been completed, the report, which is due in June, will be finalized.

- The Commission’s Policy Legal Review Administrative Law office contacted the OIG regarding the OIG’s contract authority. FEC management asked the Administrative Law office to provide a legal opinion on whether the FEC OIG may enter into contracts absent Commission approval. To discuss the issue the OIG met with an attorney representing the Administrative Law office. The OIG provided the attorney with several documents that support the OIG’s contract authority.
Those items included memorandums of understanding (MOU) between the OIG and the Staff Director, and the General Counsel., as well as a copy of the *Inspector General Act*. The Administrative Law office concluded that the OIG may enter into contracts without prior approval of the Commission.
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 Commission’s Inspector General is an active member of the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency (ECIE) and has provided input to a number of initiatives proposed by the Council. The ECIE serves as a forum for the exchange of views for the Inspector General Community. The Council identifies, reviews, and discusses issues that are of interest to the entire IG Community. The IG attended regular meetings held by the ECIE, and joint meetings of the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) and the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

For the period October 1, 2003 through March 31, 2004, the Inspector General (or staff) attended the following training, meetings, programs, seminars and/or conferences:

- ECIE - Monthly Meetings
- PCIE – Inspections and Evaluations (I&E) Roundtable Discussion
• PCIE - Financial Statement Audit Network (FSAN) Meeting
• PCIE/ECIE – Annual Joint Meeting
• PCIE/ECIE – 2004 Inspectors General Retreat
• PCIE/ECIE – Meeting with President Bush
• PCIE/ECIE – Federal Audit Executive Council (FAEC) Meeting
• PCIE/GPRA - Human Resources Roundtable Discussion
• USDA Graduate School – Contracting Basics for Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR)
• USDA Graduate School – Contracting for Professional Audit Services
• USDA/OIG – 2004 Directors of Investigation Conference
• Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) – Audit Command Language (ACL)
• Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) – Auditing in Government Conference: Changing World...Changing Solutions
• Office of Management and Budget (OMB) – Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) Training
• Management Concepts – CFO Reporting: Preparing Federal Financial Statements
• Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) – Improving Performances with Useful Financial Information
• Small Agency Council – Effective Writing (Intermediate)
• Federal Election Commission/Information Division – Campaign Finance Law Seminar for Candidates and Political Party Committees
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-------------------------------18
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-(Table III)-------------------25
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)(7) Summary of Significant Reports-------------------9
Section 5(a)(8) Questioned and Unsupported Costs-(Table I)-------------------23
Section 5(a)(9) Recommendations that Funds be put to Better Use (Table II)-------------------24
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 I

**INSPECTOR GENERAL ISSUED REPORTS WITH QUESTIONED COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>QUESTIONED COSTS</th>
<th>UNSUPPORTED COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. For which no management decision has been made by commencement of the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which were issued during the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total (A&amp;B)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Dollar value of disallowed costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Dollar value of costs not disallowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Reports for which no management decision was made within six months of issuance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II

INSPECTOR GENERAL ISSUED REPORTS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS THAT FUNDS BE PUT TO BETTER USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>DOLLAR VALUE (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>0</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>Report Title</th>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Controls Governing the Process for Procurement of Vendor Training Services</td>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>09/00</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.

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.

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.

FEC / OIG Strategic Plan

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.

Objective C: Identify customer needs and provide products and services to meet them.

Strategy:
- establish new customer feed back mechanisms;
- consider and evaluate customer feedback when planning and developing products and services;
- respond to Congressional inquiries and request for briefing and testimony;
- promote open exchange of ideas and information through outreach and through use of e-mail; and,
- receive, evaluate, and respond, as appropriate, to information received through the OIG hotline and other sources.

Objective D: Implement efficient, effective, and consistent resolution and follow-up procedures.

Strategy:
- ensure that IG follow-up procedures are followed and that management is aware of their role in the process; and,
- establish common OIG standards for terminology, date, maintenance and communications.

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: 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.

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.
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.
Our Website address: http://www.fec.gov/fecig.htm.

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