

**FINDINGS FROM SITE VISIT OF CRC SOGEMA IMPLEMENTATION OF  
STANDARD INTEGRATED GOVERNMENT TAX ADMINISTRATION  
SYSTEM (SIGTAS) FOR THE ETHIOPIA REVENUE AND CUSTOMS  
AUTHORITY (ERCA)**

**BY**

**A DELEGATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE ON UNIQUE  
TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (UTIN) PROJECT OF THE JOINT  
TAX BOARD**

- i. SIGTAS was implemented in Ethiopia in three phases.
  - ii. Ethiopia Revenue and Customs Authority (ERCA) expressed satisfaction with the performance of the SOGEMA and its solution.
  - iii. Inadequate skilled manpower is a challenge to the successful implementation of the solution. The JTB, FIRS and States Board of Internal Revenue (SBIR) should commence capacity development programme for the stakeholders to mitigate the risk. Also there should be concrete plan on how to manage and operate the system after implementation
  - iv. JTB and FIRS should procure fingerprint wipers to reduce the rejection rate in fingerprints capturing.
  - v. From the evaluation of the visiting team members, SIGTAS is a good solution for implementation at the JTB.
  - vi. A consortium should be utilized for the implementation to make the project management easier.
  - vii. Build capacity within JTB to manage the system after implementation. This might require immediate recruitment or secondment.
-

## SITE VISIT EVALUATION SHEET

- 0 = Requirement not met and/or requires modification to baseline) OR No details provided  
 1 = Partially met i.e. some functionality exists but requires additional modification/customization  
 2 = Configuration Required  
 3 = Requirement met with Baseline  
 4 = Functionality provided in Baseline Exceeds Requirement

		EVALUATORS									
			Oduba O Oduba	Hassan Isa	Shehu Aliyu	Ceejay Ojong	Chinedu Ekeh	Amos Audu	Shonde I.A	Akinwale O.A	Average
	DESCRIPTION	Max									
<b>A</b>	<b>SOLUTION ARCHITECTURE</b>										
1	Overall level of customer satisfaction with solution	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3.25
<b>B</b>	<b>Size of install base:</b>										
1	Number of users supported	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.75
2	Number of taxpayers supported	4	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2.38
3	Volume of transactions	4	2	2	4	2	3	2	2	2	2.38
4	Recurrent Costs (Data communication, Maintenance,	4	2	2	4	3	3	2	2	2	2.50
<b>C</b>	<b>Performance</b>										
1	Interface with third party applications e.g. Biometric, AFIS, other tax administration system (Open Architecture)	4	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3.00
2	Response during peak usage	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.88
3	Response during non-peak usage	4	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	3.13
<b>D</b>	<b>Ease of Use</b>										
1	level of skills required	4	2	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3.00
2	adaptability / learning curve	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3.13
3	User-friendliness	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3.25
<b>E</b>	<b>PROJECT MGT &amp; IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES (Level of satisfaction with implementation services)</b>										
1	Documentation	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	3.00
2	Administrative support	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
3	Compliance with standard project management methodology	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	3.00
	<b>Quality of vendor implementation team</b>										
4	Experience / skill of implementation team	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3.13
5	Resource allocation / deployment	4	3	3	4	4	2	3	4	3	3.25

**SITE VISIT EVALUATION SHEET**

		EVALUATORS									
			Oduba O Oduba	Hassan Isa	Shehu Aliyu	Ceejay Ojong	Chinedu Ekeh	Amos Audu	Shonde I.A	Akinwale O.A	Average
<b>F</b>	<b>Project Quality Metrics:</b>										
1	Adherence to project deliverables	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3.25
2	Adherence to budget	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3.25
3	Project duration (planned vs actual)	4	2	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3.13
	<b>Involvement of client's technical team in implementation:</b>										
4	Role & scope of services provided	4	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	3.13
<b>G</b>	<b>POST IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES</b>										
1	Level of satisfaction with post-implementation support	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3.25
2	Type & quality of support provided during product go-live	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3.13
	<b>Response time and efficiency of problem resolution</b>										
3	Proactive problem management	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3.13
4	Timely response / adherence to SLAs	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3.25
5	Quality of available local support	4	2	2	4	3	2	3	2	3	2.63
<b>H</b>	<b>SKILLS TRANSFER</b>										
1	Overall level of satisfaction with skills transfer / training of client staff	4	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	3.00
2	Scope & quality of training / skills transfer program	4	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	2.50
	<b>Learning curve:</b>										
3	Type/level of skills pre-requisite for staf	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
4	Ease of adoption / use of the solution across the organization	4	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	3.13
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>86.75</b>
	<b>Total Percentage (%)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>65.5</b>	<b>91.4</b>	<b>79.3</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>74.1</b>	<b>74.1</b>	<b>71.6</b>	<b>74.78</b>