2015 Annual Report
Affiliate Support Committee
Libertarian National Committee

Policy Manual Charter:

The LNC Policy Manual states the ASC shall identify the needs and interests of the various affiliates. In addition, the ASC shall identify those affiliates that are in particular need of assistance that the LNC can provide. The ASC shall deliver a report on Nov 10th of each year, identifying and prioritizing those needs and interests of the various affiliates. That ranked list shall be taken into consideration when drawing up the following year's budget, and throughout the year as needed. This list will also assist the Executive Director in deciding how to assign tasks to staff, by identifying those services that staff provides to the affiliates that are the most desired.

The ASC shall also, as and when needed, recommend to the LNC measures that will address the particular affiliates that need assistance from the LNC.

The ASC will also establish a process for tracking the progress in meeting those needs.

Report Attachment: MS Excel file "ASC 2015 Poll Results Rev 0.xls"

ASC attempted to contact a member of the state executive committee of all 51 state affiliates. With the sole exception of Montana, contact was made with a member of every affiliate Executive Committee, either the Chair or VC, so our analysis includes results from 49 of 51 state affiliates. The complete raw data for each state is listed in tabs provided in alphabetical order in attached workbook. Additional tabs in workbook provide analysis calculations or results.

Poll questions included the following:

1. Rank LNC service level: 1 = worst, 3 = average and 5 = best.
2. What are the top 3 "needs and interests" that you are addressing in your state?
3. What is your state's #1 need from LNC?
4. How many candidates were on the ballot in 2014-2015 (partisan or non-partisan)?
5. What is your state's annual include (exclude LNC ballot access contributions)?
6. What are your state's annual expenses?

Analysis results are provided in graphical form, as follows:

1. Table – LNC Service Level
2. Table – Affiliates Internal Needs and Interests
3. Chart - Ranked list of affiliate's #1 need from LNC
4. Chart – Candidates on Ballot
5. Table - Affiliate Annual Income and Expenses

Table - LNC Service Level

Affiliates 2015 score of LNC's current service experienced a significant shift towards positive as compared to 2014. Scores from 2014, listed in bad to good order, were 5, 15, 21, 8 and 1. Only one affiliate gave a "good" score in 2014, but 2015 scores were qty 4, 4, 19, 11 and 7. "Bad" scores in 2014 were five times more frequent than "Good" scores, but 2015 good scores exceed bad by a 7:4 margin. Poll results from 2014 included responses from 50 affiliates {2014 bad to good scores }, but only 45 responses are available in table above.

Table - Affiliate Internal Needs & Interest

The top needs & interests remained fairly constant between 2014 and 2015, as follows. Each affiliate could list up to 3 activities, and about 135 applicable responses were received. Those were categorized into common topics, as follows. In order to accomplish their internal goals, the ASC believes that a robust database & CRM solution would serve as an essential tool for success.

Voter/member recruitment	30
Fundraising	29
Candidate Recruitment	20
Ballot Access	14
Newsletter/Media/Website	8
Build state organization	7
Legislative Lobbying	6
Candidate Development	5
Outreach / PR Materials	5
LP Brand Building	4
Build local organizations	4
Database	3

Chart - Ranked List of Affiliate's Needs from LNC:

The affiliates were asked to give their #1 needed help from LNC, and these results are summarized below.

2015 #1 Need from LNC		2014 #1 Need from LNC	
Ballot access	9	Ballot access	9
Communication	7	dBase support	8
LP Brand Building	5	Help with local activism	5
Web, Media & Dbase Support	4	Financial support	5
Financial support	3	Advertising	5
Fundraising support	3	General IT support	4
Candidate Development	3	Training	3
Outreach / PR Materials	2	Position papers & Media Pkg	3
Training	2	General assistance	2
Membership	2	Improve communication	2
Good Presidential Candidates	1	Offensive litigation	1
Litigation assistance	1	Synergize with Prez	1
Candidate recruitment	1	Pay restitution	1
Executive Director Services	1		

Ballot Access in both 2015 and 2014 tops the list numerically. In 2015, there was much less emphasis on dbase/IT. That's in stark contrast to 2014 when together dBase support (8) and General IT support (4) topped the list.

Candidates on Ballot:

To augment poll data, candidate information was obtained from the following affiliate websites: Georgia, Kentucky, Montana, New Hampshire & Virginia. The following affiliates didn't know the quantity of non-partisan candidates, so zero was used to fill in those blanks: Arizona, Mississippi, Nevada, Ohio and Texas.

Affiliate Annual Income:

The total income of affiliates who chose to report was $567,257 with average of $12,892. That compares unfavorably with 2014 results when the total of reporting affiliates income estimate was $819,100 with average being $17,807 per affiliate. Of the 51 state affiliates, seven affiliates either didn't have the requested information or chose to not provide it. From total income table, the following breakdown on income applies:

Breakdown	2015	2014
Income >= $100K	0	1
$100K >= Income > $10K	13	14
$10K >= Income > $1K	19	23
Income <= $1K	12	7
Non-Reporting	7	6

The drop probably reflects typical decrease for an odd numbered election year.

A useful breakdown is to evaluate income prorated per unit population.

Income Factor = State Affiliate Est Income * 10,000 / State Total Population

2015		2014
> 100: 3		> 100: 2
90 to 100: 0		90 to 100: 0
80 to 90: 1		80 to 90: 1
70 to 80: 1		70 to 80: 2
60 to 70: 0		60 to 70: 2
50 to 60: 1		50 to 60: 0
40 to 50: 3		40 to 50: 4
30 to 40: 1		30 to 40: 1
20 to 30: 2		20 to 30: 4
10 to 20: 7		10 to 20: 13
< 10: 25		< 10: 16
No info: 7		No info: 6

The following state affiliates are known to either currently or recently have had paid staff. The prefix is their respective ranking of state affiliates in absolute cash flow amount: see attached table. High income states without a known paid staff include Texas (#1 ranked having $78K), Maine (#2 having $67K), Minnesota (#3 having $58K), Oregon (#6 having $46K) and North Carolina (#8 having $40K). Presumably, the high income states without

staff generally have high ballot access costs (e.g. Maine), or have made a decision to use volunteer staff (e.g. Texas).

<div align="center">

#5 ($48K) -Indiana

#7 ($42k) California

</div>

Recommendations:

1. Based upon 2014 report, IT funding should be allocated to address the dbase deficiencies, and provide CRM services to affiliates.
2. Consider shared platform that enables targeted integration of database operation between consenting state affiliates and national.
3. Continue supporting contractor(s) or staff member(s) who focuses on Affiliate Support.
4. Utilize existing phone system and provide numbers for each affiliate + DC.