

MINUTES OF UNIQUE TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (UTIN) IMPLEMENTATION/STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 7th & 8th DECEMBER, 2009 AT THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE JTB SECRETARIAT, ETF BUILDING, MAITAMA, ABUJA.

ATTENDANCE

S/N	NAME	OFFICE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS			
1.	Mrs Ifueko Omoigui Okauru	C/JTB	ifueko_omoigui@yahoo.com
2.	Ejemeyovwi, I.A.K	FIRS	andyejemeyovwi@yahoo.com
3.	Oduba Oduba	FIRS	odubao@yahoo.co.uk
4.	Rajiva Singh	PROJECT ADVISOR	rajiva-singh@hotmail.com
5.	Hassan M. Isa	NIMC	isahassan2@yahoo.com
6.	Ibrahim Haruna	BOF	ibroharu1976@yahoo.com
7.	Malik Tukur	FIRS	malikng2001@yahoo.com
8.	Umeh Chiedozie. M.	BIR ABIA	edoxumeh@yahoo.com
9.	Awaisu Garba Kunya	NSA	ws_grb@yahoo.com
10.	Okolo Onyekachi Nicholas	BIR DELTA	kachinic72@yahoo.com
11.	Joel Onowakpo	BIR DELTA	joelonowakpo@yahoo.com
12.	Ceejay Ojong	SA, HMF, FMF	ceejayojong@yahoo.com
13.	Abdallah Rabi U Usman	ALGON	abdallausman@yahoo.com
14.	Seyi Akinyede	INDPT. OBSERVER	oluakinyede@yahoo.com
15.	Ndagi Makun Yakubu	BIR NIGER	ndagimakun@yahoo.com
16.	Abdullahi T. Umar	BIR KATSINA	birvkat@com
JTB SECRETARIAT			
17.	Edgal Femi	SEC.JTB	femiedgal@yahoo.com
18.	Tabai David G.	JTB	davetabai@yahoo.com
PROJECT TEAM			
19.	Chinedu Ekeh	PT	chinedu.ekeh@jtb.gov.ng
20.	Nkemakosi, Kingsley	PT	knkemakosi@jtb.gov.ng
21.	Mohammed Isa	PT	misa@jtb.gov.ng
22.	Ja'afaru, M.I	PT	jaafarumuhd@yahoo.com
23.	Akinwale O.A.	PT	gbakinwale@yahoo.com
ABSENT			
24.	Ajongbade Emmanuel	FRSC	emmaaj2003@yahoo.com
25.	Representative of Speakers' Forum	NA	
26.	Rep. of Clerk of National Assembly	NA	
27.	Amos A.O.	FIRS	auduamos@yahoo.com
28.	Oji, Uzoma Ugochukwu	CAC	uzoma_noble@yahoo.com
29.	Ajao Gbolagade A.	NPC	gbajao@yahoo.com
30.	Salihu B. Alkali	BIR GOMBE	abalkali@yahoo.com
31.	Fatima T. Usman Katsina	NGF	fatima.yu@gmail.com
32.	Aliyu Shehu	BPP	aliyushehu@gmail.com
33.	Sadiku, B.M.T.	CBN	batsadik@yahoo.com
34.	Abubakar Sadiq Bello	CCCOBIN	sadiq.bello@gtbank.com

S/N	SUBJECT	DISCUSSION/DECISIONS	ACTION BY
1	Opening	The meeting which was the second for the day was called to order by the Chairman JTB at 7.45pm and thereafter an opening prayer was said by the representative of ALGON.	
2	Opening Address	<p>The Chairman welcomed everybody to the meeting and expressed regrets that the meeting started very much behind schedule because of the JTB meeting which encroached into the time earlier scheduled for the UTIN Steering Committee meeting.</p> <p>In view of pressure on time the Chairman suggested that the meeting should treat the item 7 on the agenda (Report on RFP Evaluation by Infrastructure and Systems (I & S) Sub-Committee) and then adjourn till the next day and the suggestion got the support of the house.</p>	
3	Presentation of RFP Evaluation Report by the Chairman of Infrastructure and Systems Sub-Committee	<p>The RFP Evaluation report whose copies were made available to members was presented by the Chairman of Infrastructure and Systems (I & S) Sub-Committee, Mr. Oduba Oduba. He told the meeting that the RFP Evaluation process involved four companies namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Accenture Consortium ii) NADRA iii) Telnet Consortium iv) Quanteq & Estrata <p>The meeting was also informed that only NADRA submitted Bank Draft while the three other companies submitted Bid Security Bonds. It was agreed that acceptance would be subject to confirmation of the draft and the bid bonds.</p> <p>The Chairman of the Sub-Committee also informed the meeting that the Evaluation Committee which was approved by the Steering Committee was made up of the following persons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Oduba Oduba Chairman ii) Hassan Isa Member 	

- iii) Rajiva Singh External Consultant
- iv) Oke Millette External Consultant
- v) Dr. Amos Audu Member
- vi) Richard Ogbu Member
- vii) Seyi Akinyede Independent Observer
- viii) Chinedu Ekeh Member
- ix. Akinwale Akinlolu Member

However the meeting was also told that Dr. Amos Audu and Richard Ogbu could not fully participate in the Evaluation process. Consequently only seven evaluation score sheets were considered in the report.

(i) Evaluation Outcome

The Chairman of I&S Sub-Committee informed the meeting that after evaluating the four companies and weighing their strengths and weaknesses, the result below came out:

S/N	Bidder	Tech. Bid Score (%)	Position
1	Telnet Consortium	67.7	1
2	Accenture Consortium	62.8	2
3	NADRA	55.5	3
4	Quanteq & Estarta	41.1	4

(ii) Financial Evaluation

The meeting was informed that going by the above results the financial bids of the 1st and 2nd position (Telnet & Accenture) with scores of 60% and above were opened and considered further because the evaluation criteria

states that a company must score 60% and above in the technical evaluation before proceeding to the financial evaluation.. The details and comparisons of the financial proposals from the two Vendors were highlighted.

(iii) Evaluated Bid Prices Equivalent in Naira

The evaluated bid prices for the two companies were disclosed as follows:

- a) Telnet Consortium- N3,603,131,075.62
- b) Accenture Consortium - N6,409,996,764.27

(iv) Evaluated Bid Scores

The evaluated bid scores were presented as follows:

S/N		Telnet	Accenture
1	Technical Bid Score	48.5	47.1
2	Financial Bid Score	15	8.43
Total Bid Score		63.5	55.53

The meeting was also informed that the Bidder with the highest evaluated bid score would be the Most Economically Advantageous Bid (MEAB).

Based on the presentations the Committee recommended that the contract for the design, supply and implementation of the Unique Taxpayer Identification Number, Infrastructure and Systems be awarded in favor of Messrs Telnet Consortium.

At the end of the report the Chairman JTB called for comments/questions on the presentations made.

(v) Questions and Comments on the Presented RFP Evaluation Report

The Chairman JTB thanked the Committee for the good work they did but noted she had two comments namely:

i) In terms of the process of the proposal it was very clear but in terms of content, it could not really be felt. It was not too sure for instance whether with the company that was recommended their solution would achieve our goal.

ii) Secondly the Chairman JTB was of the view that the bids presented should not be final. The Steering Committee should have a feel of the demonstration by the bidders. The Committee should be able to negotiate and save some money for the project.

In his reaction to the Chairman's comment Mr. Oduba informed the meeting that the committee did not do any price negotiation as that was considered outside its terms of reference.

After some deliberations on the issues raised it was agreed that the bidders should be re-invited to make demonstrations in the presence of the Steering Committee members even as the recommendations of the sub-committee were borne in mind. At the very minimum, the local partners of the bidders should be able to organize a demonstration even without the foreign partners the next day, to enable the Steering Committee members who are the business owners see things themselves and take decisions.

However it was also agreed that the demonstration might not be a total product walkthrough as the foreign partners who should deliver that level of support may not be reached within the short notice. It was the hope that the demonstration should place the Steering Committee in a level of comfort to be able to take a decision.

(vi) Presentation to NEC

It was agreed in the meeting that there would be a presentation before the National Economic Council (NEC) where the Steering Committee members would attend

#7

	<p>with the full squad of the bidding teams. The arrangement was to give the Governors as the ones paying, an opportunity to ask questions. The project team was told to make this happen.</p> <p>(vii) Decisions</p> <p>After exhaustive discussions on the issues raised above, the following decisions were made that the Infrastructure & Systems Sub-Committee and the project team should:</p> <p>i.) Do the price negotiation with Telnet and Accenture and determine the final price from the two Vendors.</p> <p>ii.) Slate presentations by the two companies from 2.00pm the next day after the negotiations.</p> <p>iii.) At the end of the presentation the Steering Committee should meet by 5.00pm to decide on the recommendation made by the Technical Committee as to whether to award the contract to Telnet or otherwise.</p>	PT
Closing	<p>In view of the fact that it was already late and most members present were tired, Mr. Ceejay Ojong moved that the meeting be adjourned to 5.00pm the next day and he was seconded by Mr. Femi Edgal. The meeting finally rose at 10.15pm.</p>	

MINUTES OF THE WALK THROUGH PRESENTATION MADE TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE UTIN PROJECT ON 8TH DECEMBER 2009 AND THE MEETING THAT FOLLOWED THEREAFTER

ATTENDANCE

S/N	NAME	OFFICE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS			
1.	Mrs Ifueko Omoigui Okauru	C/JTB	ifueko_omoigui@yahoo.com
2.	Ejemeyovwi, I.A.K	FIRS	andyjemeyovwi@yahoo.com
3.	Oduba Oduba	FIRS	odubao@yahoo.co.uk
4.	Rajiva Singh	PROJECT ADVISOR	rajiva-singh@hotmail.com
5.	Hassan M. Isa	NIMC	isahassan2@yahoo.com
6.	Ibrahim Haruna	BOF	ibroharu1976@yahoo.com
7.	Sadiku, B.M.T.	CBN	batsadik@yahoo.com

8.	Ceejay Ojong	SA, HMF, FMF	ceejayojong@yahoo.com
9.	Oji, Uzoma Ugochukwu	CAC	uzoma_noble@yahoo.com
10.	Okolo Onyekachi Nicholas	BIR DELTA	kachinic72@yahoo.com
11.	Aliyu Shehu	BPP	aliyushehu@gmail.com
12.	Seyi Akinyede	INDPT. OBSERVER	oluakinyede@yahoo.com
13.	Abdallah Rabiou Usman	ALGON	abdallausman@yahoo.com
14.	Malik Tukur	FIRS	malikng2001@yahoo.com
JTB SECRETARIAT			
15.	Edgal Femi	SEC.JTB	femiedgal@yahoo.com
16.	Tabai David G.	JTB	davetabai@yahoo.com
PROJECT TEAM			
17.	Chinedu Ekeh	PT	chinedu.ekeh@jtb.gov.ng
18.	Nkemakosi, Kingsley	PT	knkemakosi@jtb.gov.ng
19.	Mohammed Isa	PT	misa@jtb.gov.ng
20.	Ja'afaru, M.I	PT	jaafarumuhd@yahoo.com
21.	Akinwale O.A.	PT	gbakinwale@yahoo.com
ABSENT			
22.	Ajongbade Emmanuel	FRSC	emmaaj2003@yahoo.com
23.	Representative of Speakers' Forum	NA	
24.	Rep. of Clerk of National Assembly	NA	
25.	Amos A.O.	FIRS	auduamos@yahoo.com
26.	Joel Onowakpo	BIR DELTA	joelonowakpo@yahoo.com
27.	Ajao Gbolagade A.	NPC	gbajao@yahoo.com
28.	Salihu B. Alkali	BIR GOMBE	abalkali@yahoo.com
29.	Fatima T. Usman Katsina	NGF	fatima.yu@gmail.com
30.	Ndagi Makun Yakubu	BIR NIGER	ndagimakun@yahoo.com
31.	Abdullahi T. Umar	BIR KATSINA	birvkat@com
32.	Abubakar Sadiq Bello	CCCOBIN	sadiq.bello@gtbank.com
33.	Umeh Chiedozie. M.	BIR ABIA	edoxumeh@yahoo.com
34.	Awaisu Garba Kunya	NSA	ws_grb@yahoo.com

Bidder's Attendance

The following persons were present at the demonstration from the two bidders.

(A) ACCENTURE CONSORTIUM

S/N	NAME	OFFICE
1	Imoyo Adebukola	Accenture
2	Lekan Balogun	SAP
3	Bola Adisa	SAP
4	Izah Fidelis	SAP
5	Chinyere Okeye	Accenture
6	Abiodun Adeoye	CONSOL

7	Abi Abiola – Ajimobi	SAP
8	Kunle Adebiyi	SECURE ID LTD

Accenture Consortium consisted of the following:

- i. Accenture
- ii. Crown Agent
- iii. Secured ID Ltd
- iv. Contract Management Solution Ltd
- v. Link Serve
- vi. CONSOL
- vii. SAP
- viii. HP

B) TELNET CONSORTIUM

<i>S/N</i>	<i>NAME</i>	<i>OFFICE</i>
1	Gbenga Odujinrin	Telnet
2	Ini Akpan	Telnet
3	Peter Hakpa	Telnet
4	Taiwo Adeleke	Telnet
5	Bosun Ayeni	Telnet
6	A Adetugo	Telnet

The Consortium of Telnet consist of:

- i. Telnet
- ii. CRC Sogema
- iii. Face Technologies

Opening

The Walk through presentation started by 7.45pm.

The Chairman JTB in an opening speech told the vendors to convince the Steering Committee members on how their solutions were going to be the best in terms of what it was intended to achieve.

PRESENTATION BY ACCENTURE

The leader of Accenture was the first to present on behalf of the Consortium. At the end of the presentation the following questions arose for Accenture to provide

answers to:

- i.)** How do you handle individuals that are not companies by virtue of the Personal Income Tax Act provisions and Enterprises/Companies, for instance if someone is Bukola and has a company called Bukola Enterprises.
- ii.)** How do you hope to capture the people in the rural areas in the system?
- iii.)** Can the system proposed by Accenture do off-power location?

The representatives of Accenture provided the needed Technical responses to the questions raised. Additionally, the alternate Chairman observed that there were a lot of companies on the team of Accenture and he demanded to know how Accenture intended to mitigate the risk of failure of some of the partners. The team provided an explanation to the issue raised by the alternate Chairman.

The Accenture team explained that they had worked on projects with the partners in the past with high success rate. They also said the contract and project management methodology proposed was successfully implemented by Accenture and CBN. The team added that it was because of the size of the niche projects that they were advising JTB to deal directly with the partners to save costs and allow Accenture to do the entire programme management.

Mr. Seyi Akinyele also observed that Accenture in their proposal wanted JTB to deal with all the Consultants in their group directly and he therefore required an explanation on who takes the responsibility when problems arise in that arrangement.

The leader of the group explained that given the skill and quality of people in the group they were convinced that it would be a better model to contract directly and it would also make for a better management. Accenture insisted they had used the system before and it worked.

PRESENTATION BY TELNET

The lead presenter of Telnet told the committee that their solutions had the following special features:

a) It could take care of those people whose fingers are not complete and is also capable of advising on alternative e.g. Iris, Toes etc.

b) It supports any language

c) The system supports tax types

d) The system has internal dictionary for all languages.

At the end of the demonstration the following questions arose:

i.) The Chairman JTB wanted to know whether the solutions proposed by TELNET had operated in a Federal system before. The Consortium answered in the affirmative, mentioning Ethiopia specifically.

ii.) The alternate Chairman demanded to know the roles TELNET played in the previous contact centres they had delivered and to which TELNET responded that they were involved in all aspects of the delivery and implementation processes.

iii.) The representative of NIMC told TELNET that the Committee was interested in knowing how TELNET planned to avert the previous bad experiences they had been having which were documented somewhere.

iv.) Further to the issue raised in (iii) above, the representative of BPP observed that it had been noted that TELNET had done some work for FIRS in the past and he demanded that TELNET should share that experience with the Committee.

TELNET told the Committee that with the FIRS, the company underrated the key deliverables to FIRS and believed erroneously that it was all about technology but realized it involved much more than that. Similarly

	<p>TELNET also underrated the capacity of the people in FIRS and the people reacted and it resulted to some problems managing them to date.</p> <p>Also the Leader of the team told the meeting that TELNET, in order to ensure smooth flow of funds had to come with First Bank of Nigeria as fund providers should there be need for that in the UTIN Project.</p> <p>Finally the Chairman JTB demanded to know how TELNET intended to handle issues like Literacy level of taxpayers, electricity, etc. at the registration points in the rural areas. The TELNET leader told the Committee that TELNET was offering 40 (forty) mobile devices which could be taken to the remotest areas of the country.</p> <p>The Committee was also told that the system had off-line capacity. On literacy level TELNET told the Committee that all that was required for an operator was school certificate and simple understanding of numerals.</p>	
<p>Continuation of the Steering Committee Meeting</p>	<p>When the Vendors were gone the Chairman re-called the meeting to order and demanded to know whether the Committee accomplished the objectives for which the demonstrations and the price negotiations with the Vendors were organized.</p> <p>She invited the Chairman of the Infrastructure and Systems Sub-Committee to re-present his reports in the amended manner agreed with the Committee in the previous meeting. The Chairman of the sub-committee made the presentation.</p> <p>At the end of the presentation the Chairman JTB called for questions and comments. The representative of BPP observed that the Sub-Committee did not mention any completion period with the two companies in their recommendations.</p>	

Specifically the following points were equally noted from the presentation:

i) The financials of Accenture was higher than that of TELNET.

ii) Some Committee members expressed fear on the part of TELNET to deliver especially giving their experience with FIRS.

iii) That a full-time involvement of the Project Manager who is from Sogema in Canada should be arranged. This was also one of the recommendations of the sub-committee

iv) It was also noted that training cost for JTB staff was enormous and was not contained specifically in the budget. However, it was observed that the budget for project implementation could carry the training cost for JTB Staff.

v) There were discussions around the exchange rate risk of the project as well.

vi) On the issue of Cards which TELNET suggested to be increased from 8KB to 32KB, the Committee demanded to know the cost implications and was told that 8KB costs \$1.00 whereas 32KB costs about \$1.76. The meeting agreed therefore that if the 8KB Card was not expandable, we need to think more of what size of card that would be most appropriate.

Finally the Chairman JTB observed that there were certain assumptions we made which should be contained in the recommendations clearly and they were enumerated as follows:

a) The Contract shall be in writing.

b) The deliverables from the Vendors must be stated clearly.

c) The time to roll out should be clear and unambiguous.

d) The recommendation about the Project Manager of

	<p>Sogema is an institutional request and not about a person</p> <p>e) There must be key performance milestones and penalties, but it was later agreed that we play down on penalties because of the counter effect it could generate from the Vendors.</p> <p>f) It was also agreed that we should request for 10% performance bond from reputable banks.</p> <p><u>Next Step and Decision on the Vendors</u></p> <p>The next step was to tidy up on the agreed areas and move to BPP. On the decision on the Vendor it did appear that the Steering Committee members present were convinced by the recommendation of the Sub-Committee to award the contract to TENLET at the cost of N3, 532,321,863.53 plus VAT in the sum of N176, 616,093.18 giving a total project cost of N3, 708,937,956.76 at the exchange rate of US \$1.00 = N150.85 (including 1% CBN charges).</p> <p>The award however would be based on definite Project Management commitment from Sogema or Project Management by another local Consultant recommended by Telnet and approved by JTB.</p>	
<p>Report from the Sub-Committee on Land</p>	<p>The Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Land Mr. Aliyu Shehu presented a report of the Sub-Committee to the meeting. At the end of the report the Sub-Committee made the following requests in order to move forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Raise a draft of N100, 000.00 in favour of Abuja Geographic Information System (AGIS). ii. Get an Architect to get a preliminary drawing/concept of the building that was intended to be put up. iii. Identify where the Land was needed and the Project Team was told to follow-up with the Land committee. 	<p>PT/Land Committee</p>
<p>Oath of Secrecy Forms</p>	<p>The amended Oath of Secrecy forms which were enclosed in the package for the meeting were completed and signed by members present and returned to the Project Team. The Project Team is to ensure that other Steering Committee members completed and returned their forms.</p>	

10	Performance Evaluation Form	<p><u>Evaluation of Project Team Members</u></p> <p>On the evaluation of the Project Team members it was agreed that the Project Manager and the Steering Committee members should evaluate the Project Team members but the Project Manager should be made to have a higher mark at his disposal as the person who works directly with the other Project Team members.</p> <p>Similarly, the Steering Committee members and the Project Team members should evaluate the Project Manager's performance in return. The Project Team was told to work out the modalities as soon as possible and revert. The Project Team was told to come up with the Performance Evaluation Form by the next meeting for approval.</p>	PT
11	Trip to India	<p>The Chairman JTB announced the names of some members, who were to visit the India Revenue Authority from 15th to 22nd December, 2009. She told those who could not make the list to exercise patience as it would be some other people's turn next time.</p>	
12	Adjournment/ Closure	<p>It was obvious that the members present had dealt with the most important issues on the agenda and therefore the meeting was adjourned till the year 2010.</p> <p>The closing prayer was said by the representative of ALGON and the meeting finally rose at about 10.40pm.</p> <p>Ifueko Omoigui Okauru (Chairman)</p> <p>Kingsley Nkemakosi (Secretary)</p>	