

# NAFSGL Working Group Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November 20, 2014

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

**Attendees:** Mike Kelly (MC&FP), Justin Hall (MC&FP), Zel Leach (DFAS-IN), Darryl Davis, Robin Bedsole and Nancy Stephens (Navy CNIC), Coleen Amstein (Army Secretariat), Mitch Covington (Army DFAS), Cheryl Basil (Air Force MWR AF SVA/SVF), Pat Craddock and Courtney Pulis (USMC), Laura Strong (ACSIM), Jeremy Blain, Mark Douek & Tina Cooper (Grant Thornton)

## Welcome and Introductions – Mr. Mike Kelly, Director, MWR & Resale Policy

- Thanked WG for producing measurable results
- Announced addition of Mike Curtis to MC&FP in mid-December. Mr. Curtis is an accounting expert and NAF expert. He has his CPA, CDFM, and other certifications. Experienced in both Appropriated and NAF sides of DoD. Has SEC experience and private sector as well. He comes to MC&FP by way of the Army.
- Reminded WG that there are some overlaps and converging interests between this project and other MC&FP initiatives. Urged more cross pollination between working group and IT working group. Need to make sure we're all playing from the same playbook.

## Initiative Status Update – Mr. Jeremy Blain, Grant Thornton

- Common account code elements
  - Conducted one-on-one meetings with Services about the common account code elements.
  - Received good feedback about the OSD perspective as well as service-specific needs that we should address.
  - Want to maintain a level of customization at the service level.
  - The conversations have been interesting and have been around reducing the number of activities and account codes. Want to also minimize the number of keystrokes and data entry requirements.
  - The overall structure of the account code is complete. Now are working through the exceptions, so we are about 95% done.
  - What's next is the formal staff process to get the NAFSGL approved.
  - As we move forward from here, we will establish a governance board to update the structure of the NAFSGL.
  - **Action Item:** Meetings with IT representatives of each Service. Goal is to engage IT to see how they would implement the NAFSGL in the accounting systems at each of the Services/installations.
- Website
  - Website will function alongside FMR policy. Since NAFSGL items need to be regularly updated, information will be pulled out of the policy and hosted instead on a website to allow easier access and updates.
  - Site will be a centralized spot where everyone can access the chart of accounts, common NAF GL, etc. Service SOPs can be linked as well. Training, definitions and tooltips will be available on the site. Still need to flush out full requirements.
  - All Services gave support to the idea of the site; Air Force noted that it is doing the same thing with its COA.
  - Justin – MC&FP will maintain the site and fund it.

- **Action Item:** GT to develop user requirements for website.
  - Need to figure out who's developing/building this site.
  - Need to make sure information is linked and automatically synced. Don't want the site to crumble under its own complexity.

### **Common Account Code Elements – Mr. Jeremy Blain, Grant Thornton**

- Should NAF Fund come first or Installation in ordering of digits?
  - Resolved to keep order as is.
- Navy requested that the account string be required for reporting only and not be a required ordering for each Service's system.
  - Justin – that confirmation will be in the memo package.
- NAF Fund digits
  - **Action Item:** Jeremy proposed to remove last two NAF fund digits since Services voiced that those digits are not necessary. Proposed to keep the breakout between HQ, installation, etc. in the fund codes.
  - USMC: Agreed to remove digits. Digits already represented in the other levels.
  - USAF: Agreed to remove digits but keep breakout of HQ, installation, etc. in fund codes. Need a way to limit the access of some users so they can't influence codes they don't directly work with.
  - Navy: Agreed to remove digits
  - Army: Agreed to remove digits
- Installations List
  - **Action Item:** Installation digits in account code to change from 3 digits to 4 digits to accommodate USAF numbering.
  - **Action Item:** Services to check installations list for accuracy and send GT any changes as well as send four digit numbering for installations.
- NAF Funds
  - **Action Item:** GT to update fund list to reflect funds that are for multiple Services or for one Service only.
  - **Action Item:** Services to send GT additional funds to add to list along with definitions.
  - **Action Item:** GT to move Warfighter to activity list. Make capital improvements and insurance into special purpose funds.
  - Should like-funds roll up into the program group?
    - USMC: Doesn't mind having multiple special purpose funds. Either option works.
    - USAF: Wants to keep fund codes as is.
    - Navy: Roll up fund codes to program by use of additional leading digit
    - Army: Keep fund codes as is because all are stand-alone activities.
    - **Action Item:** GT to remove the service-specific digit and rewrite the NAF fund string to have first digit designate program group. Next two digits designate the fund.
- Activities
  - Amusement and Recreational Machines as activity or cost center?
    - Army: Keep as activity
    - USAF: Move to cost center
    - Navy: Keep as activity
    - USMC: Remove it. It is accounted for in the background
    - **Action Item:** GT to look into the issue. Keep as is for now.
  - How to list child development and youth programs?

- USAF: Secretariat level needs to make decision. There is not a consolidated location for the 0-5 yr olds and the 6+; they are entirely separate programs.
- Navy: Has CDC, School Aged, and Youth services but there is common overhead that rolls up all three.
- USMC: Defer to Marine family programs, but similar to Navy since they have common shared overhead that is allocated across the different programs.
- **Action Item:** Justin to discuss proper listing with OSD.
- Necessary to have category A and category B recreation centers?
  - Navy: Has both types of centers
  - USMC: Has both types of centers
  - Army: Only has category A centers
  - USAF: Only has category A centers but has category B & C activities in these centers.
  - Resolved to keep both category A and B recreation centers
- Army requested an additional activity for its chaplain services.
  - **Action Item:** If Army cannot find another activity to place it under, we will create a new activity for it.
- Are two Marina activities necessary?
  - Navy/USMC: Keep both because they designate difference between category A, B, and C activities.
- Food & Beverage: No Service objected to how this is listed out.
- Cost Centers
  - Do we need to keep the officer/enlisted breakout for lodging?
    - Army: It probably will be helpful
    - USAF: Has its own unique breakout
    - **Action Item:** GT to look at best way to list lodging cost centers.
  - Does boat repair need to be a cost center?
    - All Services agreed that the maintenance cost center suffices.
    - **Action Item:** GT to remove the boat repair cost center.
  - Special Events vs. Community Events
    - **Action Item:** Remove special events cost center since it is redundant. Consider adding an additional service specific digit to the cost centers
  - **Action Item:** Move recycling from community programs to an activity.
  - Keep commercial sponsorship separate from marketing
  - Should there be a legal cost center in the common cost center section?
    - USAF/Army: Don't need it
    - USMC/Navy: Want it as a cost center

**NAF Accounting Standards Board – Mr. Justin Hall (MC&FP)**

- **Action Item:** Services to review the draft charter before the next WG meeting on 12/18/14.