

Comment from Public Member Cheryl Stanton on *Congressional Constituent Service Inquiries*
April 24, 2024

Lines 13 and 72: Should “ombud” be “ombudsman”?

Line 51: Suggest addition as follows in bold “operational need, **operate under different statutory requirements**, and different resources...”

Line 54: Suggest replacing “of the programs they administer” to “each agency faces.”

Lines 99-100: Suggest rewriting as follows: “include ~~required~~ information of documentation **required to for the request to be processed**. Instead...”

Line 116: The idea of sharing underlying code for a system from one agency to another is probably prohibited by the contract so either strike that or add after “systems” add “to the extent legally and contractually permissible..”

Line 126: Do we want to add after “requests” “because the agency prematurely closed a previous request without fully responding to the caseworker’s inquiry”? I am open to other language here but I think that is the concept we are trying to address?

Line 149: Should we clarify that by “Agencies” we mean “Agency decisionmakers” or “Senior Agency officials”? The idea is that the people processing the Congressional requests will not be making this determination but rather someone in a different position.

Lines 170-175: is this training we want each individual agency to be performing or do we want to recommend a centralized training (perhaps that is recorded so new Congressional constituent services staff can review in the event of turnover), with follow up documentation on particularly agencies? If so, I think this would need to be a separate recommendation – and if we decide to take this approach I can recommend language on a break based on how any discussion on this topic goes so we have actual language to consider.