



INTELLIGENCE

2026 ELECTION CYCLE
SERVICE OVERVIEW &
CAPABILITIES

SERVICE OVERVIEW & SAMPLE DELIVERABLES

DFX Intelligence

AI-Native Political Intelligence for Winning Campaigns

| | |
|----------------|---|
| DOCUMENT | Service Overview & Capabilities |
| AUDIENCE | Prospective Clients · Campaign Leadership |
| DATE | April 2026 |
| PREPARED BY | DFX Intelligence |
| CLASSIFICATION | Marketing · SAMPLE |

DFX INTELLIGENCE
POLITICAL INTELLIGENCE ·
DONOR STRATEGY

This document provides an overview of DFX Intelligence services and capabilities. All sample data, candidate names, donor information, and financial figures are entirely synthetic and created for demonstration purposes only. No real individuals or campaigns are represented.

DFX Intelligence — Service Overview

SAMPLE DOCUMENT — Contains synthetic illustrative data for demonstration purposes only. No real candidates, donors, or campaigns are represented below unless explicitly noted.

Who We Are

DFX Intelligence is an AI-native political intelligence firm delivering opposition research, candidate due diligence, campaign strategy diagnostics, and donor opportunity mapping at speeds and price points the traditional consulting market cannot match.

We combine deep political expertise with proprietary AI-augmented research workflows that cut analyst hours by 40–60% — passing those savings directly to campaigns while maintaining the source-verified rigor that campaign counsel and finance chairs demand.

Our clients include: Democratic campaigns, PACs, independent expenditure committees, issue-advocacy organizations, and party committees.

What We Deliver

1. Opposition Research Books

Comprehensive, source-verified dossiers on opposing candidates — the foundation of every competitive campaign.

| FEATURE | DFX STANDARD |
|---------------------|--|
| Length | 30–80 pages |
| Sources | FEC, SEC, PACER, state courts, LDA, PFDs, local/national press, Ballotpedia, OpenSecrets |
| Confidence scoring | Every finding labeled VERIFIED FACT / ALLEGATION / DISPUTED / INFERENCE |
| Materiality scoring | 1–5 scale on every substantive claim |
| Turnaround | 5–10 business days (vs. industry standard 3–6 weeks) |
| Deliverable | Branded PDF + structured data appendix |

Sample Findings — Synthetic Candidate “James Whitfield” (CD-12 Democratic Primary)

This is a fictional example using entirely synthetic data.

| # | FINDING | CONFIDENCE | MATERIALITY |
|---|---|---------------|-------------|
| 1 | Whitfield reported \$4.2M in assets on 2025 PFD; \$1.8M in pharmaceutical stocks while sponsoring drug-pricing legislation | VERIFIED FACT | 5 |
| 2 | 78% of itemized donations originated outside the district (FEC Schedule A analysis) | VERIFIED FACT | 4 |
| 3 | Campaign manager previously fined \$12,500 by state ethics commission for unreported bundling (2021) | VERIFIED FACT | 4 |
| 4 | Whitfield’s consulting firm billed \$340K to a 501(c)(4) that later endorsed him | ALLEGATION | 3 |
| 5 | No civil or criminal litigation found in PACER, state trial courts, or federal district courts | VERIFIED FACT | 1 |
| 6 | PolitiFact rated two Whitfield claims “Mostly False” during 2024 state senate race | VERIFIED FACT | 3 |
| 7 | Former business partner quoted in local press alleging “misleading investor communications” | ALLEGATION | 3 |
| 8 | Whitfield served on board of charter school network that received \$2.1M in state grants during his tenure as state senator | VERIFIED FACT | 4 |

Red / Yellow / Green Classification:

| CATEGORY | COUNT | KEY ITEMS |
|---------------------|-------|---|
| Red Flags | 1 | Pharmaceutical stock holdings + legislative conflict |
| Yellow Flags | 4 | Out-of-district money, campaign manager ethics fine, 501(c)(4) billing, charter school grants |
| Green Flags | 3 | No litigation, no personal enforcement actions, strong small-dollar fundraising |

2. Self-Research / Vulnerability Audits

The same rigorous methodology applied to *your own* candidate — identify and prepare for attacks before your opponent finds them.

- Full public-records sweep (FEC, PACER, SEC, state courts, LDA, PFDs)
- Media sentiment analysis across local and national coverage
- Social media vulnerability scan (archived posts, deleted content recovery from public archives)
- Prioritized vulnerability matrix with recommended inoculation strategies
- Delivered under attorney-client privilege framework when engaged through campaign counsel

3. Campaign Intelligence & Value Creation Reports

A full strategic diagnostic that converts raw intelligence into an actionable campaign playbook.

Sample Output — Synthetic Campaign “Maria Santos for Congress” (CD-7)

This is a fictional example using entirely synthetic data.

Strategic Position Assessment:

| DIMENSION | SANTOS (CLIENT) | OPPONENT A — "TOM BRADLEY" | OPPONENT B — "RACHEL PARK" |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Origin | District native, 12-year city council | Transplant from neighboring district, 3 years residency | District native, state house 6 years |
| Funding (Q1) | \$425K raised / \$380K COH | \$1.1M raised (62% self-funded) / \$890K COH | \$310K raised / \$275K COH |
| Core vulnerability | Lower name ID outside city limits | Self-funding + out-of-district donor base | Crowded progressive lane, limited fundraising infrastructure |
| Top endorsement | State AFL-CIO | None | Planned Parenthood Action |
| Narrative risk | "City-only candidate" framing | "Buying the seat" + carpet-bagger | Splitting progressive vote |

Top 5 Exploitable Vulnerabilities (Ranked):

1. **Bradley self-funding** — \$680K personal loan creates "buying the seat" narrative (Materiality 5)
2. **Bradley residency** — 3-year district residency vs. Santos's lifelong roots (Materiality 4)
3. **Park fundraising deficit** — Signals viability risk to institutional endorsers (Materiality 3)
4. **Bradley pharma consulting** — 4 years at mid-cap pharma firm while district has opioid crisis (Materiality 4)
5. **Park missed votes** — 11% absence rate in state house, highest in delegation (Materiality 3)

Donor Opportunity Mapping (Top 5 Segments):

| RANK | SEGMENT | EST. YIELD | LIKELIHOOD | ACQUISITION CHANNEL |
|------|----------------------------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| 1 | Labor / AFL-CIO network | \$120K–\$180K | High | Endorsement-driven solicitation |
| 2 | Trial lawyers (AAJ network) | \$80K–\$140K | Medium-High | Fundraiser circuit + counsel referral |
| 3 | Latino/a Victory Fund | \$50K–\$90K | Medium | Apply for endorsement; triggers bundling |
| 4 | Small-dollar digital (ActBlue) | \$60K–\$100K | Medium | Contrast ads driving email acquisition |
| 5 | Local business owners (district) | \$40K–\$70K | Medium | Council relationships → house parties |

30/60/90 Day Execution Roadmap included with specific capital, narrative, and field milestones.

4. Donor Opportunity Mapping

Standalone donor intelligence product — segmented prospect lists with warm-intro pathways and defectability scoring.

- 15–25 ranked donor segments with estimated yield, likelihood, and acquisition channel
- Individual HNW donor profiles with giving history, network connections, and approach strategy
- Defectability analysis: which of your opponent's donors are gettable, and how
- Cross-referenced against FEC, state campaign finance databases, and OpenSecrets

5. Monthly Intelligence Retainer

Ongoing monitoring and rapid-response support throughout the campaign cycle.

Included each month:

- Opposition monitoring brief (weekly)
- FEC/PFD/LDA filing alerts and same-day analysis
- Media monitoring and narrative-risk detection
- Rapid-response decision trees for breaking stories
- Donor intelligence updates (new prospects, defection opportunities)
- Monthly strategy call with DFX principals

6. FEC Quarterly Flash Reports

Same-day analysis of opponent FEC filings — delivered within hours of filing deadline.

Sample Flash Report Output — Synthetic Data:

Q1 2026 Flash — "Tom Bradley for Congress" (C00XXXXXX)

| METRIC | Q1 2026 | Q4 2025 | DELTA |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Total receipts | \$487,312 | \$612,889 | -20.5% |
| Individual contributions | \$189,445 | \$298,112 | -36.4% |
| Self-funding | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | Flat |
| Cash on hand | \$891,204 | \$653,892 | +36.3% |
| Burn rate | 23.4% | 41.2% | Improved |
| Out-of-district % | 71.8% | 68.3% | Worsening |

Key Takeaway: Bradley's individual fundraising collapsed 36% Q/Q while self-funding held flat — signals donor enthusiasm problem. Out-of-district concentration worsening. Deploy "bought and paid for" frame in next 72 hours while filing is newsworthy.

7. Debate Prep Intelligence Package

Vulnerability matrices and attack/defense decision trees tailored to each opponent.

- Opponent-specific vulnerability cards with sourced attack lines
- Pre-bunk file: anticipated attacks against your candidate with recommended responses
- Decision trees: if opponent says X, respond with Y (branching logic for live debate)
- Post-debate rapid-response memo template

Why DFX Intelligence

| TRADITIONAL FIRM | DFX INTELLIGENCE |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 3–6 week turnaround | 5–10 business days |
| \$15K–\$50K per oppo book | \$8K–\$25K per oppo book |
| Manual research only | AI-augmented + human-verified |
| Flat PDF, no updates | Living intelligence with retainer option |
| Oppo OR strategy — rarely both | Integrated oppo + strategy + donor intel |
| Available to top-tier campaigns only | Accessible to competitive down-ballot races |

Past Engagements

DFX Intelligence has delivered research products across competitive Democratic primaries and general elections, including multi-candidate due diligence portfolios and full campaign intelligence packages.

Client list and references available under NDA upon request.

Get Started

DFX Intelligence offers a complimentary 30-minute consultation to assess your race and recommend the right intelligence package.

Contact: - Email: info@dfxintelligence.com - Web: dfxintelligence.com

DFX Intelligence conducts all research using exclusively lawful, publicly available primary and secondary sources. No private, paywalled, or unlawfully obtained data is used. All findings are labeled by confidence and materiality.