

MINUTES OF UNIQUE TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (UTIN) IMPLEMENTATION/STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 8TH FEBRUARY 2010, 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	Salihu B. Alkali	BIR GOMBE(Chairman)	abalkali@yahoo.com
5	AB Okauru	NGF (DG)	aokauru@yahoo.com
6	Fatima Y. Usman Katsina	NGF	fatima.yu@gmail.com
7	Hassan M. Isa	NIMC	isahassan2@yahoo.com
8	Ibrahim Haruna	BOF	ibroharu1976@yahoo.com
9	Malik Tukur	FIRS	malikng2001@yahoo.com
10	Umeh Chiedozie. M.	BIR ABIA	edoxumeh@yahoo.com
11	Awaisu Garba Kunya	NSA	ws_grb@yahoo.com
12	Okolo Onyekachi Nicholas	BIR DELTA	kachinic72@yahoo.com
13	Joel Onowakpo	BIR DELTA(Chairman)	joelonowakpo@yahoo.com
14	Abubakar Sadiq Bello	CCCOBIN	sadiq.bello@gtbank.com
15	Seyi Akinyede	IT CONSULTANT	oluakinyede@yahoo.com
16	Aliyu Shehu	BPP	aliyushehu@gmail.com
17	Sadiku, B.M.T.	CBN	batsadik@yahoo.com
18	Ajao Gbolagade A.	NPC	gbajao@yahoo.com
19	Ajongbade Emmanuel	FRSC	emmaaj2003@yahoo.com
20	Dosumu F.A (Prince)	NCS	obadosumu@yahoo.com
21	Adamu Abudlkadir Fanini	CAC	faniniaa@yahoo.com
	JTB SECRETARIAT		
22	Edgal Femi	SEC.JTB	femiedgal@yahoo.com
23	Tabai David G.	JTB	davetabai@yahoo.com
	PROJECT TEAM		
24	Chinedu Ekeh	PT	chinedu.ekhe@jtb.gov.ng
25	Nkemakosi, Kingsley	PT	knkemakosi@jtb.gov.ng
26	Mohammed Isa	PT	misa@jtb.gov.ng
27	Ja'afaru, M.I	PT	jaafarumuhd@yahoo.com
28	Akinwale O.A.	PT	gbakinwale@yahoo.com
	ABSENT WITH APOLOGY		
29	Abdallah Rabiou Usman	ALGON	abdallausman@yahoo.com
	ABSENT		
30	Representative of Speakers' Forum	NA	
31	Rep. of Clerk of National Assembly	NA	

32	Amos A.O.	FIRS	auduamos@yahoo.com
33	Ceejay Ojong	SA, HMF, FMF	ceejayojong@yahoo.com
34	Rajiva Singh	PROJECT ADVISOR	rajiva-singh@hotmail.com
35	Ndagi Makun Yakubu	BIR NIGER	ndagimakun@yahoo.com
36	Abdullahi T. Umar	BIR KATSINA	birvkat@.com

S/N	SUBJECT	DISCUSSION/DECISIONS	ACTION BY
1	Opening	The meeting was called to order by the Chairman JTB at exactly 5.30pm and thereafter an opening prayer was said by Mohammed Isa, the UTIN Project Accountant.	
2	Opening Address	The Chairman welcomed everybody to the meeting and for want of time moved quickly to the agenda for the meeting.	
3	Motion for Adoption of the Agenda	In the absence of any amendments to the agenda the representative of NIMC moved for the adoption and he was seconded by the representative of the National Population Commission.	
4	Introduction of New Members	Two new members namely: Mr. Dosumu F.A, Deputy ^{Comptroller} Director Tariff, in the Tariff and Trade department of the Nigeria Customs Service and Mr. Adamu Abdulkadir Fanini, Deputy Director Finance & Accounts, Corporate Affairs Commission were introduced to the meeting. Similarly the DG NGF, Mr. A.B. Okauru who led the India delegation for the study tour was present at the meeting and was also introduced as such.	
5	Reading, Amendments and Adoption of the Minutes of the 7th and 8th December 2009 Meeting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 2; paragraph 3(iv) "Quanteq & Estrata" to read "Quanteq & Estarta" • Page 9; paragraph 4, line 1, "Mr. Seyi Akinyele" to read Mr. "Seyi Akinyede". • Page 10 (iii), line 3, the word "pervious" to read "previous" and also the word "planed" to read "planned" • Page 13, paragraph 2, line 5, "TENLET" to read "TELNET". • Page 13, paragraph 8; "Report of Sub-Committee on Land" to read "Report of Ad-hoc Committee on 	

Land”.

In the absence of further amendments Mr. Malik Tukur moved for the adoption of the minutes and he was seconded by the representative of the CBN.

6 **Reading, Amendments and Adoption of the Minutes of the 7th January 2010**

There was no amendment to the minutes and the representative of NIMC moved for the adoption and he was seconded by the representative of the National Security Adviser.

7 **Matters Arising**

The Chairman JTB called on the Project Manager to lead the discussions on the matters arising for the meeting and the following issues came up:

a) Update on Forwarding of Copy of Letters for Counterpart Funding to States

The Project Manager told the meeting that reminder letters were sent to States in the second week of January for the payment of their counterpart funding.

b) Administration of Oath of Secrecy

The forms were given to members who had not been administered to the oath of secrecy. The representative of NPC wanted to know the extent that members could not divulge information in view of the fact that members give reports to the organisations they represent.

The meeting agreed that the assumption was that the management of the organisations represented in the UTIN Steering Committee are authorized persons and should be privy to our information hence any member giving official information to the management of such organisation was still not in breach of divulging JTB's information.

Additionally, the Gombe BIR Chairman demanded

explanations on the following issues:

- i. What would happen to a member who sends a representative to attend meetings on his behalf if the representative misbehaves.
- ii. What would be the sanctions in case of breach of the oath of secrecy?
- iii. What happens to the oath taken by members when the project is fully implemented and closed.

In response to the issues raised by the Gombe BIR Chairman the meeting recalled that it was agreed that the oath of secrecy had no time limit when it could bind the members just as Governors and other highly placed public officials do not divulge classified information after their tenure. On the sanctions, it was agreed that any breach of the oaths should be treated as is obtained in the Public Service Rules, (PSR).

c) Presentation of Performance Evaluation Forms for Discussion/Approval

When this matter came up for discussion, it was stepped down to be discussed later in the meeting.

d) Securing the Visitation of Kaduna and Lagos SBIR

The meeting was told that after the trip to Ethiopia a comprehensive report/explanation was made to the Lagos State Governor and copied to the Chairman Lagos SBIR. Also a request to undertake the visitation was put across but there had been no response from Lagos State Government to confirm the visitation or otherwise.

For Kaduna SBIR the Project Manager also informed the meeting that the response had been that all the people the Steering Committee Members were supposed to see were not on site, and so JTB should continue to reach the office. The Project team was told to follow up until a date was given by the two State SBIR's.

PT

e) Co-opting of Immigration and Custom Service into the UTIN Steering Committee

The meeting was told that the attendance of the representative of Nigeria Customs Service had been secured and the representative Mr. Dosumu, F. A was present at the meeting. Similarly Immigration had nominated a representative into the Steering Committee but the Officer was not disposed to attend the meeting. The Project team was told to follow up to secure the Immigration Officer's attendance. **PT**

f) Update on the \$1 Million from World Bank to JTB

The Project Manager informed the meeting that the CD, CDG in FIRS, Mr. Osy Chuke met with the World Bank, DFID and the Project team on the matter. The World Bank had advised that for JTB to be able to utilize the money the process of JTB must meet World Bank standard.

A new template was therefore issued to JTB in December 2009 for completion. It was agreed that the \$1Million would be put in the World bank work plan for 2010 for JTB to be able to utilize the money. The meeting agreed that JTB should be guided by the World bank rules. The Project team was told to follow up. **PT**

g) Report of the Ad-hoc Committee on Land

Although the Chairman of the Ad-hoc committee was not around when this matter was called up, the Secretary JTB informed the meeting that the relevant documents for land allocation had been completed with AGIS and the fee of N100, 000.00 had also been paid.

The meeting was also informed that a request for a plot of 5000m² was made with the hope that it would contain the JTB Secretariat where UTIN office and the data centre **Ad-hoc Committee on Land**

would be located. It is hoped that the Honorable Minister's approval would be secured before long. The ad-hoc committee and project team was told to follow-up.

h) Presentation by Vendors before NEC

The meeting was told that JTB got a "No Objection Certificate" from BPP on December 14, 2009, but on 17th January, 2010, a hold was put on the "No Objection Certificate" to enable JTB clarify issues raised by Accenture, one of the Vendors on their bid, GPMC card size and costing.

Consequently, presentations could not be made to either FEC or NEC by the Vendors to date. It was agreed that the presentation should be pending until all the relevant issues were sorted out.

i) Securing Dates for visits to the SGF, Ministry of Finance, National Economic Adviser and the Chairman House Committee on Finance

The meeting agreed that invitation should be extended to the Chairman Senate Committee on Finance as well. The Project Manager informed the meeting that the SGF had been visited and he promised to support the Project and gave very useful advice.

On the visitation to the Ministry of Finance and the National Economic Adviser, the meeting was told that it could not be feasible last December due to the fact that most of the key members of the Steering Committee travelled out of the country on study tour to India.

PT

The Project team had written on 2nd February, 2010 for a reminder but was advised to step the matter down a little in view of the state of the Nation. The project team was told to follow up.

j) Meeting with NIMC, FIRS and JTB

The meeting was informed that in view of the intention to get FEC approval, UTIN Steering Committee needed to equip itself with answers to likely questions that would arise especially bothering on UTIN doing the same type of work NIMC was already doing. It was on that basis that the meeting was scheduled and held on 18th January, 2010 to ascertain areas UTIN could harmonize, collaborate and leverage on with NIMC. The representative of JTB on the NIMC Harmonization Committee would continue to give update on the matter.

k) Reactions of the Gombe SBIR Chairman on the Presentations made by the Vendors.

The Gombe SBIR Chairman observed that the involvement of the 6(six) BIR representatives on the Steering Committee during the presentations were very poor. He pointed out that none of the SBIR Chairmen was present at the 8th January, 2010 presentations and that the Project was proceeding as if it is all about technology which is wrong because ICT is just an aid for improvement in our job of tax collection.

He noted that the Chairmen of SBIR should be the ones to observe the presentations, make contributions and comments as the Project owners and the ICT people job if anything should be advisory. This is more so when some of the State Chairmen had participated in visiting the States, listened to their questions, comments and have ideas of their opinions on the UTIN project.

The Gombe Chairman also expressed surprise that there was no provision of sanction in case of breach on the part of Vendors in a project of the nature and scope being dealt with. He finally submitted that the issue was a serious one and opined that the presentations should be

re-visited to enable the SBIR Chairmen and other Steering Committee members to be carried along.

The Chairman of Infrastructure and Systems Sub-Committee explained to the meeting that the presentation of 8th December, 2009 was a fall out of 7th December meeting which had Delta, Katsina and Niger SBIR Chairmen in attendance. However, he added that the Chairmen did give their go ahead on the 8th December, 2009 presentations but said that they may not be available as they would be rushing back to their various States for other assignments.

At this juncture the JTB Chairman acknowledged that the Gombe SBIR Chairman made a very good point but noted that the beauty of the whole thing was that nothing had been concluded and no commitments made by JTB. Moving forward, she opined that the State Chairmen and Steering Committee members should be incorporated and made to listen to the presentations.

On the sanctions to the Vendors the Chairman noted that it could not have been forgotten but that it was considered that penalties/sanctions should be two ways and the issue was whether JTB was ready on its own part to bear the consequences if there should be breach on her part.

Brief by Representative of NIMC on the NIMC Meeting

The representative of NIMC informed the meeting that the need for the meeting with NIMC arose out of concern raised by stakeholders on duplication of functions of NIMC by the UTIN Project. It also arose out of the need for JTB to identify areas of interest, setting of common standards and where collocation of facilities could be possible.

		<p>The meeting was also told that the National ID-Card was developed by SAGEM but there were issues to be sorted out and hopefully by the next two weeks all the issues would have been settled and SAGEM would handover and give access of data to NIMC. Mr. Hassan Isa also told the meeting that a Harmonization Committee meeting would be held the next day and thereafter NIMC would be able to come up with their standards which JTB would work on.</p> <p>Finally the NIMC representative told the meeting that the meeting with NIMC, FIRS and JTB was a welcome one by the organisations and that there was an agreement to collaborate during the meeting. Later in the meeting copies of the minutes of the 18th January, 2010 meeting with NIMC were shared to all the members present.</p>	
8	<p>Review of the India Visitation Report</p>	<p>The India report was presented by the leader of the delegation, Mr. A. B. Okauru who is also the Director General of the Nigerian Governor's Forum. He told the meeting that the tour was essentially undertaken to ascertain how JTB could leverage on the substantial automation that had taken place in the Tax Administration System of that country as well as their legal framework.</p> <p>The leader of the delegation noted the following points as major lessons learnt from the tour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The States in India are substantially autonomous and there is substantial independence at the State level in the Tax Administration System. (ii) The extent to which India had been able to use technology to make their work easier was the major lessons learnt from India. (iii) The legal framework of India drives the whole tax idea and we may need some amendments in our current tax laws. (iv) There is need for a disaster recovery centre. 	

(v) There is a lot of Public Private Partnership (PPP) arrangement in India. We may need to involve our private sector in Nigeria.

Finally, the DG NGF noted the need to be persistent on the Governors for the release of their counterpart funding and to continue to maintain the link with NGF. He promised to assist in this regard, and also called on other participants in the tour to share their experiences on the India trip and the following responses were received:

(a) Mr. Hassan Isa

He told the meeting the following;

- i. In India PPP is very key in their implementation.
- ii. The data centre is extensively secured and any movement around it was captured 24/7 digitally.
- iii. Training of staff is handled by private firms for Government and not the Vendors as JTB is proposing. JTB and SBIR do not have the capacity in terms of trained personnel to support this project.

(b) Mr. Oduba Oduba

Mr. Oduba told the meeting that some of the things JTB had done had been reviewed after the India trip, for instance, the mobile registration centre had been increased from one to three. The Government of India is highly supportive of the PAN project and several utilities/government benefits are tied to it. Some government benefits should be tied to UTIN for people to be moved to use the UTIN when it is eventually rolled out.

There was also a discussion on having a distinct management structure from their ownership but the meeting was unanimous in the agreement that given our environment, the centre should be managed by trained JTB Staff otherwise we may have problems.

Mr. Oduba Oduba explained the rationale behind inviting

		<p>TELNET to bid for FIRS ITAS and BULL for UTIN. However for the UTIN, the meeting was informed that BULL was evasive in their responses to most of the issues and they did say that they could handle UTIN only on the condition that ITAS was awarded to them.</p> <p>At the end of the evaluation, BULL scored 42.1% which was not up to 60% that could have qualified them for the financial evaluation, so JTB was left with the original two Vendors namely: TELNET and ACCENTURE.</p>	
9	<p>Report of the Ethiopian Visitation</p>	<p>The Chairman of Infrastructure and System sub-committee again told the meeting that the visit to Ethiopian came up in view of the fact that one of the solution providers (TELNET) had their solution called SIGTAS running in the Ethiopia Revenue and Customs Authority and hence the visit to ascertain things first hand.</p> <p>He noted that a problem JTB was likely to have would be adequate skilled manpower within the JTB, FIRS and SBIR and he put up the following options for JTB to start considering going forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) JTB to recruit the needed skilled manpower. (b) To second the needed skilled staff from FIRS. (c) Convert the people in the project team to JTB staff to provide the needed skilled manpower to run the project. <p>Another important experience from the tours, he said was the need for finger print wipers which was omitted completely in JTB RFP. Given our weather in Nigeria there was need to avoid having a low quality finger print capture and finger print wipers would be very necessary.</p> <p>Finally, the Chairman of the sub-committee concluded his report by submitting that the TWC was still of the opinion that TELNET had a more competitive bid than ACCENTURE and recommended that JTB considers them based on the explicit contract implementation. At the end</p>	

of the two reports, the JTB Chairman called for comments, questions and contributions.

Comments on the Ethiopian Trip Report

1) The Chairman of Gombe SBIR demanded to know who authorized the Ethiopia visit as it was not contained in the PIB.

He also demanded an explanation for visiting the site of only one of the solution providers and not the two which would have made comparisons possible and made a sacrifice for fairness and level playing ground.

He warned again that JTB was being carried away by too much emphasis on technology and ICT instead of the main purpose which was improvement in tax collection and administration especially as most of the people who visited Ethiopia and India were ICT people.

Finally the Gombe SBIR Chairman was of the opinion that the sub-committee should work in a manner that would not suggest that the members have an interest in TELNET. He noted that the assignment needed maturity in view of the very high position the Steering Committee members occupy in the Nigeria Public Service.

2) The Representative of the Budget Office in the FMF supported the idea of visiting the site of Accenture for fairness.

He also told the meeting that out of omission, the JTB had not been routing letters meant for the FMF through the budget office which is responsible for handling tax matters in that Ministry and the practice needed to be corrected. The project team was told to take note to avoid future mistakes.

3) A member needed to know what informed the choice of Oracle.

4) In his own contribution the representative of BPP gave the following advice which he considered

necessary to pass the due process certification.

- JTB should not award any contract outside what the Vendor had submitted; any difference envisaged should be handled at the level of implementation.
- JTB should not stick to a specific percentage of bonds.
- Implementation timelines should be as the Vendors submitted and should not add or subtract.

RESPONSES

(i) Why Accenture Site was not visited

In response to the issues raised the Chairman of Infrastructure and Systems sub-committee explained that SAP where FIRS visited was the only functional reference site Accenture has unless we wanted to visit a work-in-progress site.

(ii) The Choice of Oracle

Mr. Oduba explained to the meeting that there were a lot of data bases in Nigeria namely: Microsoft, IBM, Sybase, Oracle, etc. He noted that the cheapest of the lot remained Microsoft but it could not support the type of project that was intended to run for the entire country.

On Sybase he told the meeting that the company has less than fifty (50) experts in Nigeria and may not meet the required skilled manpower needed for the project.

On Oracle he explained that the RFP stated "**Oracle or its equivalent**" two Vendors quoted for Oracle and MSSQL respectively but the two most technically qualified Vendors quoted for Oracle database. He explained further that many people understand Oracle in Nigeria and that the application that was intended to be used may not be necessarily Oracle but the database. He also added that

there was a negotiation for direct dealership with Oracle.

At the end of the explanations the meeting agreed that the TWC should amend their report to include the following:

- a) State everything as clear as possible and state reasonable post implementation period to make for comparison.
- b) Work on 2-year post implementation and determine the actual year of implementation/warranty period.
- c) Create column for specifications so that it would be like for like.
- d) State the configuration even where they are the same.
- e) Mention/highlight the NIMC standards.
- f) Examine the new cost implication presented by Accenture thoroughly to ascertain whether there are hidden charges.

The Chairman JTB demanded to know from the Steering Committee whether there was still need to visit ACCENTURE site after the explanation, so that it could be contained as an outcome of the day's meeting. The members present answered in the negative.

However, the meeting was unanimous in their agreement that the two Vendors (TELNET and ACCENTURE) should be invited to make presentations before SBIR Chairmen and Steering Committee Members.

The meeting also agreed that the presentations should be made on Monday the 15th of February 2010, at 10.00am at the conference room of JTB. The Delta SBIR Chairman however muted that he might not be available for the 15th February presentation due to official engagements.

Other issues that came up included the following:

- i) Capacity building and change management.
- ii) The Evaluation Team had noted the need for JTB to have competent staff in the various States, FIRS and the Secretariat, to manage the project after

PT

	<p>implementation. The issue was agreed to be communicated to the JTB during their next meeting.</p> <p>iii) The issue of Programme Manager for TELNET still remained a challenge.</p> <p>iv) The States that gave approval for their counterpart funding should be followed up to ensure that funds come in before the 15th February, 2010 meeting/presentation.</p> <p>v) It was agreed that SBIR Chairmen should pursue their project counterpart payments and as the representatives of the 6 (six) geopolitical zones, lead the way by paying immediately.</p> <p>vi) The meeting reasoned along the line of committing the States to sign an Irrevocable Standing Payment Order (ISPO) for JTB but could not agree on the measure.</p>	
<p>10</p> <p>Adjournment / Closure</p>	<p>The Chairman JTB thanked members present for their time and contributions and urged members to endeavor to attend the 15th February, 2010 presentations especially the SBIRs representatives.</p> <p>In the absence of other matters the CCCOBIN, Mr. Sadiq Bello moved that the meeting be adjourned and he was seconded by the representative of FRSC. The meeting finally rose with a prayer by the Chairman Delta BIR at exactly 9.00pm.</p> <p>Mrs. Ifueko Omoigui Okauru (Chairman)</p> <p>Kingsley Nkemakosi (Secretary)</p>	