

FEDERAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD
Board Meeting Minutes
June 26-27, 2019
Room 7C13
441 G Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20548

Wednesday, June 26, 2019..... 1

Attendance 1

Administrative Matters 2

 • Approval of Minutes 2

 • Updates and Clippings 2

Agenda Topics 2

 • Land..... 2

 • Liability for Cleanup Cost Interpretation..... 4

 • Omnibus..... 5

 • Materiality..... 5

 • Steering Committee 6

 • Appointments Panel..... 7

Adjournment 7

Thursday, June 27, 2019..... 7

Agenda Topics 7

 • MD&A Amendments 7

 • Reporting Model..... 10

 • Intragovernmental Allowances..... 11

 • Note Disclosures 14

 • Materiality..... 15

 • Omnibus Amendments 2019 15

Adjournment 15

For research purposes, please see the briefing materials at www.fasab.gov. Briefing materials for each session are organized by tab; references to these tabs in the minutes are hyperlinked.

Wednesday, June 26, 2019

Attendance

The following Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB or “the Board”) members were present throughout the meeting: Mr. Showalter (chair), Mr. Bell, Ms.

Bronner, Messrs. Dacey, Granof, McNamee, Scott, Smith, and Soltis. The executive director, Ms. Valentine, and general counsel, Mr. Kirwan, were also present throughout the meeting.

Administrative Matters

- **Approval of Minutes**

The Board approved the April meeting minutes prior to the meeting.

- **Updates and Clippings**

Mr. Showalter acknowledged the two incoming Board members, Ms. Sallyanne Harper and Mr. Terry Patton, who were attending the meeting as observers.

Mr. Showalter noted that the clippings now include updates on the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) and the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board. He requested Mr. Granof give the GASB update for the last time. Mr. Granof reported that the GASB has made progress on the reporting model, omnibus, public-private partnerships and revenue and expense projects. The GASB is also preparing to issue an implementation guide on leases and fiduciary activities. Mr. Showalter commented that GASB's cloud computing project may have implications for other standards-setters.

Mr. Dacey noted that he had attended the Public Sector Standard Setters Forum in Toronto. He mentioned that the forum discussed several emerging issues and that he conducted a tax expenditures presentation.

Agenda Topics

- **Land**

Mr. Domenic Savini, assistant director, introduced the discussion on the *Accounting and Reporting of Government Land* draft Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) from [tab D](#) of the briefing materials.

Members discussed the draft basis for conclusions, required supplementary information (RSI) transition period and effective date, and temporary land rights (TLRs).

Question 1 – Do members believe that the revised basis for conclusions discussion adequately expresses its rationale relative to those factors the Board considered significant in reaching its conclusions? If not, what other discussion points would members wish to include? Moreover, are there discussion points which members believe do not warrant a basis for conclusions discussion and should be eliminated?

Although members agreed that the basis for conclusions improved from its prior (April) version, the Board reserved judgment on whether any additional technical matters exist until staff presents for review a final basis for conclusions. Specifically, members discussed the following:

- **Overall Basis for Conclusions Content, Flow, and Voice** – Given the number and complexity of edits incorporated into the revised basis for conclusions, members requested a final editorial review. The review should focus not only on the content, but also flow and ability to clearly express Board intent and rationale. Lastly, the basis for conclusions should read in one voice as though it was authored by a single person. A member cited paragraph A32, which addresses requests for exceptions to de-recognition, as an example of a paragraph that could benefit from such an editorial review.
- **TLRs** – As discussed in question 2 below, members generally agreed with alternative 2 to maintain the exposure draft (ED) position to require continued capitalization of temporary land rights. Members noted that, given the definite or fixed useful life of these land rights, the allocation concept in accounting best serves as the Board’s rationale in requiring that TLRs be capitalized. Accordingly, members requested that staff add a TLR section to the basis for conclusions.

Question 2 – Does the Board agree with the staff suggestion to adopt alternative 2? If not, please provide your rationale and any accompanying suggestions.

The majority of members agreed with alternative #2, which would maintain the ED position to require continued capitalization of TLRs. However, members disagreed with allowing those entities electing to exclude land and (all) land rights from opening balances to be permitted to expense all future land rights including TLRs. That is, entities adopting the alternative method would need to capitalize and depreciate/amortize TLRs prospectively. Accordingly, members agreed to change the proposed SFFAS 6, *Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment*, Paragraph 40.f.i amendment to reflect the prospective capitalization of TLRs.

Question 3 – Are there any remaining technical matters or suggested edits to the standards members wish to identify?

Members discussed clarifying the RSI transition period and effective date language by ensuring that the guidance clearly states:

- For general property, plant, and equipment (G-PP&E) land, existing requirements to display balances and disclose information remain in effect until fiscal year (FY) 2024, when the RSI information transitions to basic.
- For both G-PP&E land and stewardship land (SL), no balance sheet reference to RSI should be made during the transition period.

- For SL, existing requirements to reference a note on the balance sheet that discloses information without displaying any asset dollar amount should continue until FY 2024, when the RSI information transitions to basic.

The Board did not identify additional technical matters; however, members reserved judgment until they review a final basis for conclusions.

Next steps

- Staff will incorporate a revised basis for conclusions pursuant to Board deliberations and work with members to help ensure that their concerns are reflected in the forthcoming revisions.
- Staff will address the technical issue raised concerning TLRs.
- Staff will clarify guidance concerning the RSI transition period and effective date.
- **Liability for Cleanup Cost Interpretation**

Ms. Melissa Batchelor, assistant director, explained the purpose of the session was to review and approve the pre-ballot draft Interpretation of Federal Financial Accounting Standards, *Cleanup Cost Liabilities Involving Multiple Component Reporting Entities: An Interpretation of SFFAS 5 & SFFAS 6*. The materials were included in the briefing materials at [tab A](#).

Based on member comments, Ms. Batchelor had suggested that the Board consider moving to a ballot version at the meeting. Member feedback prior to the meeting appeared to be supportive of moving to a ballot. Further, staff explained most members had no comments or small editorial comments on the pre-ballot draft.

Therefore, staff provided for review a marked ballot version and clean draft version of Interpretation 9, *Cleanup Cost Liabilities Involving Multiple Component Reporting Entities: An Interpretation of SFFAS 5 & SFFAS 6*.

Question 1 – Do members have any comments or questions regarding the pre-ballot, *Cleanup Cost Liabilities Involving Multiple Component Reporting Entities: An Interpretation of SFFAS 5 & SFFAS 6*?

The Board had submitted comments on the pre-ballot prior to the meeting and did not have any further comments.

Question 2 – Do members wish to move to a ballot Interpretation 9, *Cleanup Cost Liabilities Involving Multiple Component Reporting Entities: An Interpretation of SFFAS 5 & SFFAS 6* for vote at the June meeting?

The Board agreed to move to a ballot version of Interpretation 9, *Cleanup Cost Liabilities Involving Multiple Component Reporting Entities: An Interpretation of SFFAS 5 & SFFAS 6*. After reviewing minor edits, the Board approved the document.

Next steps: The Board unanimously approved Interpretation 9, *Cleanup Cost Liabilities Involving Multiple Component Reporting Entities: An Interpretation of SFFAS 5 & SFFAS 6*. The document will be forwarded to members representing the Department of the Treasury (Treasury), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the Government Accountability Office. If none of these members object within 45 days after its submission, FASAB will issue the document. The issuance is anticipated to be August 16, 2019.

- **Omnibus**

Mr. Ross Simms, assistant director, introduced the discussion on *Omnibus Amendments 2019* from [tab B](#) of the briefing materials.

Question 1 – Do members have any comments or questions regarding the pre-ballot, *Omnibus Amendments 2019*?

Mr. Simms noted that respondents generally agreed with the Board’s proposals. Those that did not agree noted that required supplementary stewardship information (RSSI) provides a section of the financial report that highlights investment information. Members noted that the basis for conclusions section explains that investment information may be significant for some reporting entities and warrant discussion in management’s discussion and analysis (MD&A). Members discussed edits to improve the flow of the basis for conclusions.

The Board also revised the effective date section of the Statement to clarify 1) the requirements that would be effective for reporting periods beginning after September 30, 2019, and for which early adoption would not be permitted; and 2) the requirements that would be effective upon issuance.

Question 2 – Do members wish to move to a ballot *Omnibus Amendments 2019*?

Members agreed to consider a ballot Statement during the next day of Board discussions.

- **Materiality**

Ms. Grace Wu, assistant director, introduced the discussion on a pre-ballot draft Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts (SFFAC) titled *Materiality* from [tab C](#) of the briefing materials.

Question 1 – Do members have any comments or questions regarding the pre-ballot, *Materiality*?

The Board generally supported the pre-ballot draft and discussed various edits and comments.

The Board agreed to remove the references to RSSI from paragraph 164a. Instead, a footnote was added noting SFFAS 57, *Omnibus Amendments 2019*, eliminates RSSI in the general purpose federal financial report. Members also agreed to eliminate the following statement from the summary section: “It also helps financial users improve their understanding and comprehension of federal financial reports.” The Board noted the proposed Statement may help the Board and preparers assess materiality but including such a statement about the effect on users may not always be true. Members added a reference to SFFAC 1, *Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting*, in a footnote to identify different kinds of accountability and relevant qualitative considerations. The quoted material from the Government Auditing Standards, section 6.03 was also removed. The Board discussed maintaining current MD&A materiality references in the basis for conclusions to address the current application of materiality in the MD&A.

One member questioned whether the Board should delay the issuance of this draft SFFAC because the Auditing Standards Board (ASB) is in the process of getting feedback on changing the auditing materiality definition to “substantial likelihood.” This term differs from FASAB’s proposed use of “reasonably be expected” in the draft SFFAC. Members discussed whether materiality definitions for preparing and auditing financial statements should be the same. The Board generally agreed that there is no requirement that the auditing and accounting definitions have to agree. The current drafted term of “reasonably be expected” reflects this thought. As such, there is no need to modify the term. The Board agreed to modify paragraph A12 in the basis for conclusions to acknowledge that other standards-setters have different materiality definitions. The Board also agreed not to delay the issuance of the Statement to wait on the ASB final guidance.

Question 2: Do members wish to move to a ballot *Materiality*?

Members agreed to consider a ballot Statement during the next day of Board discussions.

The Board meeting adjourned for lunch.

- **Steering Committee**

The Committee discussed the potential effect on the Board of the recent Executive Order on Evaluating and Improving the Utility of Federal Advisory Committees. Mr. Soltis agreed to look further into the issue.

Ms. Valentine presented her recommendation for the new FASAB senior analyst position, and the Committee approved the recommendation.

Ms. Valentine presented a staffing proposal to the Committee that would facilitate staff development and succession planning. The Committee tentatively approved the

recommendation. Ms. Valentine noted she would update the Committee on the developments of the proposed staffing structure.

Ms. Valentine presented a proposed budget for FY 2020 to the Committee. The federal members of the Committee noted they would seek approval from their respective leadership on the proposal.

- **Appointments Panel**

Ms. Valentine outlined to the Panel the expected timeline of the FY 2019 annual report. She also proposed a change in the content of the annual report.

The annual report is issued on November 15 each year. The report includes a statement from the FASAB chair, a summary of outreach activities, results from the member performance survey, a three-year plan for the technical agenda, the status of current projects, and a list of potential projects. During the past few years, FASAB has also conducted an online survey asking the community for feedback on current FASAB projects, as well as the list of potential projects.

Ms. Valentine proposed that the list of potential projects not be created, and the online survey not be conducted in FY 19. She suggested including both items in the annual report and three-year plan every other year—during the even numbered years. Due to the pace of FASAB’s current projects, the need to solicit input on new projects annually has not been necessary. However, FASAB will still solicit both formal and informal feedback via email and comment letters on the three-year plan in brief. All other portions of the annual report will be updated as normal.

The Appointments Panel approved Ms. Valentine’s proposal not to include the list of potential projects and the online survey in FY 2019 and to include that additional information in the even numbered years only.

Adjournment

The Board meeting adjourned for the day at 3:30 p.m.

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Agenda Topics

- **MD&A Amendments**

Ms. Robin Gilliam, assistant director, presented [tab G](#) to the Board. Ms. Gilliam explained that the new project, titled MD&A amendments, was a consolidation of the risk reporting and reporting model phase I: MD&A and stewardship improvements projects and she would be taking the lead. She reminded members that SFFAC 3, *Management’s Discussion and Analysis*, includes most of the standards-based

language that staff will use to amend SFFAS 15, *Management’s Discussions and Analysis*.

Question 1 – Does the Board approve adding the materiality boilerplate paragraph to SFFAS 15?

Ms. Gilliam asked members to explain why materiality is different for MD&A compared to the financial statements to help determine if members wanted to include the materiality boilerplate in the SFFAS 15 amendments.

Members explained that materiality is the same for both MD&A and the financial statements, but it is applied differently to MD&A. While the financial statements include materially quantitative information, management should apply more judgment to what qualitative information to include in MD&A. For example, there are no numerical thresholds to consider in MD&A. Instead, management should understand trending issues to determine what citizens are getting for their money and what qualitative information will be useful for interest groups.

Management should also consider a qualitative discussion in MD&A to explain, for example, why a financial statement balance is growing, the associated risk, and potential effect on operations.

To ensure inclusion of important information, members agreed that they did not want the materiality boilerplate. Instead, the Board wants to include a discussion about the concept of materiality and how it applies to MD&A.

Members asked what staff intended to propose for the future of SFFAC 3.

Ms. Gilliam explained that she used the initial analysis of SFFAC 3—[attachment 2](#) in the briefing materials—to focus on proposed amendments to SFFAS 15. Decisions about what to relocate or rescind from SFFAC 3 will be presented at a future Board meeting. Members agreed, noting that SFFAS 15 amendments should provide clarity and focus to help manage and reduce any additional burdens currently placed on preparers.

The Board requested that staff present information included in other concepts statements about MD&A to help determine the future of SFFAC 3.

Question 2 – Does the Board approve updating the SFFAS 15 header title from “Statement of Standards” to “Standards” to conform to current SFFAS formats?

Board members agreed to change the title to “Standards.”

Question 3a – Does the Board approve adding a scope section to conform to current SFFAS formats?

Board members agreed to add a scope section.

Question 3b – Does the Board have any comments about the recommended scope content?

A number of members had requested editorial changes in emails received prior to the Board meeting. These members believed some content was beyond scope information. Members requested that staff present an updated version of the scope section at a future Board meeting. In addition, most Board members asked staff to change the phrase “brief yet concise summary.”

Question 4 – Does the Board approve adding a definitions section to SFFAS 15?

The Board agreed to add a definitions section with terms to be identified and defined at future meetings.

Question 5 – Does the Board have any comments about the recommended content to replace SFFAS 15, paragraph 2?

Members questioned the “financial centric” reference because they thought it focused too much on the changes in the financial balances and not enough on what the organization accomplished.

Ms. Gilliam explained that this amendment would remove the required sections—approved at the April 2019 Board meeting—but still requires MD&A to include discussions on the items from those sections with a focus on financial effects.

Members recalled the umbrella diagram presented at a past Board meeting that recommended an MD&A framework and expressed concern that some of the project history was lost in merging the risk reporting and reporting model phase I: MD&A and stewardship investments improvements projects.

Staff had proposed “financial centric” standards to refocus the MD&A on financial effect and away from performance goals presented as statistical data. Instead of using the term “financial centric,” members preferred to focus on a balance between financial and non-financial information to achieve a holistic story about financial position and condition for agency mission programs and activities.

Question 6 – Does the Board have any comments about the recommended content to replace SFFAS 15, paragraphs 3-7?

Members were concerned that boundaries were not included in the draft proposed risk standards. Ms. Gilliam explained that staff had no intent of setting enterprise risk management (ERM) policy. The proposed MD&A standards should encourage agencies to utilize information from the ERM process to help users understand potential financial effect of high-profile risks. Members agreed.

Members did want to define “financial position” and “financial condition” when asked by staff. Members see financial condition as broader than financial position, which relates predominantly to the balance sheet. Members agreed that financial condition exists at

all levels of the federal government—government-wide and agency—but applies differently at an agency. For example, an agency could discuss the economic health of a mission-based program, while the government-wide could discuss the fiscal health of the U.S. government.

Members requested that staff develop objectives for the MD&A before continuing to develop standards. Objectives should independently help preparers understand what should be achieved in MD&A and prevent the mentality that checklist compliance will lead to an effective MD&A. The Board requested that staff identify all MD&A concepts from the FASAB Handbook (in addition to those in SFFAC 3) to help drive the objectives.

Next steps:

- Staff will present MD&A concepts included in the current FASAB Handbook.
- Staff will develop objectives for MD&A.
- **Reporting Model**

Mr. Ross Simms introduced the discussion on the reporting model from [tab H](#) of the briefing materials. The objective of the discussion was to determine the next steps for the project, and Mr. Simms asked Board members to rank a set of alternatives from 1 to 9. Questions 1-9 from the briefing materials request the Board’s reaction to these projects. Table 1: Priorities provides a list of the alternatives considered and the total votes each received. Because members ranked their top priorities 1-9, the lowest ranking alternatives represent the most popular choices.

The Board observed that (1) Improve Budgetary Information Reporting, (2) Performance Reporting, (3) Electronic Reporting, and (4) Data Quality and Integration received the highest rankings. Members noted that linking budgetary and performance information would improve financial reporting.

Total	Project	Description
28	Improve Budgetary Information Reporting	Determine how to improve the reporting of budgetary information, including whether the information should be basic or RSI
31	Performance Reporting	Determine what performance information should be reported in general purpose federal financial reports and its format
33	Electronic Reporting	Determine FASAB’s role with respect to electronic reporting

Total	Project	Description
35	Data Quality and Integration & Top-Down Assessment	Determine what role financial statements might play in facilitating data quality and integration across the federal government and, based on a top-down assessment, determine what information might be needed across government, rather than for individual component reporting entities
47	User Project	Assess user needs
49	Disaggregate Costs – Statement of Net Cost	Determine how best to disaggregate costs on the face of the statement of net cost
61	Guidance on Financial Statements and Financial Reporting	Develop guidance that would explain the relationship between financial statements and financial reporting
61	Remove the Reporting Model Umbrella & Conduct Discrete Projects	Focus on discrete projects to improve the reporting model rather than continuing an overall reporting model project
61	Number and type of Financial Statements	Determine the basic financial statements that reporting entities should present

Table 1: Priorities

Next steps: For the August 2019 meeting, staff will propose a plan to address the high-priority projects.

- **Intragovernmental Allowances**

Ms. Batchelor introduced the session on intragovernmental allowances for losses. The materials for the session were provided in [tab 1](#). The objective of the session was to consider a draft Technical Bulletin (TB), *Loss Allowance for Intragovernmental Receivables*, to address a request for guidance from Treasury regarding intragovernmental allowances for losses.

Ms. Batchelor explained that staff had prepared a TB to provide clarity and resolve the perceived uncertainty related to intragovernmental allowances for losses. Staff explained that a TB appeared to be the most appropriate document to provide such guidance. TBs provide guidance for applying existing FASAB Statements and Interpretations and resolving accounting issues not directly addressed by them. A TB will not be issued if a majority of the FASAB members object either to the guidance in it or to communicating that guidance in a TB.

Ms. Batchelor indicated that, based on feedback prior to the meeting, over half the Board had expressed support for the TB. However, one Board member had disagreed with the guidance in the document.

Staff provided the members with an updated version of the TB at the meeting that included minor edits and comments noting disagreement by the member.

Mr. Showalter noted that a TB is a document of staff, not a document issued by the Board. It only requires the majority of the Board to not object to its issuance.

Question 1 – Does the Board agree with the staff recommendation?

Most members agreed with the staff approach and recommendation to proceed with a TB. The Treasury member disagreed and provided an overview of his concerns. He noted that he did not necessarily disagree with the use of a TB, but he disagreed with the guidance it provided.

Mr. Bell explained Treasury's concerns:

- Treasury agrees that, in general practice, an allowance does not necessarily precipitate a write-off. However, showing an allowance on the face of a financial statement gives an explicit indication that the entity does not expect to collect the amounts recorded as the allowance. Such an indication can give trading partners the impression that allowance amounts are not expected to be repaid.
- Treasury agrees that a TB is an appropriate vehicle through which to clarify the standards but disagrees with the proposed clarification in that it does not recognize the inherent distinctions of transactions subject to statutory reimbursement requirements.
- Treasury recommends the TB clarify that allowances on intragovernmental receivables, particularly for those payables/receivables associated with statutory requirements, are not appropriate. At a minimum, the guidance should be more explicit in establishing an allowance does not represent a write-off.

After discussing Treasury's concerns, the members confirmed their position that there is no differentiation in the standards, and recognition of allowances for losses applies to both intragovernmental receivables and receivables from nonfederal entities. The Board recognized that there may be factors that should be considered in assessing collectability that are specific to intragovernmental receivables. However, most members believed that should be considered by management. The Board also noted that this issue has come up because financial reporting is advancing. The Board also recognized the unique scenario that exists with intragovernmental receivables but believed fair presentation is important.

Staff noted that a proposed paragraph in the basis for conclusions encourages additional disclosures that would provide transparency about this issue. The reader could be provided more information about intragovernmental receivables and allowances. This could include the age of the receivables, underlying statutory requirements, the fact that agencies are required to pay although an allowance may be recorded, and the fact that agencies may not be able to collect or pay without Congressional action. The Board agreed that encouraging transparency would be helpful and the best role for the Board.

Treasury asked if the Board would consider including language regarding the difference between the accounting requirements and the underlying legal requirements. Treasury suggested clarifying that, although there is an allowance, the receivable can still be collected because there is a statutory requirement that exists. Members agreed adding this language would be helpful. Staff agreed to work with general counsel and certain members to add this notion to the TB.

Treasury also had concerns regarding points made around judgment, but the issue had been resolved through the closing package or top-level journal vouchers. Mr. Showalter noted that staff agreed to remove language pertaining to these items from the basis for conclusions.

Mr. Showalter explained that, although there were enough votes to move forward with the document, he wanted to be sensitive to Treasury's concerns. Therefore, he requested that staff consider the points discussed and determine what may be addressed within the framework of the TB. After doing so, staff will send the document back to the Board for a final 15-day review.

2. If the Board agrees, staff requests Board member feedback on the draft TB, *Loss Allowance for Intragovernmental Receivables*, at the June meeting so that an exposure draft may be issued for comment. Do Board members have comments on the draft?

Most members provided minor editorial comments prior to the meeting. Staff provided to the Board an updated version, including these changes, at the meeting. The Board also discussed other minor edits as noted in question 1.

3. If members disagree, what alternatives do they prefer to address the issue? For example, do members wish to pursue a different GAAP-level document to address this issue?

Members agreed to address the issue in a TB.

Next steps: Staff will provide members an updated TB, *Loss Allowance for Intragovernmental Receivables*, that incorporates the agreed upon changes for a 15-day review. If a majority of the members do not object, the TB will be exposed to the public for comment.

- **Note Disclosures**

Ms. Grace Wu introduced the discussion on note disclosures from [tab J](#) of the briefing materials with the objective of obtaining feedback on the draft disclosure principles.

Question 1 – Does the Board agree with the updated draft principles? If not, do members have any suggestions?

The Board generally supported the draft principles. Members discussed edits and clarifications during the session:

One member suggested the draft principles could incorporate GASB’s recent discussion on the determination of essential information. The Board agreed to maintain the current draft principles because they are easier to apply as a result of the direct connection to the concept of “reasonable user” established in the materiality project.

One member questioned whether the draft should summarize the principles from other standards on why information should be presented in the notes instead of on the face of the financial statements. The Board agreed that the discussions in other standards might be difficult to summarize, and the quotes from the other standards in the footnotes should remain in the draft.

One member asked if the six detailed disclosure consideration examples listed in paragraph 23 of the draft should be regrouped according to the three categories of major types of notes. The Board decided to maintain the current presentation because those examples are qualitative considerations, which would be impossible to regroup into the three categories, and the examples cross all three categories.

Members concurred on the updated relevance and materiality section and provided further suggested edits. In addition, the Board discussed minor edits to other sections and the questions for the Board section title change.

Question 2 – Does the Board wish to discuss any other matters not identified by staff in the proposed draft note disclosure principles?

One member asked why staff included in the draft principles appendix B, which includes text from the Financial Accounting Standards Board’s (FASB) Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts 8. Staff had presented this section, titled “Decision Questions to Be Considered in Establishing Disclosure Requirements,” to the Board at the August 2018 meeting. During that meeting, the Board had agreed to include a similar section in the principles to help identify relevant disclosures and the level of detail required during the standards-setting process. Staff documented the reasons for including appendix A in the draft principles in paragraphs 20-22.

Next steps:

- Staff will update the draft principles based on Board input.

- Staff will prepare a presentation with the working group on decision questions to be considered by the Board for the August 2019 meeting.

- **Materiality**

The Board reviewed a draft ballot version of SFFAC 9, *Materiality*, which included various changes based on the discussion from the prior day. Members made minor edits and clarifications. In addition, one member requested to expand the discussion of differing materiality definitions among accounting and auditing standards-setters in the basis for conclusions. The Board agreed to do so. Due to the extent of changes proposed by members during the meeting, Mr. Showalter deferred voting on the pre-ballot version until the next meeting. At the next meeting, the Board will review the updated pre-ballot version.

Next steps: Staff will update the pre-ballot version of SFFAC 9 based on the discussion.

- **Omnibus Amendments 2019**

Mr. Ross Simms noted minor, non-technical edits to the pre-ballot *Omnibus Amendments 2019*, and members approved the Statement for issuance.

Adjournment

Mr. Showalter recognized Mr. Granof for his many contributions to FASAB's progress and publications and congratulated him on his ten-year tenure as a Board member. Mr. Showalter then concluded his own ten-year term as a Board member, including three and a half years as chair, by adjourning the meeting and passing the gavel to Mr. Scott, the incoming chair. Mr. Scott thanked Mr. Granof for his ten years of service to the Board. Mr. Scott also recognized Mr. Showalter for his excellent leadership as chair of the Board and contributions as a Board member. The Board meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.