

Attendees

- MC&FP
 - Justin Hall, Mike Curtis
- Army IMCOM G-9
 - Bryan Hartsell, Sonia Daugherty, Tina Hudson
- Air Force Secretariat
 - David Curley
- Air Force Services Activity
 - Jane Belinfante, Tom Marsh
- USMC MCCA
 - Pat Craddock, Courtney Pulis
- DFAS – Indianapolis
 - La Zaleus Leach
- Navy CNIC
 - Daryl Davis, Nancy Stephens, Diane Brewer, Jason Phillips, Debbie Phillips
- Grant Thornton (GT)
 - Jeremy Blain, Sara Carver, Ashley Beveridge, Mike Casias

Action Items from Previous Meeting

- MC&FP and Grant Thornton to present more information about the proposed changes to the NAFSGL Installation List. **Completed.**
- MC&FP to present/discuss the “Questions from the Services” not discussed at the current meeting. **Completed.**

Action Items Still Open

- None

Action Items Summary – Current Meeting

- None

Welcome and Introductions – Mr. Justin Hall, MWR & Resale Policy

- Mr. Justin Hall opened up the working group meeting and thanked everyone for attending and for their ongoing efforts. He reaffirmed to the group that he is filling in for Mr. Mike Kelly. Looking at the agenda, he emphasized importance of the group focusing on instituting the NAFSGL, getting the updates published, and helping to put a governance structure in place for successful implementation.

General OSD Update – Mr. Mike Curtis, MWR & Resale Policy

- Mr. Mike Curtis walked through outstanding action items from the July meeting minutes. No follow on issues were identified.
- Mr. Curtis informed the group that MC&FP received approval to purchase Tableau Server-based support. They are currently working with the supporting OSD procurement office to completion

the acquisition. They plan to build a SharePoint website to enable user access and host the Tableau Server.

- Mr. Curtis surveyed the group to see if they had any issues putting together the NAFSGL implementation waivers. No issues were identified.
- Mr. Curtis informed the group that for the DoDI 1015.15 revision they are asking the Services to confirm if there are any funds within Group V and VI that are not listed or no longer used. USMC stated they have a supplemental mission fund at one installation called the “Animal Care Fund.”

Updates to the NAFSGL following June 2015 approval - Mr. Mike Curtis, MWR & Resale Policy

- Mr. Curtis surveyed the group to see if there were any new issues with updates to the GLACs and/or chart of accounts. USMC reiterated that changes to the numbering and structure of the NAFSGL would require substantial recoding and maintenance. Per Mr. Curtis, the intent is to not make a big change to the numbering structure going forward. USMC also asked for confirmation that the Services should use the approved June 2015 NAFSGL. Mr. Curtis informed the group that the June 2015 NAFSGL is still the current officially approved version, so the more recent changes we are discussing won't be in effect until we get an official memo signed.
- Mr. Jeremy Blain walked through the process of making ongoing changes to the GLAC/chart of accounts, and incorporation of a new naming convention to the NAFSGL installation list. The new naming convention will allow us to look at geographic areas and specific Service bases in our analysis. Mr. Blain surveyed the group for concerns.
 - Air Force concurred.
 - USMC noted that they have an issue with MCCA headquarters listed as part of Quantico MCB for the proposed solution. They will talk internally to see about the titles and report back.
 - Navy asked if all of their historic information has to have some link into this installation listing. Mr. Blain confirmed this would only be on a going forward basis.
 - Mr. Curtis queried the group to see if there are any objections to this concept. No other objections were identified.

Questions from the Services – Mr. Mike Curtis, MWR & Resale Policy

- Mr. Curtis walked through other questions from the Services. Air Force had a question involving food trucks and how they should be reported in the annual report. The ability to not be so restrictive with the cost centers would be ideal going forward. The Air Force also expressed concerns on reporting food & beverage and lodging.
 - Navy has a similar situation with food and beverage in lodging. There are small food operations. They report it as an MWR food outlet, as it is run as MWR.
 - USMC has process similar to Navy's. They have small food operations in their TLFs. They record it as MWR food & beverage.
 - Air Force agreed that utilization of the Food and Beverage program code is correct and that is where they are heading.
- Navy brought up a topic around treating Category C activities as Category B activities for APF authorization purposes for remote and isolated sites, primarily in OCONUS. The concern as the OP-34 is reviewed at the end of the year, it will show a small amount that goes into Category C, but those are all remote and isolated –would it be more appropriate to call them Category B? Navy asked the group how other Services interpret, and also if there is a DOD policy?

- Mr. Curtis stated he believes they should be reported as Category C so we see the APF going toward the Category C. He noted that remote and isolated location policy will be added to the DoDI 1015.15 during the current revision process.
- No further issues were identified.

Tableau Visualization Update – Mr. Mike Casias, Grant Thornton

- Mr. Casias walked through various visualizations that showed different views of program data from the various annual reports.
 - Ms. Leach asked if this data can show information on installations. Mr. Mike Casias informed her that it can, but it depends on the type of data we can obtain and it reinforces the importance of installation codes.
 - Mr. Curtis informed the group that the intent of sharing everyone's data on certain MWR activities at this level is not to point fingers about performance, but to instead share the information to promote the sharing of ideas. For example, Navy is the only Service that has a profit in golf and CAT C bowling, so we may be able to share best practices in these programs and/or identify accounting issues, if any. The hope is to start a healthy dialogue and share best practices and/or concerns.

Wrap up – Mr. Mike Curtis, MWR & Resale Policy

- Mr. Curtis wrapped up the meeting by stating the next working group session is planned for September 22, 2016.