

DoD Inspector General (DoDIG) **Military Leadership Diversity Commission Recap of Military Service Component's Progress** by Project Manager, Evaluations, DoDIG

3 MAY 2024 | DACODAI Public Meeting

[00:00:00.440] - Speaker 1

Good morning. It is now 1115, and we will start with the next briefing. The DoD IG or Inspector general's office will provide a recap briefing on the military services practices or progress on the military leadership Diversity Commission recommendations, otherwise known as MLDC. The briefing will last approximately 30 minutes, after which the chair will initiate the committee's questions and answer session. The slide deck for this briefing is located at Tab Foxtrot. Today's briefer is Mister Michael Guagliano, and he is the supervisory follow up analyst for the DoD IG. And Mister Guagliano, you have 30 minutes, and right now we have General Lyles as the chair. Sir, I think you're not.

[00:01:01.250] - Speaker 2

Yeah, there you go. I'm sorry, I was mute there. Thank you, Mister Gagliana, for coming to talk to us about the status report relative to the MLDC and how the DoD ID does this follow up, these types of follow up reviews, and probably everybody knows. Just so coincidental, and by the way, it is coincidental that I was the chair, chairman of the Military Leadership Diversity Commission several years ago. So we are all very, very interested in your comments and specifically how the department has responded to the 20 recommendations that came out of the MLGC study. So thank you for joining us and the floor is yours.

[00:01:45.650] - Speaker 3

All right, well, thank you, General Lyles. We greatly appreciate the opportunity to brief the status on the follow up and where the department is in making progress on this very important critical issue to us all. I do want to preface my presentation today. It's a real time work in progress. This is an active dialog in pursuit. I'm speaking about DoD IG 2022 144, our report on the department's progress towards the 2011 MLDC recommendations. I did want to also offer for everyone's consideration for the commission. DoD IG certainly welcomes suggestions, comments, insight to the oversight into our follow up process, what we hold DoD to the standards to close the recommendation. You all are certainly the experts vast knowledge that we could never even dream of. You've probably forgotten more than we'll ever know. So if you do have any suggestions, comments to pursuing the oversight or things we should consider, please speak up now during my presentation. Or you can send an after action for our consideration. But I do have to say, we are an independent oversight body. The final decision on progress status completion is ours to make. We maintain our independence, but we certainly welcome and look forward to any feedback from such distinguished folks as yourself and commission.

[00:03:23.820] - Speaker 3

So, with that said, I just wanted to give you the role of. Next slide, please. Yeah, so that'll be my agenda going over our evaluation structure, DoD IG, Mister Storch. The honorable Rob Storch is making some organizational structure changes within DoD IG that will include our diem folks. Right now it's a standalone unit. He is going to merge them in June underneath the evaluations component. Okay? So if you can go to the next slide, I'll show you that one how that's going to line up, cause these are your key pocs. So on top of course, is the honorable Robert Storch, the inspector general, where you see dig diem that is gonna slide left and be a separate assistant inspector general under the deputy IG for evaluation. So basically, Mike Rourke, the deputy inspector general for evaluations, will have the entire diem line of effort underneath him. So you have pretty much a singular point of contact audit, will still do audits under Mister Mansfield on the far right, we will still do audits diem related, but your predominant is Mike Rourke now. Okay? So that gives us a nice unified approach all the way to Mister Storch, the inspector general.

[00:04:51.150] - Speaker 3

So we look forward to that. You know, as this modernizes, we're changing to adjust and match to that. So just wanted to bring that to your attention. Okay, any questions on that? We're good. Okay with that next slide. Okay, so overall, the role of the follow up, you know, the inspector general, as we know, is a creature brought about by law, and we are the independent oversight. The eyes, ears, conscience. It's been said of the department's progress, every report that we issue, every recommendation comes under the follow up process that falls under myself and my colleague, Mister Steven Santiago. We are the, if you will, the gatekeepers. Nothing gets closed until it meets all elements. Foreclosure. I thought that was important to make the commission aware of, and I'm sure you still have that in the back of your minds from active duty days and such, general. So with that, every recommendation is said, it's record tracked and reported to Congress. Every semiannual report to Congress. You can find that on our website, that usually September and March of every year is the reporting cutoff to Congress. So Congress has kept the form, we send it to the department.

[00:06:17.990] - Speaker 3

So the secretary is informed of all recommendations, including the DM related recommendations. We also prepare a compendium, open recommendations. This year we're kind of changing it to more user friendly, call it a Reader digest version. Nobody wants to read a 300 page document, you know, we're trying to get to more salient points, and one of those in all of this is these diem recommendations. So I want to say within our general mission, we also do broadcast the state of all recommendations, including Diem. And as such a hot topic, we provide focus, concentrated reporting. So we might have a diem section in an upcoming semiannual report to Congress, or a special report to the secretary of defense. That's all up to Mister Storch's discretion, right? And monthly I post in the Department of Defense. It's called the Odam website. For those who have a enabled CAC, you can log on to the ODEm website and I'll be happy to send that link to be part of the records. You can log in to see the status, real time status of recommendations. You may also come to the DoD office of Inspector General's website, and in there you will find a link to all of our open recommendations that we try to update quarterly.

[00:07:47.430] - Speaker 3

But if you send us a request, I can always just like anybody else who requests with a duly authorized need to know and enroll, we can provide a real time status update every month. I do provide the department on the OdAm website a snapshot of all open DoD ignite recommendations. So the takeaway is we are very transparent, very visible on all recommendations. Our universe. Nothing is done in the shadows. Everything is for public knowledge, awareness, and for such authorized entities. We can provide detailed discussion such as today. Okay, so next slide. As I mentioned, the DoD is a creature, statutory by law, of the Inspector General act. It has specific requirements of the DoD Inspector general that we fulfill and we report every March 31 and September 30 to Congress. Okay, I've already covered these, what we report, but it's all open recommendations, things that we consider critical. And this includes investigations, sexual assaults, inappropriate senior official conduct, contract procurement frauds, if you will, and then key significant audits and evaluations, such as DoD's progress on 2020 to 144. Next slide. These are the standards I just wanted everyone to be aware of. These are the standards we are held to.

[00:09:28.960] - Speaker 3

We have peer reviews that come in to ensure the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General is upholding our statutory standards, our White House OMB standards. So I just wanted to have this in the slide deck for you. The key one is OMB circular A 50. That is about the department being timely and responsive to open recommendations from GAO and Inspector generals, the oversight community. It requires them to provide complete and thorough compelling support for processing these so they can't just leave them sit for in perpetuity. They can't just brush us off and say, yeah, we took care of it. Close it. No, it doesn't work like that. These are the standards that require and compel the department to provide detailed, thorough, sufficient support and evidence that, that the actions in our reports have been taken. The department does have by law, the opportunity to not agree with us. And ultimately, that would lie on the deputy secretary of defense through an escalation process to adjudicate and either side with the DoD, inspector general side with the DoD, or somewhere in the middle, and with that in open, transparent reporting. If the deputy secretary of defense does not side with us, we are required to report that to the congressional.

[00:10:52.480] - Speaker 3

In our semiannual report to Congress. We also report specifically when the incidents happen. So they'll get real time reporting and they'll get the annual report. So, for you all, if a recommendation in 2022 144 was not fulfilled and department disagreed, somewhere down the road, whether change in environment, change in perceptions, then we would be open, transparent. You would know, the commission would know, Congress would know, the people would know. Right? And DoD instruction 7650 is the DoD how we implement a 50 that's available to all to look at. So with that, if you can skip the next slide, too, I just covered that. I'll give you the follow up process for general awareness. As I mentioned, anytime a final report is issued, it comes to us by rule. Every report issued comes to the follow up group. It gets ingested by us, myself, we start that, we kick it off. I review every report, every recommendation. Can we come up

with a follow up strategy? As I mentioned in the opening, we certainly welcome your input, your wisdom, sharing your thoughts on follow up strategies that we may want to consider. You know, we can ingest that if the need would arise.

[00:12:17.250] - Speaker 3

If the commission had concern, we could take, we could take that into account. But once it's transferred to follow up for the air force folks, and so I have the stick, it comes to me. Rest with me. Ultimately, I report to deputy Inspector General Mansfield, Mister Brett Mansfield, and his assistant, Miss Jan Stallings, the status of these recommendations. Now, we generally go out every six to eight months for each recommendation, so we just don't get them and put them on a shelf. We actively follow up on each recommendation that's in our portfolio. No recommendation sits and gathers dust. You know, it's not just on the shelf. Set it and forget it. We are active following up. That said, when the department responds back to us, or the services, when they respond back to us, we adjust and tailor our follow up strategy. If they tell us it's going to take a year to implement, then we generally wait about eight months. Ten months to then do a follow up and say, hey, you know, status check. Are you on progress? This is what you told us. This is a suspense date. Have you met that?

[00:13:30.160] - Speaker 3

Are there any changes, anything we need to be apprised of? And based on what they give us, we'll adjust our follow up down the road. We do require, by rule, the department has 30 days to respond to our inquiries. If they do not respond to our inquiries, we keep sending out reminders. Just before this meeting, I was with senior army officials. I alerted them to this meeting that was coming up and the importance of 2022 144, status of implementation. But they would have 30 days to respond to us and thankfully not related to 22 144. We just went over some overdue inquiries where they're getting us a response back today. So there the services, the army. I just spoke with senior Air Force leadership this morning. Mister Doug Bennett, the audit general for the Air Force, who briefs the secretary of Air Force monthly. Wednesday, I briefed the naval auditor general, Miss Don Jett Gilmore. She briefs the secretary of Navy monthly and then bi weekly with the undersecretary. So we have a very robust active communications channel to the services senior leadership, these secretaries, through their appropriate oversight components in their relationships. So all of this is a very tightly interwoven and very effective relationship.

[00:14:53.010] - Speaker 3

We have to keep the energy, the focus, the vision on open recommendations, including the eight that remain open for 2022 144. So with that next slide. Okay, so for this, and I apologize, I will take this as an action item to report back. I wanted to crosswalk the report itself to the commission's recommendation so you can have a one for one kind of linear assessment. I apologize. The team that's doing it, they were, they didn't get it to me yet, but I will get that into the notes for this meeting. I will report that back to you. You will get a good crosswalk, but I am going to discuss our recommendations where we stand today. As you know, the report was issued September 30, 2022. The DoD IG determined the DoD and services

implemented six of the 18 recommendations identified in the 2011 MLDC report. We also found that the Office of Personnel Readiness and the service level diversity inclusion offices did not fully implement the remaining twelve recommendations. We also found the DoD and circumflex had fully addressed the three goals identified in the 2012 to 2017 diversity and inclusion strategic plan. So that sets the precedence where we were at September 30 of 2022 and we recognize, acknowledge, DaccA dies report.

[00:16:23.800] - Speaker 3

Recommendation three sustains the need to take actions to fully implement those twelve recommendations that were not fully addressed in the commission's 2011 report. So where do we stand today? As of this morning, of the 43 recommendations that were in our report, 35 have been closed. That leaves eight remaining open. Now, I wanted to give you, as you'll see on the slide set, just some insight. And this is what's going to be reported in the semiannual report, which will be coming out in the next couple weeks. So the reason acts are not repeated, not completed. Personnel readiness is still addressing how to address barriers, preventing the reserve component members from fulfilling joint requirements, and addressing the weaknesses personnel and finance systems that affect transition between act and reserve components. Navy National Guard Bureau continue to develop and implement a plan to address the goals outlined in the DoD diversity inclusion strategic plan. Right now, the estimated completion date is December 31, 2027. And as you can see, that's the Navy National Guard Bureau and personnel and readiness. That's what makes up the eight remaining recommendations. So we wanted to give you status on that, where we are.

[00:17:44.940] - Speaker 3

That that's your general summary overview. I know there's questions. I'll be happy to take them as we go through these. So if you can go to the next slide. Okay, so I put these in order for you. So first we can start the National Guard Bureau. There's three recommendations. I wanted you to see that just in April of 2024, we sent an inquiry out to the the national Guard for a status check, and their response is due. I believe it's next week, May 11 or so. So we will let you know on that. And you see that TBD. Once we get their response, we will address our next follow up. We'll set an our next follow up, we'll assess it. What's the status? Is this getting close to closure? Is there something that we would want to escalate to senior leadership based on their responses? That's the process. So we will definitely. If you want to know the status of those, we can probably generate an update when that comes through. Same thing with Navy. As you see now, each recommendation has a life of its own. So you see a couple times on those Navy wrecks.

[00:18:56.800] - Speaker 3

We went out in December of 2023 with a response that is overdue. It was due in January 2024. I believe it was like January 17. For that. We have sent a couple reminders to Navy for their responses. With that said, this past Wednesday, I raised it to the auditor General that there's overdue responses. She has her staff checking with the appropriate offices within the Department of Navy to provide an update to us. So

the Navy is actively working that even though they are late, it is at the senior leadership's awareness and they are pursuing the status, as you'll see, for recommendation b one, we're going to be going out. It'd be two weeks from now, I believe it is. We'll be going back to Navy for the next status check on that one. So that'll be a TBD once we get a response back. Next slide for personnel and readiness. There we go. So the last response received was just back in January. Based on their responses, we plan in June. I believe it that one's going to be early June. We're going to go back out to personnel and readiness for recommendation h one and h two to check on their status and what.

[00:20:22.810] - Speaker 3

We will be happy to let you know on that one. Is there any questions? Did you want me to go over what it takes foreclosure for these recommendations? Would you like to hear that part?

[00:20:37.530] - Speaker 2

Yeah, if you would. And then I have. I'm sure the other committee members and I specifically have several questions, but please go ahead on describing the closure process.

[00:20:49.090] - Speaker 3

Okay. Thank you, sir. So for the National Guard Bureau, if we can roll back, is it one slide or two? I apologize. There we go. Okay. For the National Guard Bureau, for those three recommendations. The first one, we need evidence that the National Guard Bureau issued guidance and educated and counseled service members on the importance of a complete promotion board packet. So that said, they will have to perform, provide us some form of support that these actions have been taken. That recommendation itself was DoD IG recommended in regards to military leadership. Diversity Commission report recommendation number ten. The director of the Diversity Inclusion Office for the National Guard Bureau worked with the army and Air Force diversity inclusion offices to issue guidance that identifies the knowledge, skills, abilities and potential necessary to promote to senior levels and educate and counsel all service members on the importance of a complete promotion board packet. So that, that is in a nutshell for National Guard bureau, what we're looking for. The next one pertains to the commission's recommendation 17. And that is the director of Diversity inclusion office for the National Guard Bureau. Maintain documentation support that it reports annually to Congress and the DoD on the status of diversity in each state, territory and the District of Columbia for all ranks of the army and Air National Guard.

[00:22:21.110] - Speaker 3

For that, we're going to need evidence that the National Guard Bureau provides diversity input to the army and Air National Guard and their annual report to Congress and the president that reports the status of diversity in each state, territory and District of Columbia. So again, that's going to be more documentation and support that they did directly provide such input and guidance. For the last one. For b

one, the Dodig recommended the directors of office diversity and equity and inclusion, and the directors of Diversity Inclusion Office for Air Force, Army, Marines, Navy, and the National Guard review the three goals outlined in the 2012 2017 DoD diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan. For that, we're going to need evidence to verify that the National Guard has employed the strategies and used metrics to determine whether the National Guard is accomplishing the goals outlined in the plan. So, like all strategic plans, we have a plan, we have implementation, we have goals to measure, then we have reporting against those goals. We'll be looking for the same standard reporting of those goals. How do they measure and assess themselves? Any questions on those before I move to Navy?

[00:23:34.540] - Speaker 2

Go ahead, please.

[00:23:35.890] - Speaker 3

Okay, copy that. So, Navy, it's going to be the same thing. It's recommendation seven. The a translates to recommendation seven of the MLDC, and that's the director of the Diversity Inclusion Office for the Navy update its diversity inclusion plan to develop a common application for service reserve officers, training corps and academy programs. To that, they're going to. Navy needs to provide evidence to verify that the common application for ROTC and US Naval Academy is operational. So we will assess that to the standards of the recommendation. And once Navy provides that, we will assess whether that's sufficient or not. Next for a two. I guess that's an I or a one. Four second from the bottom. That is the military leadership Diversity Commission recommendation number 19. And that's the director of the diversity inclusion offices for the Navy include diversity leadership and performance assessments throughout the careers. For that, we're going to need evidence from the Department of Navy that demonstrate it has implemented its revised performance assessments. The next one is again b one. And that will need evidence that the Navy has addressed goal number two. So we await Navy's response to that next slide, please.

[00:25:09.470] - Speaker 3

Okay, then this is for personnel and readiness. This is recommendation 14 for the MLDC, and that's the undersecretary of defense for personnel readiness. Address weaknesses and the personnel and finance systems that affects transition between active and reserved components. We're going to need evidence that personnel in readiness identified the responsible parties for service specific gaps and implemented a plan to address those gaps. So, basically, the gaps were identified. They have an action plan to address those gaps, and we have at some state a goal, an estimated completion date of when that will be accomplished. And as we report to Congress, it's the longest lead. So 2027 may be when this part will be. But I can retake that as an action item, if you're interested, on when personnel readiness anticipates that to be accomplished. The last one is recommendation 14 again, and that's to assess how to address the barriers preventing reserve component members from fully fulfilling joint requirements. To close that, we're going to need evidence that explains how the undersecretary works with the services to address the

barriers preventing reserve component members from fulfilling joint requirements. So those are the evidence standards and what we'll be looking for to close those recommendations.

[00:26:36.810] - Speaker 3

That's the line, if you will, that the services and personnel and readiness will have to achieve and their actions taken for us to consider closure. Now, I did want to say one part of the closure with the recent enactment of law in December 2023, that may impact some of the recommendations. Depending on how the interpretation of the department proceeds, they could declare that maybe the recommendations are obsolete based on the implementation of the law. If that were to be the case and these were closed unimplemented because of the law passed in December 2023, we would report that as unimplemented and it would go to the semiannual report to Congress and declared, and you would see a statement. Due to changes or enacted law, these recommendations have become overcome by vent. I do not have anything on the portfolio right now that states any of these eight open recommendations have been overcome. I just wanted to bring it to your attention that in the closure process that may occur, there's a potential. I don't have anything to say that is, but I wanted to bring that to your attention. With that, I'm open for questions. Comments.

[00:27:57.570] - Speaker 2

Okay. First, Doctor Gaga Lena, thank you very much for walking through the process to us and giving us that explanation. Let me just sort of, this is both a question and a request. It's a question because I'm not sure what allowances to DoD the process allows for sort of one on one discussion. Let me use that terminology you talked about earlier about cross walking from the different recommendations to make sure you've captured what needs to be addressed and to make sure there's sort of one on one understanding of that. As you were mentioning some of these individual reports, I was probably no surprise walking through the MLGC reporting and the recommendations that I remember signing off on, and it became part of the record for the report that went out. And it's not one for one as described by you. And I clearly understand the differences there. As an example, you talked about actions that the Navy has to take with the actual recommendation talked about all of DoD, not just one individual service. And so I assume that the IG has determined that the other services have accommodated or resolved that particular recommendations, except for the Navy.

[00:29:28.050] - Speaker 2

And so there's a little confusion, if you will, because of that. You don't have to answer this right now, but what I'm asking is, is it possible for a subset of perhaps the subcommittee we have of the Dakota organization to sit down with you or whoever your principals are, just to sort of cross walk the different recommendations? So I know we're looking at the same things that would help us a lot to understand how to judge whether something has been addressed or has not been addressed.

[00:30:03.540] - Speaker 3

Absolutely, sir. Just a simple request. You can send it to myself, the committee can send it to myself, I will forward it up, and we can go through our appropriate channels. And I'm sorry I got you on the screen here and the cameras here, so I apologize. That's okay. Yeah, I'm not that good to look at.

[00:30:21.610] - Speaker 2

Don't worry about looking at me.

[00:30:24.060] - Speaker 3

Hey, as I said, I have a face for radio. And with that, if you send the request, we would certainly look at briefing all the closures and how that is. So. You're absolutely right, sir. Those that if I didn't brief, they were open, they were closed. And we can provide you an appropriate narrative of what happened, what transpired for those closures. We could sit with you or we could exchange the information, but I would escalate that through my leadership chain for Mister Storch. Mister Storch may want to meet with you on this very important subject, that it does have his senior attention. Mister Rourke may want to. I would certainly hate to me versus a political appointee. I think you want to have a political appointee, but yes, we would certainly. Please send that request to myself to Miss Amy Hughes, the project manager. And we will certainly get an action plan to support and provide you the information that you are seeking on how those services complete and fulfilled, per the recommendations. I know for DoD IG, it does get confusing for crosswalking our recommendations as a whole. We may split that up. Where, as you mentioned, general, the.

[00:31:42.320] - Speaker 3

As a recommendation to all the services I spoke specific, we just split them up. Just so we have Inspector General Schmitz in 2002 2003 directed. I'm so appreciative of his vision back then, 20 years and it still stands to give us that spotlight, laser focus on each element office that needs to act so they get their own spotlight, so there's no hiding in the crowd. Everybody gets their own time and focused effort. So that's why you hear it as I briefed it. But we definitely take this as an action item to you, sir.

[00:32:18.560] - Speaker 2

Okay, great. And we will take advantage of that. Let me see if some of the other committee members have any questions. And I specifically. Doctor Lim. Doctor Nelson Lim from rand. And in full transparency, Mister Galliano, by the way, we're probably killing your name. How do you pronounce it? Appropriately.

[00:32:38.710] - Speaker 3

This is the shortened italian version. It's Gualiano. But since I was born, as long as you don't add different letters, just hit a gut and I'll answer.

[00:32:47.460] - Speaker 2

Well, sounds fine. Thank you. You may or may not know doctor Lim was also on the MLDC commission with me, and he also is chairing our subcommittee that's looking at how the MLDC recommendations have or have not been addressed. So Nelson, the floor is yours.

[00:33:09.590] - Speaker 4

Thank you, sir. Yeah, I think the crosswalk will be very helpful because as a subcommittee, we were looking at your briefing yesterday, just looking at planning for our activity for the rest of the year. And when we saw 43 recommendations, and even on the same slide said, you know, MLDC has 20 recommendations, so how do we go from 20 to 43? And then Slide said, and you repeated today that 35 out of 43 has been closed. So I have a harder time personally trying to imagine some of these recommendations has been implemented. So like for example, recommendation 15, I just used it as an example. MLDC recommended that DoD create a chief diversity officer. And as far as I can tell, we still don't have that structure at this point in time. Yes, PNR has double duty last year. Take it on. But at the same time, within that recommendation itself, you will see that there's a lot of analysis requirements that MLDC envisioned that chief diversity officer will be able to mobilize as needed. I don't think it's there. So this is just one example of how can gig would recommend or decided that, hey, this recommendation has been closed.

[00:34:56.860] - Speaker 4

So that's the kind of information that I think, General, I was alluding to that we would like to follow up with the IG and trying to understand how that 20 recommendation become 43 and then how these recommendations are considered close. When some of these, for example, diversity leadership training recommendation, we have a harder time imagining that services have implemented them.

[00:35:27.560] - Speaker 3

Okay. Absolutely, absolutely. Appreciate the comments and concerns and the challenge. Right. We need to stand and provide that to you all in open transparency. And I think in that request, let's build that in as a request to us and we can do that crosswalk, as general is talking about, we could crosswalk. We'll find that specific recommendation in our report. And I'm looking so, sir, I apologize. I was reading through all the closed recommendations as you were talking. I was trying to find where it said recommendation 15. It wasn't written in what I have in my briefing notes. On the right hand side, I have what took. So we do have that. So for every recommendation that you see in our report, we do have the actual document in a federal, as required, federal repository system of record what actions took. So that'll stand time in perpetuity. And I do want to say for everybody that if you, if you don't agree or you think there's more on the table that might have been missed. Absolutely. Totally. Okay. If you want to engage, right now we are doing our planning for 2025 oversight, and they may have taken the actions to recommendation as writ to close it.

[00:36:52.730] - Speaker 3

But if something's still there, you can bring that up for our consideration for 2025, or even sometime in 2024 if we have the capacity, we could do a follow up audit or evaluation of that. So if something doesn't seem right, you could raise that for Mister Storch's consideration in our planning process. So you actually have an opportunity to influence the DoD IG's oversight. So I just wanted you to keep that in mind.

[00:37:21.850] - Speaker 2

Good. Thank you Mister Gualiana, and that's very, very helpful. And I'm sure you understand that none of our comments here are pejorative. We just want to make sure we understand each other. So this crosswalk, which we will immediately request through your channel, is up to Mister Storch, I think will be very, very helpful for us and for you, given the last comment about request suggestions for future, future examinations, future inspections. So I think they'll be very good. So, any other questions from any other committee members? Nelson, any other comments from you?

[00:38:08.560] - Speaker 4

No sir. We will follow up as a subcommittee.

[00:38:11.810] - Speaker 2

Okay, great. Okay. This, as I figured, this was very helpful. And even if we had follow on actions, that was really what we needed to understand and to, we're anxious to work with you and your team. We all have the same objectives in mind, if you will, to make our military the best merit based, mission focused organization it can possibly be. So, we'll continue and follow up with you, Mister Gwaliona, and I really appreciate your time this morning. You've actually opened up a door to us that we needed to better understand. We'll make sure we close the loop as quickly as we can.

[00:38:54.860] - Speaker 3

Okay, thank you. Pleasure to brief you all on this. Thank you for the invite. Look forward to it. And we all stand shoulder to shoulder together on this.

[00:39:03.220] - Speaker 2

Great. Thank you very much. Thank you, General Lyles.

[00:39:07.800] - Speaker 1

I have for action to contact Mister Gagliano so that we are able to have Doctor Lim's subcommittee to be able to provide follow up actions and also possible meeting. If we do get to a point where we schedule a meeting, it will have to be open to the public as well. So we'll keep everyone posted.

[00:39:32.330] - Speaker 2

Okay. And Shirley, we'll talk about the latter comment. I see this as fact finding, if you will, but we do ultimately have to report the results of our discussions to the public and how we do that, whether it's the next BBM or some other means or just our website. But we will make sure that the discussions ultimately results are transparent to the public.

[00:39:56.260] - Speaker 1

Absolutely, sir.

[00:39:57.700] - Speaker 2

Okay.

[00:39:58.540] - Speaker 1

Happy all.

[00:39:59.630] - Speaker 2

Thank you again, Mister Gwaliano. If I can ask our members to, committee members to stay on. And Shirley, you actually have a follow on activity for the public, so thank you again, Mister Gualiano.

[00:40:12.020] - Speaker 3

Thank you, general. Have a good day all.

[00:40:14.320] - Speaker 2

Thank you. You too.

[00:40:16.740] - Speaker 1

Ladies and gentlemen, we will now transition to the public comment period as outlined on today's agenda. The staff receive a total of 26 written comments, and that's for today and yesterday's biannual business meeting. They are posted to the DACA Die website for everyone to see. This concludes the public comment period as well as today's public agenda. Thank you very much for your interest and your attention and support to the DACA die.

[00:40:45.180] - Speaker 2

Shirley, I think I owe and I feel it and my prerogative as the chairman just to remind particularly the public that's listening in the statement I made earlier, that we are looking at ways we can, either through best practices or some other ideas, make sure that we can get better visibility to the public of the things that we're seeing in terms of information, the comments we're getting, and any resolution to any of the things that are provided to us. The website works great in today's world in terms of getting information out there, but I know everybody who's interested in this subject would like to see and understand more detail. So we're open to and looking at ways we can do this a little bit different, a little bit better for the purpose of the transparency to the public. With that, Shirley, I will close this meeting for the public and ask the members to stay on for just some closing comments and follow up actions for us as committee. Thank you everybody. Thanks for your vital interest in this very important topic.

[00:41:57.570] - Speaker 1

The DACA die biennial business meeting is now officially closed and ended. Thank you so much.

[00:42:05.730] - Speaker 2

Charlie. You'll have to tell me.