
From: Paz Holly O
Sent: Wednesday, February 29, 2012 8:19 PM
To: Lerner Lois G
Cc: Fish David L; Thomas Cindy M
Subject: RE: updated timeline

Andy and Justin are working on revising the letter. That should be done soon. In the meantime, Cindy and I discussed having specialists print the relevant parts of (b)(5)/DP since that seemed to be the most burdensome request. We can hold off on sending anymore development letters until we have the revised version.

From: Lerner Lois G
Sent: Wednesday, February 29, 2012 6:30 PM
To: Paz Holly O
Cc: Fish David L; Thomas Cindy M
Subject: RE: updated timeline
Importance: High

Have we given Cincy new guidance on how they might reduce the burden in the information requests and make it clearer that recipients can ask for extensions? I don't want anymore letters going out on advocacy cases until the letters have been adjusted. Also, I have been telling folks that not all the letters are the same because it depends on the facts. What I've seen so far though is identical letters --can you clarify for me please. Thanks

Lois G. Lerner

Director of Exempt Organizations

From: Paz Holly O
Sent: Wednesday, February 29, 2012 3:56 PM
To: Lerner Lois G
Cc: Fish David L
Subject: FW: updated timeline

doc attached to my last email had some highlighting in it. I have removed that. A clean version is attached.

From: Paz Holly O
Sent: Wednesday, February 29, 2012 3:53 PM
To: Lerner Lois G
Cc: Fish David L
Subject: updated timeline

Lois,

EO Determinations noticed an uptick in applications from advocacy organizations early in 2010.

The first case was referred to EO Technical in (b)(5)/DP 2010. That case was an application for (b)(5)/DP status. It closed (b)(5)/DP 2010 when the (b)(3)/6103

At that time, EO Technical requested another (b)(3)/6103 from an (b)(3)/6103 be transferred to EO Technical. Such a case was transferred in (b)(3)... 2010. That case also closed (b)(3)/6103 2012 after the (b)(3)/6103

EO Technical also requested an application from a (b)(3)/6103 be transferred from Determinations. A case was transferred in (b)(3)... 2010. It is still being developed by EO Technical.

To give you a sense of the growth in the number of these cases, in October 2010, we had identified approximately 40 advocacy cases. As of about 10:00 a.m. on 2/28/2012, we had 229 of these cases .

Of the 229 cases, 141 have been assigned. Development letters have been sent to the majority of the 141 assigned cases. The oldest control dates of those cases that are still unassigned are 2/8/2011, 3/18/2011, 4/28/2011, and 5/28/2011. These will be assigned next. Otherwise, we're at approximately 6/6/2011 control date for these cases.

EO Technical provided guidance regarding the development of applications by advocacy organizations to EO Determinations in November 2011.

The case assignment matrix is attached.

Holly

From: Lerner Lois G
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2012 3:46 PM
To: Spellmann Don R; Cook Janine; Paz Holly O
Cc: Kindell Judith E; Lowe Justin; Flax Nikole C; Urban Joseph J
Subject: Congressional Follow-Up
Importance: High

Just came back from the meeting and they have asked for several things.

- 1. Don/Janine--** The guidance provided to Cincy that Don reviewed -- I'm hoping you can let us know your concerns as soon as possible so we can finalize the draft. We will be sending it over to them and putting it out on the web with other check sheets/guide sheets.
- 2. Holly--**a timeline relating to the uptick --that is, about when did we notice there were enough of these that we needed guidance from R & A and then when did we get cases up here to look at. If there is info regarding development and FTEs and replacement cases, give me that too.
- 3. Case Grading Guide--**I think (b)(5) DP let me know the basis.

Thanks to all who got me ready for today--I think it went as well as it could.

Lois G. Lerner
Director of Exempt Organizations