



Ensuring Accountability of Public Resources

## AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT



**On Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures to the LEITI Reporting Templates on the Assessments and Collections of Revenues by the MOF and SUPERVISING MINISTRIES & AGENCIES (M&As) FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2011/2012**

**July 2014**

**Yusador S. Gaye, CPA, CGMA**

**Auditor General, R L**

## Republic of Liberia



### TRANSMITTAL LETTER

**July 10, 2014**

**Head of LEITI Secretariat  
Ministers of Finance, Agriculture,  
Lands, Mines and Energy;  
Managing Director, Forestry Development Authority and  
President, National Oil Company**

We have undertaken the Agreed-Upon Procedures (AUP) of the assessments made on and collections obtained from concessionaires and other entities operating within the extractive industry of Liberia for the Fiscal Year July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012. The enclosed report presents the outcomes of the AUP undertaken.

This report, besides it being a requirement under the Auditor General's statutory mandate as provided for under Executive Law Chapter 53.3, is also a requirement under Section 8.4 of the Liberia Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (LEITI).

The enclosed findings were submitted to the Head of the LEITI Secretariat, Ministers of Finance, Agriculture and Land, Mines & Energy and the Heads of the National Oil Company of Liberia, Forestry Development Authority for their attention and necessary action. Responses obtained from the MOF and M&As have been evaluated and incorporated in the Auditor General's Report on the LEITI for the Fiscal Year 2011/12.

  
**Yusador S. Gaye, CPA, CGMA  
Auditor General, R L**

**Monrovia, July 2014**

## ACRONYMNS USED

Acronyms Used	Meaning
AG	Auditor General
GAC	General Auditing Commission
GOL	Government Of Liberia
LEITI	Liberia Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative
MOF	Ministry of Finance
CBL	Central Bank of Liberia
M&As	Ministries and Agencies
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FDA	Forestry Development Authority
LCAA	Liberia Civil Aviation Authority
LMA	Liberia Maritime Authority
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MLME	Ministry of Lands, Mines & Energy
NOCAL	National Oil Company of Liberia
NPA	National Port Authority
TAS	Tax Administration System
ITAS	Integrated Tax Administration System
MSG	Multi-Stakeholders Steering Group
BIR	Bureau of Internal Revenue
TIN	Tax Identification Number
EITII	Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative International
PT	Payment Type
AUP	Agreed-Upon Procedures

## **Table of Contents**

ACRONYMNS USED .....	2
1 BACKGROUND.....	4
3 FINDINGS.....	7
4 LIMITATIONS.....	10
5 SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
6 FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (FDA) TEMPLATES VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) .....	12
7 MINISTRY OF LANDS, MINES & ENERGY (MLME) TEMPLATES VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) .....	19
8 NATIONAL OIL COMPANY OF LIBERIA (NOCAL) TEMPLATES VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) .....	20
9 MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (MOA) TEMPLATES VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF).....	22
10 TEMPLATES FILED WITH TWO TINS.....	25
11 CENTRAL BANK OF LIBERIA (CBL) VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) .....	26
12 ANNEXURES.....	27
13 SCHEDULES FOR CBL VS MOF(SEE DISK).....	62

## **1 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 In accordance with Chapter 53.3 of the Executive Law of 1972 and Section 8.4 of the Act creating the LEITI, we have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Secretariat of LEITI and the Office of the Auditor General of the Republic of Liberia, solely to attest to the accuracy of reported data in the LEITI's Reporting Templates on the assessments and collection of revenues from concessionaires and private companies in the extractive industry in Liberia by the MOF and M&As in compliance with applicable laws and regulations for the Fiscal Year ended 2011/2012.
- 1.2 The Managements of MOF and M&As are responsible for the accounting records, accuracy and completeness of the reporting templates, and compliance with applicable laws. The Auditor General's responsibility is to report on any deviation observed.
- 1.3 This Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagement was also conducted in line with the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in the International Standard on Related Services (ISRS) 4400 (previously ISA 920). The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the parties specified in this report. Accordingly, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or otherwise.

## **2 AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE LEITI REPORTING TEMPLATES SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL**

- 2.1 The procedures that we performed are summarized as follows:
- 2.1.1 LEITI's reporting templates were obtained from the MOF and M&As and inspected to verify that each template was filled in correctly.
  - 2.1.2 Payments by extractive companies were inspected to verify that they were made within the specified time period by contract or within reasonable period as prescribed by the appropriate regulations.
  - 2.1.3 Inspection was also done to verify that if legitimate payment(s) were not made within the regulated time frame (delinquency), appropriate fines and penalties as prescribed by the Revenue Code of 2000, PFM Act of 2009 and other regulatory frameworks were levied and said amount collected and deposited into GOL's Account at the CBL.
  - 2.1.4 Assessments were made to verify that all payments made directly to supervising ministries and agencies of GOL other than MOF by extractive companies were in accordance with the terms and conditions of the company's contract with GOL for the period under review.
  - 2.1.5 Examined and compared reconciliation templates of extractive companies submitted by M&As together with MOF to verify that payments and receipts reported by company and agency were properly reconciled.
  - 2.1.6 Assessed payment procedures to determine the level of controls and risk management program maintained by each M&A over the process, to determine the level of effectiveness and efficiency with which the process is implemented.
  - 2.1.7 Reviewed the implementation of prior audit recommendations by MOF and M&As to ascertain that issues raised have been fully addressed in their corrective action plans (CAP) and that proactive strategies have been put in place to mitigate re-occurrences.
  - 2.1.8 Compared assessments by each supervising M&A with receipts reported by MOF to verify that amount assessed and amount paid were reconciled.
  - 2.1.9 Verified that amount reported on each template was recorded in the proper currency unit columns for both United States and Liberian Dollars.
  - 2.1.10 Compared the list of extractive companies submitted by LEITI with the number of templates submitted by the MOF and M&As to verify that all extractive companies which met the qualification criteria for filing did so and was captured by both the MOF and M&As.

- 2.1.11 Determined the number of extractive companies for which templates were not filed by either the MOF or M&As for the attention of both MOF and M&As.
- 2.1.12 Ascertained the extractive companies operational status with their respective supervising M&A and the MOF.
- 2.1.13 Inquired from those charged with governance, the chief administrative officer, and comptroller/chief financial officer in any instance indicating fraud, illegal acts, or noncompliance, and determine whether the entity has taken the appropriate action, including implementing controls to minimize the risk that the fraud, illegal acts, or noncompliance will reoccur, including (What action(s) administration has taken to avoid reoccurrence)
- 2.1.14 Verified that amounts reported by the MOF as receipts from extractive companies have been duly collected and lodged at the CBL;
- 2.1.15 Verified that dollar amounts reported by MOF as collected funds represent the actual amount due the GOL as stipulated in each extractive company's contract for the period under review.

### 3 FINDINGS

- 3.1 From the execution of the above procedures agreed upon, we present our findings:
- 3.1.1 We observed that two separate TINs were used for 8 companies (Ref. Appendix 1, para. 8.1; Table 14); only the amount due was filled in, while amounts paid were not indicated for 35 companies (Ref. Annex 5 & 6); there was no supporting schedules for 4 templates (Exhibit 1), thus creating doubt about the accuracy of reported templates.
- 3.1.2 From our inspection, there was no indication that payment was made outside of the Fiscal Year (2011/12). This conclusion is based on the extent of our review and inspection as permitted by the Agreed – Upon Procedures (AUP).
- 3.1.3 From our analyses of reporting templates submitted by the MOF and M&As, the following were amounts due with no indication that said amounts had been collected: Ref. Annex 5 & 6.
- Amount Due (FDA) .....US\$7,403,639.73  
Amount Due (MLME) ....US\$1,153,632.90
- 3.1.4 A further review of NOCAL's templates disclosed that the entity reported total amount due in the tone of of US\$5,662,233.39 and an amount paid of US\$6,447,340.79 ,thus leaving an unexplained variance of US\$-785,107.40. Schedule 1-A
- 3.1.5 From our analyses of reporting templates submitted by the MOF and M&As, variations were observed between the MOF on one hand and the FDA, MLME, NOCAL and MOA for data reported on their respective templates. Ref: Appendix 1 (Para. 4.1 – 8.1; Tables 1 - 13)
- 3.1.6 We noted that the MOF and M&As did not reconcile their collection and billing records on a regular basis as recommended.
- 3.1.7 The issue of reconciliation and confirmation between the MOF and M&As remains to be fully addressed. It was observed that the MOF was not notified by M&As for assessments made and subsequent billings raised. On the other hand, M&As have not been properly notified for all deposits made through the MOF by extractive companies.
- 3.1.8 The MLME, FDA, NOCAL and MOF have set up designated sections or units to collect and report their revenue assessments and collection data from the extractive sector.
- 3.1.9 However, there was no evidence that MOF and the M&As have built the capacity of individuals charged with the responsibility of data collection, as a means of enhancing efficiency and effectiveness in the collection and reporting of data.



- 3.1.10 Huge disparities continue to exist between reporting templates submitted by the Supervising Ministries and Agencies and the Ministry of Finance Ref. Schedule 1 & 2 (Soft Copies on CD 1 attached to report).
- 3.1.11 From our review, there was no indication of misapplication of currency unit.
- 3.1.12 We observed that templates were not filed for the following extractive companies:
- Mining..... (1) West African Resources
  - (2) Voila International
  - Forestry..... (3) Bassa Logging
- 3.1.13 The MOF and M&As were requested to confirm the operational statuses of the three (3) extractive companies for which templates were not filed. However, neither MOF nor the M&As (MLME & FDA) responded to this request.
- 3.1.14 In the comparative analysis of data provided by the MOF's Tax Administration System (TAS) and bank statements from the Central Bank of Liberia (CBL), the following were observed:
- i. MOF (TAS) collections and deposits...US\$7,163,524.77
  - ii. CBL's data on deposits received.....US\$7,208,746.55
  - iii. Variance between MOF (TAS) and CBL US\$45,221.78; (Ref. Schedule 2)
- 3.1.15 Additionally, we wish to note herewith that the agreed-upon procedures also disclosed the following matters that warranted the attention of the Head of LEITI Secretariat, MOF and M&As officials and the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) of the National Legislature:
- i. Huge disparities continue to exist between reporting templates submitted by the Supervising Ministries and Agencies and the Ministry of Finance Ref. Schedule 1 & 2 (Soft Copies on CD 1 attached to report).
  - ii. The CBL's data did not indicate the tax payers' names, thus posing serious challenges to reconciling its data with that of the MOF (TAS).
  - iii. The MOF and M&As reported more than one Tax Identification Number (TIN) for the same extractive company, thereby creating confusion as to the one to apply.
  - iv. The MOF and CBL continue to submit the entire collections and deposits data from all tax payers in Liberia despite our previous recommendation that reported data

should contain only those on the collections and deposits of revenues from the extractive sector of Liberia.


- v. M&As continue to report huge sums as amounts due, without indication that said amounts had been paid into GOL's Account.
- vi. The LEITI reported 80 companies that meet the qualification criteria for reporting and MOF submitted 108 Companies, thus resulting in a variance of 28 Companies.

## **4 LIMITATIONS**

- 4.1.1 We could not verify the dollar amount reported for each extractive company, as we were not provided with all the contracts and contract templates to verify the terms and conditions of each .
- 4.1.2 The agreed-upon procedures do not constitute an audit or a review of MOF's and M&As' accounting records and Financial Statements, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion or limited assurance on the accounting records, or their reports. Also, we were not engaged to and did not conduct any examination or review of MOF's and M&As' compliance with applicable laws and regulations, the objectives of which would be the expression of an opinion or limited assurance on compliance. Accordingly, we do not express such opinions or limited assurances.
- 4.1.3 Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.
- 4.1.4 However, in accordance with the mandate of the Auditor General as provided for in Section 53.7 of the Executive Law of 1972, we are required to report significant deficiencies, material weaknesses, instances of fraud, noncompliance with provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, or grant agreements, or abuse that come to our attention during this agreed-upon procedures that warrant the attention of those charged with governance.

## **5 SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1.1 We recommended that authorities of the MOF, FDA, MLME, NOCAL and MOA reconcile their reporting templates and resubmit same for verification.
- 5.1.2 We requested that the MOF and M&As reconcile their reporting templates for resubmission.
- 5.1.3 We also recommended that authorities of the MOF and CBL reconcile their reported data and resubmit same for our verification.
- 5.1.4 We recommended that each template be properly filled-in and refiled for our verification.
- 5.1.5 The GAC requested the MOF and M&As to provide proof that outstanding amounts were collected and deposited in the account of GOL.
- 5.1.6 The MOF and CBL were also requested to develop a common reference by which each deposit can be identified (i.e.: receipt number or TIN) to facilitate comparison and reconciliation of their reported data.
- 5.1.7 Authorities of the Ministry of Finance (MOF) and Supervising Ministries & Agencies (M&As) are requested to address these issues in keeping with all relevant laws and regulations such as the LEITI Act, PFM Act and Revenue Code to form the basis for us to provide assurance on the validity of information provided on the LEITI's reporting templates.

  
**Yusador S. Gaye, CPA, CGMA**  
**Auditor General; RL**

**Monrovia, July 2014**

## APPENDIX ONE (1)

### 6 FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (FDA) TEMPLATES VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF)

#### Detail Findings

6.1 From our review of templates submitted by FDA and MOF, the following variances were observed as indicated in the tables (1 & 2) below:

#### AMOUNT DUE PER MOF & FDA: (Table 1)

Amount (USD) Due Per MOF	Amount (LD) Due Per MOF	Amount (USD) Due Per FDA	Amount (LD) Due Per FDA	Variance (USD) (MOF Vs. FDA)	Variance (LD) (MOF Vs. FDA)
4,819,718.62	1,018,805.37	20,072,535.08	-0-	15,252,816.46	(1,018,805.37)

#### AMOUNT PAID PER MOF & FDA: (Table 2)

Amount (USD) paid Per MOF	Amount (LD) paid Per MOF	Amount (USD) paid Per FDA	Amount (LD) paid Per FDA	Variance (USD) MOF Vs. FDA	Variance (LD) (MOF Vs. FDA)
6,020,126.87	1,018,805.37	7,624,498.31	-0-	-1,604,371.44	1,018,805.37

6.2 Moreover, the amount reported by the MOF and FDA as amount due and amount paid do not reconcile thereby leaving unexplained variances. See tables (3 & 4):

#### AMOUNT DUE AND PAID PER MOF: (Table 3)

Amount (USD) Due Per MOF	Amount (LD) Due Per MOF	Amount (USD) Paid Per MOF	Amount LD Paid Per MOF	Variance (USD) MOF Vs FDA	Variance (LD) MOF Vs FDA
4,819,718.62	1,018,805.37	6,020,126.87	1,018,805.37	(1,200,408.25)	0

#### AMOUNT DUE AND PAID PER FDA: (Table 4)

Amount (USD) Due Per FDA	Amount (LD) Due	Amount (USD) Paid Per FDA	Amount (LD) Paid Per FDA	Variance (USD) Per FDA	Variance (LD) Per FDA
20,072,535.08	-0-	7,624,498.31	-0-	12,448,036.77	-0-

6.3 In the wake of the huge variances, we are unable to provide assurance on the correctness of the reported data from the templates filed by the MOF and FDA.

6.4 We recommended that the MOF and FDA's authorities reconcile their reported revenue figures and refile the templates for verification. Ref. Schedule 1

**Management's Response (FDA)**

6.5 *Response of Forestry Development Authority (FDA) to General Auditing Commission (GAC) findings from the review of LEITI Templates*  
*Extractive Company 1: Bulgar & Vincent Timber*

6.6 *FDA reported the following:*  
*Stumpage = US\$13, 350.58*  
*Export fee = US\$ 15,319.66*  
*Export License US\$ 100.00*  
*FDA do not report on PT # 26 (export Tax)*  
*Chainsaw Lumber is not reported under this company;*

6.7 *In PT # 42, MOF report is inclusive of log export and export license fees. Provide proof for this assertion.*

6.8 *PT # 36 for stumpage fee was not captured in your analysis.*

**Auditor General's Position**

6.9 For PT # 42, authorities of the FDA should provide proof that the US\$6,713.08 reported by the Ministry of Finance (MOF) is inclusive of Log Export and Export License Fees.

6.10 The GAC has no issue with PT # 36 and therefore did not raise any question on same.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 2: Forest Venture*

6.11 *FDA Reported the following in contrast to you analysis:*

*PT # 33 Waybill fee:*  
*21,000 Due*  
*19,800 Paid*

6.12 *PT# 34 Phyto Sanitary fee is not reported by FDA*

6.13 *PT # 36 Stumpage Fee is US\$722,725.86 was reported due and US\$663,647.90 was reported by FDA instead of MOF.*

6.14 *PT # 42 Export License fee was reported US\$500 due and paid not as you reported as US\$685,525.35*

6.15 *PT #43 is Log Export fee of US\$685,525.35 was reported due and paid and not as PT # 42 (log export License)*

**Auditor General's Position**

- 6.16 Note that the point of concern on PT#33 (Waybill) is the amount due and not the amount paid. FDA reported an amount due of US\$21, 000.00, while the MOF reported US\$19,800.00, leaving a variance of US\$1,200.00.
- 6.17 We wish to note the corrections on PT# 34 Phyto Sanitary fee and the appropriate adjustments made.
- 6.18 On account of PT # 36 (Stumpage Fee), our focus is the amount due between MOF and FDA and not amount paid. The FDA should therefore reconcile (its) reported figure with the MOF.
- 6.19 With respect to PT # 42 (Export License Fee, we are concerned about the difference between the amount reported by the FDA and MOF (FDA - US\$685,525.35 and MOF 663,249.80). Even the amount due and paid by the two entities did not match. The FDA's authorities therefore did not address the issues.
- 6.20 The GAC did not have any issue on PT# 42 under this company.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 3: Buchanan Renewable*

- 6.21 *PT # 18 is not for FDA reporting*

**Auditor General's Position**

- 6.22 PT # 18 noted and appropriate adjustments made.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 4: Liberia Hardwood*

- 6.23 *Count (d) Yes, it is a registered company*

**Auditor General's Position**

- 6.24 The issue of the legal status of Liberia Hardwood should be addressed jointly by the Forestry Development Authority (FDA) and the Ministry of Finance (MOF) with documentary evidence such as business registration records and licenses issue for the Fiscal Year under review.
- 6.25 In the absence of these documents, we still maintain our position on the status of the company.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 5: Timber Liberia*

- 6.26 *PT # 39 Sawmill Fee was paid and the receipt is recorded in the reporting schedule.*

**Auditor General's Position**

- 6.27 The issue of PT # 39 is that the amount paid was not reported on the reporting template submitted by FDA and no supporting schedule. FDA should therefore include this on its reporting template and supporting schedule and refile the adjustments to address the issue.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 6: Tropical Timber*

- 6.28 *PT # 32: Contract Administration of 2,000 was not recorded on the template but it is on the supporting schedule. It was an oversight.*

**Auditor General's Position**

- 6.29 We acknowledge your admission of oversight. However, the amount must be incorporated on the reporting template and re-filed.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 7: International Consultant Capital*

- 6.30 *PT # 35 on Area fee is wrongly misplaced. It should be 667,275.00 due;*
- 6.31 *PT # 41 on Bid Premium should be written as US\$2,815,900 due.*
- 6.32 *PT # 1 & 18 are not for FDA*
- 6.33 *PT# 32 is reported US\$ 1,000 as due*

**Auditor General's Position**

- 6.34 We do acknowledge the wrong placement of PT # 35 (Area Fees). However, do the correction and resubmit your template.
- 6.35 We also note the adjustment for the amount on PT # 41 (Bid Premium). We request that FDA does the correction and resubmit the template.
- 6.36 The GAC has no problem with PT # 1 & 18 and therefore raised no issue.
- 6.37 The issue with PT# 32 is whether the amount was paid or not. The FDA should therefore address the issue of payment.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 9: Eco-Wood*

- 6.38 *PT# 31-Block Inspection should be written as US\$750 due and paid*
- 6.39 *PT # 33 Waybill US\$5400 due and paid*
- 6.40 *PT # 43 Log Export fee is US\$197,759.78 due and paid*



6.41 *Annual Contract Administration fee is US\$1,000 paid but was due from the last reporting period*

**Auditor General's Position**

6.42 On the issue of PT# 31 (Block Inspection) of US\$750 due and paid, we requested that FDA does the correction and resubmit the template.

6.43 On account of PT # 33 (Waybill), FDA's template reported US\$6,600.00 as amount due and US\$6,000.00 as paid, leaving a variance of US\$600.00. To change this amount requires that FDA refiles the template with the supporting documents attached.

6.44 In order to effect the change on PT # 43 (Log Export Fee), you were requested to provide replacement template with a supporting schedule.

6.45 We acknowledge FDA's admission that the Annual Contract Administration Fee of US\$1,000.00 was paid but was due from the last reporting period. However, incorporating amount due from last reporting period is in violation of Count 3 of the Agency/Company's Management Sign-off of the LEITI's Reporting Template (The amounts paid/received exclude payments made before 1 July 2011 and payments made after 30 June 2012). The template must be refiled with the relevant supporting documents to rectify the error.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 13: Atlantic Resources Limited*

6.46 *PT # 18 cannot be reported by FDA*

6.47 *PT # 32 Contract Administration Fee of US\$500 was reported due and paid*

6.48 *PT # 33 Waybill fee: FDA reported US\$6,750 as due and paid*

6.49 *PT # 42 Export License Fee was reported as US\$300 due and paid*

**Auditor General's Position**

6.50 PT # 18 is noted and appropriate adjustments made.

6.51 On account of PT # 32, FDA reported amount due and paid in the tone of US\$5,000.00 and not US\$500.00. The template must therefore be refiled with the appropriate adjustments made.

6.52 PT # 33 & 42 are noted and appropriate adjustments made.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 15: EJ & J Investment*

6.53 *PT # 18 is not to be reported by FDA*

6.54 *PT # 35 Area Fee of 143,155.00 was reported due and paid*

6.55 *PT # 43 Log export fee is not mentioned in the GAC analysis*

**Auditor General's Position**

6.56 PT # 18 & 35 are noted and appropriate adjustments made.

6.57 The GAC has no issue with PT # 43 and therefore should not report on same.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 18: Alpha Logging Company*

6.58 *PT # 43 Export fee of US\$491,549.38 was wrongly copied from other companies. This company shows no export fee for the period under review*

**Auditor General's Position**

6.59 We acknowledge your admission that PT # 43 (Export Fee) of US\$491,549.38 was wrongly copied from other companies and that this company showed no export fee for the period under review. However, we request that FDA does the appropriate adjustments and refile the template.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 22: Sun Yeun*

6.60 *MOF reported fees reported from FDA templates*

*PT # 32 = US\$1,000*

*PT # 33 = US\$ 3,000*

*PT # 35 = US\$ 6,250*

**Auditor General's Position**

6.61 We maintain our position on PT #s 32, 33 and 35. If the FDA has any information to the contrary, it should provide same on a replacement template.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

*Extractive Company 24: Global Logging Company*

6.62 *PT # 34 Phyto sanitary fee is not reported by FDA*

**Auditor General's Position**

6.63 PT # 34 is noted and appropriate adjustments made.

**Management's Response (FDA)**

6.64 *In conclusion, the issue of unexplained variances in the reporting template is a result of closing of the fiscal year. These variances are noted for next reporting period. In some instances where the payment is more than due, shows that there were other outstanding balances but was not recorded.*

6.65 *Secondly, the cause of differences between MOF and FDA templates is also a result of wrong nomenclature to the tax kinds.*

**Auditor General's Position**

6.66 We acknowledge your assertions and urge the FDA to collaborate with the MOF to harmonize all regulatory and operational issues that would hinder the accurate reporting of data from both entities as a means of enhancing the LEITI's Reporting process.

## 7 MINISTRY OF LANDS, MINES & ENERGY (MLME) TEMPLATES VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF)

### Findings

- 7.1 From our analyses of templates submitted by the Ministries of Finance (MOF) and Lands, Mines & Energy (MLME), the following variances were observed. See table (5 & 6) below:

#### AMOUNT DUE PER MOF & MLME: (Table 5)

Amount (USD) Due Per MOF	Amount (LD) Due Per MOF	Amount (USD) Due Per MLME	Amount (LD) Due Per MLME	Variance (USD) Per MLME	Variance (LD) Per MLME
4,391,731.38	334,138.34	4,681,835.73	-0-	290,104.35	334,138.34

#### AMOUNT PAID PER MOF & MLME: (Table 6)

Amount (USD) paid Per MOF	Amount (LD) paid Per MOF	Amount (USD) paid Per MLME	Amount (LD) paid Per MLME	Variance (USD) MOF Vs. MLME	Variance (LD) MOF Vs. MLME
4,382,731.38	42,800.00	18,524,209.75	-0-	-14,141,478.37	42,800.00

- 7.2 The above chart indicates that the MLME reported an amount due in the of US\$290,104.35 and amount paid US\$14,141,478.37 in excess of what the Ministry of Finance reported. This could be an indication that the MOF and MLME did not coordinate their data collections and reporting, thereby creating doubt as to the actual amount due assessed for the fiscal period.
- 7.3 The MOF and MLME should reconcile their reported data and refile the templates for our verification. The refiled data should be supported by the relevant information that led to the variance and should be attached to the refiled templates as notes. Ref. Schedule 1

## 8 NATIONAL OIL COMPANY OF LIBERIA (NOCAL) TEMPLATES VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF)

### Findings

- 8.1 We analyzed templates submitted by the NOCAL and corresponding templates by MOF and noted that there were variances between the reported figures of the two entities as indicated in tables (7, 8 & 9) below:

#### AMOUNT DUE PER MOF & NOCAL: (Table 7)

Amount (USD) Due Per MOF	Amount (LD) Due Per MOF	Amount (USD) Due Per NOCAL	Amount (LD) Due Per NOCAL	Variance (USD) MOF Vs. NOCAL	Variance (LD) MOF Vs. NOCAL
2,425.00	4,200.00	5,662,233.39	-0-	5,659,808.39	4,200.00

#### AMOUNT PAID PER MOF & NOCAL: (Table 8)

Amount USD paid Per MOF	Amount LD paid Per MOF	Amount USD paid Per NOCAL	Amount LD paid Per NOCAL	Variance USD MOF Vs. NOCAL	Variance LD MOF Vs. NOCAL
2,425.00	4,200.00	6,447,340.79	-0-	6,444,915.79	4,200.00

- 8.2 Furthermore, the amount reported by the NOCAL as amount due and amount paid did not reconcile, thereby leaving unexplained variances as indicated in tables 7, 8 & 9:

#### AMOUNT DUE AND PAID BY NOCAL: (Table 9)

Amount USD Due	Amount LD Due	Amount USD Paid	Amount LD Paid	Variance USD	Variance LD
5,662,233.39	-0-	6,447,340.79	-0-	-785,107.40	-0-

- 8.3 Taking into account the level of variations that exist between the reporting data of the Ministry of Finance and the National Oil Company, we cannot provide assurance on the accuracy of the amounts due and paid reported by the two entities.

- 8.4 We therefore recommend that the MOF and NOCAL reconcile their reported figures and refile for our verification.

### Management's Response (NOCAL)

- 8.5 *We are pleased to present our compliments and acknowledged receipt of your letter of April 14, 2014 requesting NOCAL to respond to audit Observation (s) noted in the draft report titled "Applying Agreed-UPON Procedures to the LEITI Reporting Templates on the Assessments and Collections of Revenues by the MOF and M&As".*
- 8.6 *First, we like to inform you that the copy of the communication we received made reference to paragraph 3.1.17. page 8 and averred that NOCAL did not provide*

*information for three (3) extractive companies- two in the mining sector (West Africa Resources & Viola International) and one in the Forestry Sector (Bassa Logging Company). Unfortunately, we are not involved with the Mining and Forestry Sectors and hence suspect that this was an oversight on your part.*

8.7 *Second, we have reviewed the findings of the draft report on NOCAL found under section 6, sub-section 6.1, page 12 and has deemed it expedient to resubmit the relevant information appertaining to this assessment.*

8.8 *Highlighted in your report, were discrepancies in the amounts associated with surface rental fees and social welfare contributions remitted to the Ministry of Finance (MOF). Following our review of your concerns, we noticed that several of the payments that NOCAL made to the MOF for surface rental fees were erroneously marked as social Contributions on the Flag Receipts. Please note that pursuant to the Product Sharing Contracts (PSCs) between the Government of Liberia (GOL), represented by NOCAL, and the International Oil Companies (IOCs) under consideration, NOCAL is **NOT** contractually required to remit social Welfare Contributions to the Ministry of Finance. Rather, NOCAL has a Corporate Social Responsibility Division that manages social welfare programs and provides financial and logistical support for programs, including initiatives proposed by government ministries and agencies. Although NOCAL is not required, by law or by the PSCs, to remit social welfare contributions to the MOF, please note that during the period under review, NOCAL provided the MOF with discretionary contributions of \$ 404,142.25 USD in response to requests for additional assistance.*

8.9 *Please find attached a summary matrix clarifying PSCs' Financial transactions for 2011/2012 based on our records.*

#### **Auditor General's Position**

8.10 Please note that paragraph 3.1.17. Page 8 in the report is exclusively for the attention of the FDA and not NOCAL. Remember that the report is designed for multi-stakeholders.

8.11 We also acknowledge your admittance of errors in the presentation of social contributions data on the LEITI's Reporting Templates. However, we recommend that NOCAL reconciles its reported data with the MOF and refiles the LEITI's Reporting Templates with all supporting documents for all adjustments made. In the absence of these adjustments supported by documentary evidence, we are unable to provide assurance on the accuracy of the templates.

## 9 MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (MOA) TEMPLATES VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF)

### Detailed Findings

9.1 In response to our earlier findings, the MOA and MOF made the following adjustments: MOA reported an amount due of US\$3,007,786.00 and an amount paid of in the tune of US\$3,001,813.00, while MOF reported an amount due of 1,841,157.65 and an amount paid of US\$2,097,088.05 respectively.

9.2 From our analyses, the following variations were noted. See tables (10 & 11) below:

#### AMOUNT DUE PER MOF & MOA: (Table 10)

Amount (USD) Due Per MOF	Amount (LD) Due Per MOF	Amount (USD) Due Per MOA	Amount (LD) Due Per MOA	Variance (USD) MOF Vs. MOA	Variance (LD) MOF Vs. MOA
1,841,157.65	-0-	3,007,786.00	-0-	1,166,628.35	-0-

#### AMOUNT PAID PER MOF & MOA: (Table 11)

Amount (USD) paid Per MOF	Amount (LD) paid Per MOF	Amount (USD) paid Per MOA	Amount (LD) paid Per MOA	Variance (USD) MOF Vs. MOA	Variance (LD) MOF Vs. MOA
2,097,088.05	-0-	3,001,813.00	-0-	904,724.95	-0-

9.3 Moreover, the amount reported by the MOF and MOA as amount due and amount paid did not reconcile, thereby leaving unexplained variances. See tables (12 & 13) below:

#### AMOUNT DUE AND PAID PER MOF: (Table 12)

Amount (USD) Due Per MOF	Amount (LD) Due Per MOF	Amount USD Paid Per MOF	Amount (LD) Paid Per MOF	Variance (USD) Per MOF	Variance (LD) Per MOF
1,841,157.65	-0-	2,097,088.05	-0-	(255,930.40)	-0-

#### AMOUNT DUE AND PAID PER MOA: (Table 13)

Amount (USD) Due Per MOA	Amount (LD) Due Per MOA	Amount (USD) Paid Per MOA	Amount (LD) Paid Per MOA	Variance (USD) Per MOA	Variance (LD) Per MOA
3,007,786.00	-0-	3,001,813.00	-0-	5,973.00	-0-

9.4 Given the level of variations that exist between the reporting data of the MOF and the MOA, we cannot provide assurance as to the accuracy of the total amounts due and paid as reported by the two entities.

- 9.5 We therefore recommend that the MOF and MOA reconcile their reported figures and refile their templates for our verification. However, the two entities did not reconcile their reported data as requested. Ref. Annex 4

**Management's Response (MOA)**

- 9.6 *This communication is in response to your letter sent on the 2nd of April 2014 requesting the Ministry of Agriculture inputs/ comments on the analysis and recommendations contained in the LEITI Reconciliation Draft Agreed – Upon Procedures for the fiscal year 2011/12.*
- 9.7 *To address the issue of the discrepancies in the MOA Template versus MOF findings as reflected in point number seven (7) on page 13, MOA reported amounts due of US\$231,217.97 and an amount paid of US\$1,070,671.72. The MOF reported amounts due of US\$14,376,258.34 and L\$68,650.00, and amounts paid of US\$16,869,167.33 and L\$63,750.00 respectively.*
- 9.8 *I am pleased to inform you that we have worked with the Revenue Department of the MOF and reconciled the payment figures.*
- 9.9 *Please find herewith enclosed the corrected templates and supporting schedules.*

**Auditor General's Position**

- 9.10 We compared amounts reported in the re-submitted templates and realized that the MOA reported an amount due of US\$3,007,786.00, while MOF reported a total amount due of US\$14,376,258.34. However, of the US\$14,376,258.34 reported by the MOF, only US\$1,841,157.65 constitute sector specific that should be reported by the MOA.
- 9.11 Comparing the amount due of US\$3,007,786.00 reported by MOA with the amount due of US\$1,841,157.65 reported by MOF (from sector specific), left a variance of US\$1,166,628.35.
- 9.12 Also compared was an amount paid of US\$3,001,813.00 by MOA with a total amount paid of US\$16,869,167.33 reported by MOF. However, of the US\$16,869,167.33 reported as amount paid by the MOF, only US\$2,097,088.05 constitute sector specific that should be reported by MOA.
- 9.13 Comparing MOA's amount paid of US\$3,001,813.00 with MOF's amount paid of US\$2,097,088.05 (from sector specific), left a variance of US\$904,724.95
- 9.14 Moreover, our inspection and evaluation of the Office of the Assistant Minister for Technical Services responsible for data collection and reporting at the MOA revealed that the Ministry does not have the requisite infrastructure in place to independently collect and report revenue data from the Agriculture sector. Instead, the MOA collected data directly



from the MOF for its reporting purpose. This action undermines the independence and credibility of data reported by the MOA.

- 9.15 We are therefore unable to provide assurance on the accuracy of the LEITI's Reporting templates submitted by the MOA.

***Management's Responses (MOF)***

- 9.16 *The MOF comments were incorporated in the response matrices. Ref*

**Auditor General's Position**

- 9.17 The Ministry of Finance (MOF) responded to Appendix 1, Section 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 9 and Annexures I – VII as contained in the Auditor General's Report on the LEITI for FY 2011/12. The MOF's comments were incorporated where appropriate in the Response Matrices I, II, III & IV. All issues considered resolved were effectively removed and the Auditor General's Positions clearly stated. Ref: Response Matrices I, II, III & IV

## 10 TEMPLATES FILED WITH TWO TINS

- 10.1 From our analyses of LEITI's Templates submitted by Ministry of Finance (MOF) and Supervising Ministries and Agencies (M&As), it was observed that eight (8) templates for the below listed extractive Companies were assigned two (2) different TIN numbers. See table (14) below:

**TEMPLATES FILED WITH TWO SEPARATE TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (TIN) TABLE 14**

No	COMPANY / TAXPAYER	TIN #1	TIN#2
1	ATLANTIC RESOURCES LTD	426669005	413236002
2	BHP	404839005	426131005
3	LIBINC OIL PALM INC	429546001	417597000
4	HUMMINGBIRD RESOURCES	412589009	47712005
5	FIRESTONE LIBERIA	421946019	400184003
6	CHEVRON LIBERIA	400576009	425604007
7	TAWANA LIBERIA	429436001	427653005
8	TIETTO MINERIAL	418134003	426672006

### Management's Responses (MOF)

- 10.2 *The double TINS represent two parties involved in the transaction; the withholder and the withholdee.*

### Auditor General's Position

- 10.3 Reason for the Tax Identification Number (TIN) was to develop a code that is unique to every tax payer. The use of double TINs clearly undermines the very objective for establishing the TIN regime.
- 10.4 The MOF should therefore provide the GAC with a valid clarification on the change and the underpinning regularity to support it.

## **11 CENTRAL BANK OF LIBERIA (CBL) VS MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF)**

- 11.1 Our analyses of data submitted by the Central Bank of Liberia and the Ministry of Finance revealed that of the US\$7,163,524.77 reported from the MOF Tax Administration System (TAS) as amount deposited with CBL, the CBL data confirmed receipt of US\$7,208,746.55 in excess of MOF's data by US\$45,221.78
- 11.2 The MOF is therefore requested to reconcile its reported TAS data with the CBL and resubmit same for our verification. Ref. Schedule 2

## **12 ANNEXURES**

**SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS FROM THE REVIEW OF LEITI TEMPLATES SUBMITTED BY THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) AND SUPERVISING MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES (M&As) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011/2012 FOR COMPANIES OPERATING IN THE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY OF LIBERIA**  
**ANNEX I**

**FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (FDA) TEMPLATES vs. MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) TEMPLATES**

No	Extractive company	Contract Adm. Fees PT#32	Area Fees PT#35	Export Tax PT#26	Chainsaw Lumber Fees PT#40	Bid Premium PT#41	Timber Export License PT#42	Log Export Fees PT#43
1	<b>Bulgar &amp; Vincent Timber- (407339002)</b>	(a) FDA reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due  (b) No indication that the US\$1,000.00 has been paid into GOL Consolidated Account at the CBL  (c) MOF did not report/capture the amount FDA and MOF authorities should reconcile the difference	(a) FDA reported US\$6,250.00 as amount due  (b) No indication that the amount has been paid  (c) MOF did not report/capture the amount  (d) MOF Authorities should reconcile with FDA		(a) MOF reported amount due and paid of US\$750.00  (b) FDA did not report/capture the amount	(a) FDA reported US\$100,000.00 as amount due only  (b) No indication by FDA that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account  (c) MOF did not report/capture the amount	(a) FDA reported US\$100.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF reported US\$6,713.08 as amount due and paid  (c) Unexplained variance of US\$6,613.08	(a) FDA reported US\$15,319.66 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF reported US\$13,532.58 as amount due and paid  (c) Unexplained variance of US\$1,967.08 (d) FDA and MOF authorities should reconcile their reported figures

		<b>Contract Administration Fees PT#32</b>	<b>Waybill Fees PT#33</b>	<b>Phyto Sanitary Fee PT#34</b>	<b>Stumpage Fees PT#36</b>	<b>Log Export License Fees PT#43</b>	<b>Chain of Custody Mgt. Fees (PSI) PT#45</b>	<b>Others PT#95.d</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Forest Venture (421700001)</b>	(a) FDA reported US\$7,000.00 as amount due and paid while MOF reported US\$8,000.00 with unexplained variance of US\$1,000.00  (b) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported figure	(a) FDA reported US\$21,000.00 as amount due while MOF reported US\$19,800.00 as amount due with an unexplained variance of US\$1,200.00  (b) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported figure		(a) FDA reported US\$722,725.86 as amount due while MOF reported US\$663,647.89 as amount due with an unexplained variance of US\$59,078.00  (b) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported figure	(a) FDA reported US\$685,525.35 as amount due and paid while MOF reported US\$663,249.80 as amount due and paid with unexplained variance of US\$22,275.55  (b) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported figure	(a) MOF reported US\$104,848.49 as amount due and paid while the FDA did not report/capture the amount.  (b) There is no assurance that the amount was assessed by the FDA  (c) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported figure	(a) MOF reported US\$3,713.44 as amount due and paid while FDA did not report/capture the amount.
		<b>Supporting Schedules</b>	<b>Surface Rental PT#18</b>					
<b>3</b>	<b>Buchanan Renewable Energies - Fuel</b>	(a) FDA used Bank Payment Slip (BPS) numbers instead of flag						



	<b>(406928004)</b>	receipt numbers  (b) FDA did not provide Tax Identification Number (TIN)						
		<b>Submission of templates PT#01</b>	<b>Contract Adm. Fee PT#32</b>					
<b>4</b>	<b>Liberia Hardwood (no TIN)</b>		(a) FDA reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF did not report the amount  (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data					
		<b>Submission of templates</b>	<b>Log Export Fees PT#43</b>	<b>Sawmill Fees PT#39</b>				
<b>5</b>	<b>Timber Liberia (no TIN)</b>		(a) FDA reported amount due US\$14,116.56 and amount paid of US\$8,701.97 with unexplained variance of US\$5,414.59	(a) FDA also reported amount due of US\$2,500.00 but no indication that it was paid into the GOL's Account (b) The FDA should provide				

			(b) There is no evidence that this amount has been paid into GOL's Account  (c) The FDA should provide evidence that the US\$5,414.59 been deposited into GOL's Account	evidence that the US\$2,500.00 been paid into GOL's Account				
		<b>Submission of templates PT#001</b>	<b>Block Inspection Fees PT#31</b>					
<b>6</b>	<b>Tropical Timber Inc. (not available)</b>		(a) FDA reported US\$2,600.00 as amount due and US\$2,000.00 as amount paid leaving a variance of US\$600.00  (b) FDA reported the US\$2,000.00 as block Inspection Fee but recorded as Annual Contract Administration Fees on its supporting					



			schedule					
		<b>Submission of templates PT#01</b>	<b>Contact Adm. Fees PT#32</b>	<b>Area Fee PT#35</b>	<b>Bid premium PT#41</b>			
<b>7</b>	<b>International Consultant Capital (not available)</b>		(a) FDA reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due only  (b) No indication that the amount was paid into GOL's Account  (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the status of the amount	(a) FDA reported US\$2,815,900.50 only as amount due  (b) No indication that this amount has been paid into GOL's Account  (c) FDA and MOF should provide information on the status of this amount	(a) FDA reported US\$667,275.00 as amount due only  (b) No indication that this amount has been paid into GOL's Account  (c) FDA and MOF should provide information on the status of this amount			
		<b>Submission of templates PT#01</b>	<b>Log Export Fees PT#43</b>					
<b>8</b>	<b>Eco – Timber Liberia (406543005)</b>		(a) FDA reported US\$8,694.90 as amount due and US\$12,832.95 as amount paid with unexplained variance of US\$4,138.05					

			(b) There is doubt as to the actual amount collected (c) FDA and MOF should provide clarification on the status of the amount					
		<b>Submission of templates PT#01</b>	<b>Block Inspection Fees PT#31</b>	<b>Waybill Fee PT#33</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Log Export Fees PT#43</b>		
<b>9</b>	<b>Eco-wood (409748007)</b>		<p>(a) FDA reported US\$750.00 as amount due and US\$1,500.00 as amount paid with unexplained variance of US\$750.00</p> <p>(b) In the absence of template from MOF, we cannot provide assurance that the amount was paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>(c) ) MOF and FDA should reconcile their reported data</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$6,600.00 as amount due and US\$6,000.00 as amount paid</p> <p>(b) No indication that the US\$600.00 has been paid into GOL Consolidated Account</p> <p>(c) The FDA and MOF should provide evidence</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$226,946.60 as amount due and US\$176,709.98 as amount paid with a variance of US\$50,236.62</p> <p>(b) No indication that the US\$50,236.62 has paid into GOL Consolidated Account</p> <p>(c) The FDA and MOF should provide evidence</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$179,591.12 as amount due and US\$196,928.82 with a unexplained variance of US\$17,337.70</p> <p>(b) The variation and absence of MOF report create doubt about the actual amount due and paid</p> <p>(c) The FDA and MOF should reconcile the tax</p>		

				that the amount has been deposited into GOL's Account	that the amount has been deposited into GOL's Account	payment data of the company.		
		<b>Submission of Templates PT#01</b>	<b>Common Taxes PT#</b>	<b>Contract Administration Fee PT#32</b>	<b>Others PT#95.d</b>			
<b>10</b>	<b>Quantum Resources (Not available)</b>	(f) FDA did not submit supporting schedules  (g) No TIN  (d) FDA should fill in the TIN number to identify the entity			(a) MOF reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due and paid  (b) FDA did not report the amount  (c) There is no assurance that the amount was paid into GOL's Account.  (d) The FDA and MOF should provide evidence that the amount was paid into GOL's Account			
		<b>Submission of templates PT#01</b>	<b>Late Payment PT#36-37</b>	<b>Bid Premium PT#41</b>				



11	<b>Euro Liberia Logging (Not available)</b>		(a) FDA reported \$161,764.63 as amount paid but did not indicate amount due  (b) FDA should provide evidence that the amount reported paid was the actual amount due	(a) FDA reported US\$3,234,292.50 as amount due and US\$300,117.50 as amount paid leaving an unexplained variance of US\$2,934,175.00 (b) No indication that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account (c) FDA and MOF should provide evidence that the US\$2,934,175.00 has been paid into GOL's Account.				
		<b>Block inspection Fees PT#31</b>	<b>Contract Adm. Fee PT#32</b>	<b>Waybill PT#33</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>	<b>Log Export Fees PT#43</b>	<b>Annual Coupe Inspection Fee PT#49</b>
12	<b>Universal Forestry Corp.</b>	(a) FDA reported US\$1,250.00 as amount due and paid  (b) FDA did not report the amount	(a) FDA reported amount paid of US\$1,000.00 with no amount due  (b) MOF did not report the amount  (c) There is no	(a) MOF reported US\$2,700.00 for amount due and paid  (b) No supporting schedule  (c) FDA reported	(a) FDA reported amount due of US\$72,006.05 and amount paid of US\$95,588.59  (b) An unexplained variance of US\$23,582.54	(a) FDA reported US\$800.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF reported US\$500.00 as amount due and paid	(a) FDA reported US\$70,050.92 as amount due and US\$101,369.83 as amount paid  (b) An unexplained variance of US\$31,318.91	



		in its supporting schedule  (c) MOF did not report the amount	evidence that the amount reported paid by FDA is the actual amount; especially in the absence of a report from MOF  (d) MOF and FDA should provide evidence that the US\$1,000.00 is the actual amount due and paid	US\$1,800.00 as amount due and paid  (d) Unexplained variance of US\$900.00	(c) MOF reported US\$31,018.80 as amount due and paid  (d) There is variance of US\$40,987.25 for amount due between MOF and FDA  (e) There is variance of 64,569.79 for amount paid between FDA and MOF	(c) There is a variance of US\$300.00 for amount due and paid between MOF and FDA  (d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data	(b) MOF reported US\$32,349.82 as amount due and amount paid  (c) An unexplained variances of US\$37,701.10 of amount due and US\$69,020.01 of amount paid between MOF and FDA  (d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported figures	
		<b>Surface Rental PT#18</b>	<b>Contract Administration Fee PT#32</b>	<b>Waybill Fee PT#33</b>	<b>Area Fees PT#35</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Bid Premium PT#41</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Atlantic Resources Limited</b>					(a) FDA reported US\$456,326.18 as amount due and US\$273,591.29 amount paid  (b) An unexplained variance of	(a) FDA reported US\$1,062,161.60 as amount due and US\$441,567.34 as amount paid (a) An unexplained variance of US\$620,594.26	

						US\$182,734.89		
						(c) No indication that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account	(b) MOF reported US\$353,053.88 amount paid but did not indicate amount due	
						(d) MOF reported US\$273,591.29 as amount paid but did not indicate amount due	There remain an unexplained variance of US\$88,513.46 between MOF and FDA	
						(e) This level variation leaves doubt as to the actual amount due and paid	(e) This level variation leaves doubt as to the actual amount due and paid	
						(f) The FDA and MOF should therefore reconcile their reported data and submit same for verification	(f) The FDA and MOF should therefore reconcile their reported data and submit same for verification	
		<b>Log Export Fee PT#43</b>						
	<b>Atlantic</b>	(a) FDA reported						



	<p><b>Resources Limited Cont'd.</b></p>	<p>US\$543,548.69 as amount due and US\$327,591.28 as amount paid</p> <p>(b) An unexplained variance of US\$215,990.03 between FDA reported figures</p> <p>(c) No indication that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>(d) MOF reported amount paid of US\$273,5591.28 but did not indicate amount due</p> <p>(e) An unexplained variance of US\$53,967.38 between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(f) FDA and MOF should reconcile</p>						
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



		their reported data and submit same for verification						
		<b>Block Inspection Fees PT#31</b>	<b>Contract Administration Fees PT#32</b>	<b>Waybill Fee PT#33</b>	<b>Area Fee PT#35</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Bid Premium PT#41</b>	<b>Log Export Fees PT#43</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Liberia Tree and Trading Company (407027019)</b>	<p>(a) FDA reported amount due of US\$1,300.00 but did not indicate amount paid</p> <p>(b) The amount was not reported in the supporting schedule</p> <p>(c) MOF did not report the amount</p> <p>(d) No evidence that this amount has been paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>FDA and MOF should provide evidence that the amount was paid</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(b) MOF did not report the amount</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$16,500.00 as amount due and US\$17,800.00 as amount paid</p> <p>(b) An unexplained variance of US\$1,300.00</p> <p>(c) However, the FDA reported US\$4,500.00 is reported on its supporting schedule</p> <p>(d) MOF did not report the amount</p> <p>(e) No evidence that this amount has been paid into</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$148,435.00 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(b) The supporting schedule did not include this tax kind</p> <p>(c) MOF did not report the amount</p> <p>d) No evidence that this amount has been paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>FDA and MOF should provide evidence that the amount was paid</p>	<p>(a) FDA Template reported US\$344,294.76 as amount due and US\$337,459.45 as an amount paid</p> <p>(b) An unexplained variance of US\$6,835.31</p> <p>(c) MOF did not report the amount</p> <p>d) No evidence that this amount has been paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>FDA and MOF should provide evidence that the</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$569,990.40 as amount due and US\$333,767.80 as amount paid leaving an unexplained variance of US\$276,768.40</p> <p>(b) No indication that amount has been paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>(c) MOF did not report the amount</p> <p>(d) No evidence that this amount has been paid into GOL's Account</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$470,285.85 as amount due and US\$457,497.37 as amount paid leaving an unexplained variance of US\$12,788.48</p> <p>(b) MOF did not report the amount</p>



		into GOL's Account		GOL's Account  (f) FDA and MOF should provide evidence that the amount was paid into GOL's Account	into GOL's Account	amount was paid into GOL's Account	(e) FDA and MOF should provide evidence that the amount was paid into GOL's Account	
		<b>Surface Rental PT#18</b>	<b>Block Inspection Fee PT#31</b>	<b>Waybill Fees PT#33</b>	<b>Area Fee PT#35</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Bid Premium PT#41</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>EJ and J Investment</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$143,155.00 as amount due and paid  (b) FDA did not report the amount  (c) There is no assurance that the amount was assessed by the FDA  (d) The MOF and FDA should reconcile their reported data	(a) FDA reported amount due of US\$2,450.00 and amount paid of US\$1,300.00 Leaving an unexplained variance of US\$1,150.00  (b) FDA did not report the tax kind on its supporting schedule  (c) MOF did not report/capture the amount thereby creating doubt as to whether the amount was	(a) FDA Reported US\$14,250.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF reported US\$8,250.00 as amount due and paid  (c) An unexplained variance of US\$6,000.00 between MOF and FDA  (d) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data		(a) FDA reported US\$242,858.79 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF did not report/capture the amount  (c) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data	(a) FDA reported an amount due of US\$289,745.72  (b) An amount paid of US\$14,847.20  (c) An unexplained variance of US\$274,898.52  (d) MOF reported US\$14,487.20 as amount due and paid  (e) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their	(a) FDA Template reported US\$900.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF did not report the amount

			actually deposited into GOL's Account				reported data	
		<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>	<b>Log Export Fee PT#43</b>	<b>Chain of Custody Mgt. Fee PT#45</b>			
<b>16</b>	<b>Tarpeh Timber Company</b>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$37,036.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MOF reported US\$31,516.20 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$5,519.80 between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$200.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MOF reported US\$100.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$100.00 exist between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$40,960.00 as amount due</p> <p>(b) US\$91,230.24 as amount paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$50,270.24</p> <p>(d) MOF reported US\$33,491.27 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(e) An unexplained variance of US\$57,738.97 between MOF and FDA</p>	<p>(a) MOF reported US\$12,888.53 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MOF reported no supporting schedule</p> <p>(c) FDA did not report the amount</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data</p>			



				(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data				
		<b>Contract Adm. Fee PT#32</b>	<b>Waybill Fee PT#33</b>	<b>Area Fees PT#35</b>	<b>Stumpage Fees PT#36</b>	<b>Bid Premium PT#41</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>	<b>Log export Fees PT#43</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>Akewa Group of Company</b>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$2,000.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MOF did report/capture the amount</p> <p>(c) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported templates</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$7,200.00 as amount paid and due</p> <p>(b) MOF reported US\$8,400.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance US\$1,200.00 between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported templates</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$6,250.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) This tax kind is not included in FDA supporting schedule</p> <p>(c) MOF did not report on the amount</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$312,794.58 as amount due and US\$142,547.79 as amount paid</p> <p>(b) An unexplained variance of US\$170,246.00</p> <p>(c) MOF reported US\$41,558.38 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(d) There is an unexplained variance of US\$271,236.2 of amount due between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(e) There is also a</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported an amount due of US\$26,000.00</p> <p>(b) No amount paid reported</p> <p>(c) MOF did not report/capture the amount</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported templates</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$500.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MOF reported US\$300.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance US\$200.00 between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reporting templates</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$491,549.38 as amount due and US\$146,406.89 as amount paid</p> <p>(b) An unexplained variance of US\$345,142.49 between the amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(c) MOF reported US\$121,441.73 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(d) An unexplained variance of amount due</p>



					variance of US\$100,989.41 for amount paid between MOF and FDA  (f) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported templates			between MOF and FDA is US\$370,107.65  (e) The variance on amount paid between MOF and FDA is US\$24,965.16  (f) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data.
		<b>Block inspection Fee PT#31</b>	<b>Contract Adm. Fee PT#32</b>	<b>Area Fee PT#35</b>	<b>Bid Premium PT#41</b>	<b>Log export Fee PT#43</b>		
<b>18</b>	<b>Alpha logging Company</b>	(a) FDA reported US\$2,350.00 as amount due  (b) No amount paid reported  (c) MOF made no report on this tax kind	(a) FDA reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due  (b) Amount paid not reported  (c) MOF made no report on this tax kind	(a) FDA reported US\$298,100.00 as amount due  (b) No amount paid reported  (c) MOF made no report on this tax kind	(a) FDA reported US\$1,198,362.00 as amount due  (b) Amount paid not reported  (c) MOF did not report the amount	(a) FDA reported US\$491,549.38 as amount due but did not report amount paid  (b) No indication that amount was paid into GOL's Account  (c) MOF made no		

		(d) No evidence that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account  (e) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount and state the current status of the company	d) No evidence that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account  (e) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount and state the current status of the	d) No evidence that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account  (e) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount and state the current status of the	d) No evidence that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account  (e) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount and state the current status of the	report on this tax kind  (d) MOF and FDA provided no supporting schedule for this template  (e) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount		
		<b>Contract Adm. Fee</b>						
<b>19</b>	<b>Nature Oriented and Timber Corporation</b>	(a) FDA reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due only  (c) No indication by the MOF that the amount was paid  MOF and FDA should reconcile their reported						

		data.  (d) MOF and FDA did not provided supporting schedule for their individual template						
		<b>Waybill Fee PT#33</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>	<b>Log export Fees PT#43</b>				
<b>20</b>	<b>K-Mark Indo-Liberia</b>	(a) FDA reported US\$150.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF made no report on this tax kind	(a) FDA reported US\$900.00 as amount due and amount paid  (b) MOF made no report on this tax kind	(a) FDA reported US\$20,739.00 as amount due and amount paid of US\$20,739.47  (b) The supporting schedule reported a non-corresponding amount of US\$20,739.41  (c) MOF reported US\$7,455.16 as amount due and amount paid  (d) There are unexplained variances of				

				<p>US\$13,283.84 of amount due and amount paid of US\$13,284.31</p> <p>(e) MOF did not provide supporting schedule for its template</p> <p>(f) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data</p>				
		<b>Contract Adm. Fee PT#32</b>	<b>Waybill Fee PT#33</b>	<b>Area Fee PT#35</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Bid Premium PT#41</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>	<b>Log Export Fee PT#43</b>
<b>21</b>	<b>Geblo Logging Company</b>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due</p> <p>(b) No report on amount paid</p> <p>(c) MOF template indicated no payment</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$3,000.00 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(b) MOF reported US\$1,200.00 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$1,800.00 exist</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$328,665.00 as amount due</p> <p>(b) No amount paid indicated</p> <p>(c) MOF Template indicated no payment</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$55,318.05 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(b) MOF reported US\$19,250.68 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$36,067.37 exist between MOF and FDA</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$1,413,259.50 as amount due</p> <p>(b) No amount paid indicated</p> <p>(c) MOF reported US\$29,442.90 amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(d) An unexplained variance of US\$1,383,816.60</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$100.00 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(b) MOF Template indicated no payment</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$63,513.00 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(b) An amount paid of US\$55,318.05</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$8,194.95</p>



			between FDA and MOF			of amount due exist between MOF and FDA		(d) MOF Template indicated no payment
		<b>Contract Adm. Fee PT#32</b>	<b>Waybill Fee PT#33</b>	<b>Area Fee PT#35</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>			
22	<b>Sun Yeun</b>	(a) FDA reported no amount due  (b) An amount paid of US\$1,000.00  (c) MOF Template indicated no payment	(a) FDA reported US\$3,000.00 as amount due and amount paid  (b) MOF reported US\$10,250.00 as amount due and amount paid  (c) An unexplained variance of US\$7,250.00 exist between MOF and FDA	(a) FDA reported amount paid of US\$6,250.00 but did not indicate the amount due  (b) MOF did not report the amount	(a) FDA reported US\$45,428.35 as amount due  (b) Amount paid not indicated  (c) MOF made no report  FDA and MOF should reconcile their variances and refile			
		<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Bid Premium PT#41</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>	<b>Log Export Fees PT#43</b>	<b>Forest Product Fee PT#38</b>	<b>Non Timber Forest Product PT#44</b>	<b>Chain of Custody Mgt. PT#45</b>
23	<b>Bargor and Bargor</b>	(a) FDA reported US\$107,581.72 as amount due and  (b) An amount paid of	(a) FDA reported US\$9,550.00 as amount due  (b) Amount paid	(a) FDA reported US\$900.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF reported	(a) FDA reported US\$121,603.75 as amount due and  (b) An amount paid of	(a) MOF reported US\$103,501.38 as amount due and amount paid  (b) FDA did not report/capture the	(a) MOF reported US\$841.08 as amount due and paid  (b) FDA did not	(a) MOF reported US\$18,554.32 as amount due and paid



		<p>US\$108,375.29</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$693.57</p> <p>(d) MOF reported US\$102,265.11 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(e) An unexplained variance of US\$ 5,316.61 of amount due exist between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(f) An unexplained variance of US\$6,110.18 of amount paid also exist between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(g) This level variations leave doubt as to the actual amount due and paid</p>	<p>not indicated</p> <p>(c) MOF did not report the amount</p> <p>(d) No evidence that the amount was paid into GOL's Account</p>	<p>US\$700.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$200 exist between MOF and FDA</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data</p>	<p>US\$129,379.40</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$7,775.65</p> <p>(d) MOF reported US\$8,537.25 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(e) An unexplained variance of US\$113,066.5 of amount due and</p> <p>(f) A variance of US\$12,842.15 of amount paid</p> <p>(g) The FDA and MOF should reconcile their reported data</p>	<p>amount</p> <p>(c) There is no assurance that the amount was assessed by the FDA and represents the actual amount that should be paid</p> <p>(d) FDA and the MOF should reconcile their reported data</p>	<p>report the amount</p> <p>(c) There is no assurance that the amount was assessed by the FDA</p>	<p>(b) FDA did not report the amount</p> <p>(c) There is no assurance that the amount was assessed by the FDA</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	---	---

		(h) FDA and MOF Should reconcile their reported data						
		<b>Contract Adm. Fees PT# 32</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT# 32</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fees PT#42</b>	<b>Log Export Fees PT# 43</b>	<b>Phyto Sanitary Fee PT#34</b>	<b>Chain of Custody Management PT# 45</b>	
<b>24</b>	<b>Global Logging Company</b>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due did not indicate the amount paid</p> <p>(d) MOF did not report on the amount</p> <p>(e) An unexplained variance of US\$1,000 of amount exist between MOF and FDA</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$55,318.05 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MOF reported 19,250.68 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(c) An unexplained variance of US\$36,067.37</p>	<p>(a) FDA reported US\$2,200 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(b) MOF reported US\$1,800 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(c) An unreported variance of US\$400 exist between MOF and FDA</p>	<p>(a) FDA re reported US\$486,752.11 as amount due</p> <p>(b) US\$421,877.43 as amount paid</p> <p>(c) An unreported variance of US\$64,874.68</p> <p>(d) MOF reported US\$370,144.88 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(e) An unreported variance of US\$116,607.23 of amount due exist between MOF and</p>		<p>(a) MOF reported US\$104,958.06 as amount due and amount paid</p> <p>(b) FDA Template did not include this tax kind</p>	



					FDA  (f) A variance of US\$51,732.55 of amount paid also exist between MOF and FDA			
		<b>Template PT#01</b>	<b>Waybill PT#33</b>	<b>Phyto Sanitary Fee PT#34</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>	<b>Timber Export License Fee PT#42</b>	<b>Chain of Custody mgt. (PSI)Fee PT#45</b>	
<b>25</b>	<b>Mandra Forestry (421798001)</b>		<p>(a) MOF reported US\$4,500.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) FDA did report the amount</p> <p>(c) No assurance that the amount reported by MOF represent assessments from FDA</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount</p>		<p>(a) MOF reported US\$467,794.74 as amount due and US\$76,219.52 as amount paid leaving an un explained variance of US\$391,575.22</p> <p>(b)No indication that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>(c) MOF should provide evidence that the amount has been paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>(d) FDA did report the amount</p>	<p>a) MOF reported US\$700.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>b) FDA did report the amount</p> <p>(c) No assurance that the amount reported by MOF represent assessments from FDA</p> <p>(d) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount</p>	<p>a) MOF reported US\$34,170.12 as amount due and paid</p> <p>b) FDA did report the amount</p> <p>(c) No assurance that the amount reported by MOF represent assessments from FDA</p> <p>(e) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount</p>	



					(e) No assurance that the amount reported by MOF represent assessments from FDA  (f) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount			
		<b>Template PT#01</b>	<b>Surface Rental PT#18</b>	<b>Contract Adm. Fees PT#32</b>	<b>Waybill PT#33</b>	<b>Phyto Sanitary Fee PT#34</b>	<b>Area Fee PT#35</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee PT#36</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>Mandra LTTC (421799008)</b>	(a) FDA did not submit template  (b) No assurance the amount reported by MOF was assessed by FDA (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the reported data	(a) MOF reported US\$168,763.00 as amount due and paid  (b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(a) MOF reported US\$1,000.00 as amount due and paid  (b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(a) MOF reported US\$12,000.00 as amount due and paid  (b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(a) MOF reported US\$1,200.00 as amount due and paid  (b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(a) MOF reported US\$148,435.00 as amount due and paid  (b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(a) MOF reported US\$450,413.05 as amount due and paid  (b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA (c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount
		<b>Timber Export Lic. Fee PT#42</b>	<b>Log Export Fee PT#43</b>	<b>Chain of Custody Mgt. (PSI) Fee PT#45</b>	<b>Survey (Annual Coup) Fee PT#95.c</b>	<b>Others PT#95.d</b>		

		(a) MOF reported US\$800,00 as amount due and paid	(a) MOF reported US\$372,754.96 as amount due and paid	(a) MOF reported US\$76,836.75 as amount due and paid	(a) MOF reported US\$1,300.00 as amount due and paid	(a) MOF reported US\$44,623.02 as amount due and paid		
		(b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA	(b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA	(b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA	(b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA	(b) No assurance that the amount was assessed by FDA		
		(c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount	(c) FDA and MOF should reconcile the amount		

**SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS FROM THE REVIEW OF LEITI TEMPLATES SUBMITTED BY THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) AND SUPERVISING MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES (M&As) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011/2012 FOR COMPANIES OPERATING IN THE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY OF LIBERIA**

**ANNEX II**

**MINISTRY OF LANDS, MINES & ENERGY (MLME) TEMPLATES vs. MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) TEMPLATES**

		<b>Class A Diamond</b>					
<b>1</b>	<b>Diamond Star Plus (428772008)</b>	(a) MOF reported amount due and paid of US\$25,000.00 (b) MLME did not report the amount  (c) MOF and MLME should reconcile their difference					

		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>	<b>Others</b>	<b>Supporting Schedule</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ascension Resources (416020019)</b>	<p>(a) MOF reported US\$19,000.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MLME only reported US\$19,000.00 as amount due</p> <p>(c) MLME did not indicate/confirm that the US\$19,000 was paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>(d) MOF and MLME should reconcile their reported data and submit same for verification.</p>	<p>(a) MOF reported US\$5,000.00 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MLME only reported US\$5,000.00 as amount due</p> <p>(c) MLME did not indicate/confirm that the US\$5,000.00 was paid into GOL's Account</p> <p>(d) MOF and MLME should reconcile their reported data and submit same for verification.</p>	<p>(a) MOF reported US\$837.60 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MLME did not report the amount</p> <p>(c) MOF and MLME should reconcile their reported data and submit same for verification.</p>	<p>(a) MLME reported the payments of US\$19,000.00 and US\$5,000.00 in its supporting schedule but not on the main template</p> <p>(b) This could be posting errors</p> <p>(c) MLME should address the errors</p>		
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration Fees</b>				
<b>3</b>	<b>BHP Billiton</b>	<p>(a) MOF reported US\$118,066.26 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MLME reported US\$15,967.75 as amount due only leaving a variance of US\$102,098.51</p>	<p>(a) MOF reported US\$25,536.14 as amount due and paid</p> <p>(b) MLME reported US\$5,000.00 as amount due only leaving a variance of US\$20,536.14</p>				

		(c) MLME template also did not confirm that the US\$15,967.75 has been paid into GOL's Account	(c) MLME did not also indicate that the US\$5,000.00 has been paid on the reporting template (d) Though the amounts were reported in the MLME supporting schedules (e) MOF also reported US\$34,664.06 as amount due and paid (f) MLME did not report the amount				
		<b>Templates</b>	<b>Others</b>				
<b>4</b>	<b>Pedsam Mining Limited (1430675001)</b>	(a) MLME did not indicate as to whether US\$59,994.66 for Surface Rental, US\$15,000.00 for Exploration Fees and US\$7,500.00 for Others reported as amount due was paid into GOL's Account	(a) MLME did not report US\$7,500.00 for Others which reported by the MOF leaving an unexplained variance of US\$7,500				
		<b>Templates</b>	<b>Others</b>				
<b>5</b>	<b>Investment Development (429720001)</b>	(a) MLME did not indicate as to whether US\$116,164.84 for Surface Rental,	(a) MLME did not report US\$5,565.62 for Others which reported by the MOF leaving an				

		US\$15,000.00 for Exploration Fees and US\$5,565.62 for Others reported as amount due was paid into GOL's Account	unexplained variance of US\$5,565.62				
		<b>Templates</b>					
<b>6</b>	<b>Tietto Mineral</b>	(a) MLME did not fill in the amount paid column					
		<b>Templates</b>	<b>Others</b>				
<b>7</b>	<b>West Peak Iron</b>	(a) MLME did not fill in the amount paid column	(a) MLME reported US\$30,000.00 as amount due but MOF did not report the amount leaving an unexplained variance of US\$30,000.00				
		<b>Templates</b>	<b>Others</b>				
<b>8</b>	<b>VBG Vale BSGR Liberia</b>	MLME did not fill in the amount paid column	MOF reported US\$38,412.16 as amount due and paid (b) MLME did not report the amount leaving an unexplained variance of US\$38,412.16				
		<b>Templates</b>	<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License</b>	<b>Gold Class B</b>		
<b>9</b>	<b>Youssef Diamond Mining</b>	(a) MLME did not fill in the amount due	(a) MLME reported US\$48,636.50 in the	(a) MLME reported US\$5,000.00	(a) MOF reported US\$10,000.00 as		



		columns	supporting schedule but not recorded on the reporting template  (b) MOF did not report the amount	(b) MOF did not report the amount	amount due and paid  (b) MLME did not report the amount leaving an unexplained variance of US\$10,000.00		
		<b>Templates</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>	<b>Royalty</b>	<b>Class B Gold</b>	<b>Class A Diamond</b>	<b>Others</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Konblo Bumi Inc. (408469007)</b>	(a) MLME did not fill in the amount paid columns	(a) MOF reported US\$10,000.00 as amount due and paid while MLME reported US\$15,000.00 as amount due leaving an unexplained variance of US\$5,000.00	(a) MOF reported US\$1,141.50 as amount due and paid  (b) MLME did not report the amount	(a) MOF reported US\$5,000.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MLME did not report the amount	(a) MOF reported US\$25,000.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MLME did not report the amount	(a) MOF reported US\$35,406.12 as amount due and paid  (b) MLME did not report the amount
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Others (Reconnaissance License Fees)</b>				
<b>11</b>	<b>Tawana Liberia, Inc.</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$15,000.00 as amount due and paid  (b) MLME did not report the amount	(a) MLME reported US\$15,000.00 as amount due  (b) MOF did not report the amount				

		<b>Minerals License Fees</b>					
<b>12</b>	<b>China Union Investment ( TIN: 415979002)</b>	<p>(a) MLME reported US\$50,000.00 as amount due</p> <p>(b) No indication that the US\$50,000.00 has been paid into GOL Consolidated Account at the CBL</p> <p>(f) MOF did not report/capture the amount</p>					
		<b>Royalty</b>					
<b>13</b>	<b>ArcelorMittal (TIN:404633007)</b>	<p>(a) MOF reported US\$ 2,586,465.89 as amount paid</p> <p>(b) MOF did not indicate the amount due</p> <p>(c) MLME did not file a corresponding Template</p>					
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>				
14	<b>Sinoe Exploration (TIN: 418500000)</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$33,052.00 as amount due and paid	(a) MOF reported US\$ 5,000.00 as amount due and paid				

		(b) MLME did not file corresponding template	(b) MLME did not filed in the Corresponding Template  (c) No Commodity indicated on MOF Template				
		<b>Others Fees</b>					
15	<b>Jonah Capital (BVI) Ltd (TIN: 40498004)</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$ 3,792.82  (b) The Template from MLME did not indicates Others FEES					
		<b>Template</b>					
16	<b>Belle Resources (TIN: 408163005)</b>	(a) MLME did filed in corresponding Template					
		<b>Template</b>					
17	<b>Treco Mining Company (TIN: 418134003)</b>	(a) MLME did filed in corresponding Template Commodity not indicated					
		<b>Template</b>					
18	<b>Iron Resources Limited (TIN: 411610004)</b>	(a) MLME did filed in the corresponding Template (b) No Commodity indicated					

		<b>Template</b>					
<b>19</b>	<b>Iron Bird Resources (TIN: 429501008)</b>	(a) MLME did filed in the corresponding Template (b) No Commodity indicated					
		<b>Template</b>					
<b>20</b>	<b>Weajue Hill Mining (TIN: 409491006)</b>	(a) MLME did filed in the corresponding Template					
		<b>Template</b>					
<b>21</b>	<b>Western Cluster (TIN: 426822008)</b>	(a) MLME did not filed in the corresponding Template (b) No Commodity indicated					
		<b>Template</b>					
<b>22</b>	<b>White Rock (Liberia) (TIN: 432344002)</b>	(a) MLME did not filed in the corresponding Template  (b) No Commodity indicated					
		<b>Template</b>					
<b>23</b>	<b>Xin Yuan Transnational Corporation (TIN: 414697003)</b>	(a) MLME did not filed in the corresponding Template  (b) No Commodity indicated					

		<b>Template</b>					
<b>24</b>	<b>Han Uman (TIN: 432136019)</b>	(a) MLME did filed not in the corresponding Template					
		<b>Template</b>					
<b>25</b>	<b>Steinbock Mineral (TIN: 40546004)</b>	(a) MLME did not filed in the corresponding Template					
		<b>Surface Rental</b>					
<b>26</b>	<b>Amlib United Minerals Inc. ( TIN:400777004)</b>	(a) MLME reported US\$ 200,207.20 as amount due but no indication that the amount due was paid  (b) MOF reported US\$ 191,304.50 as amount due and amount paid					
		<b>Surface Rentals</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>	<b>Stumpage Fee</b>			
<b>27</b>	<b>Knights Group Inc. ( TIN:41349009)</b>	(a) MLME reported US\$ 45,515.84 as amount due but no indication that the amount due was paid (b) MOF reported US\$ 17,593.34 as amount due and amount paid	(a) MLME reported US\$ 10,000 as amount due but indication that amount was paid	(a) MOF reported US\$ 27,922.50 as amount due and amount paid (b) MLME Template did not reflect the amount			

		<b>Surface Rentals</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>	<b>Export tax</b>			
<b>28</b>	<b>Bukon Gedeh Resources Inc. ( TIN:407565002)</b>	(a) MLME reported US\$ 81,738.41 as amount due but no indication that the amount due was paid (b) MOF reported US\$ 76,738.41 as amount due and amount paid	(a) MLME reported US\$ 10,000 as amount due but indication that amount was paid  (b) MOF reported US\$ 5,000.00 as amount due and amount paid	(a) MOF reported US\$ 100.00 as amount due and amount paid  (b) MLME Template did not reflect the amount			
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>				
<b>29</b>	<b>Liberia Development Initiative (TIN: 433939000)</b>	(a) MLME reported US\$24,811.05 as amount due but there was no indication that the amount was paid. (b) MOF did not filed in Corresponding Template	(a) MLME reported USD\$10,000.00 as amount due but there was no indication that the amount was paid. (b) MOF did not filed in Corresponding Template				
		<b>Royalty</b>					
<b>30</b>	<b>Golden Vision Trading (TIN: 420421001)</b>	(a) MLME reported US\$ 140,940.04 as amount due and amount paid  (b) MOF did not filed in Corresponding Template					
		<b>Other fees</b>	<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>			
<b>31</b>	<b>Jonah Capital (TIN:</b>	(a) MOF reported	(a) MOF reported	(a) MOF reported			

	<b>431093006)</b>	US\$3,792.82 as amount due and amount paid  (b) MLME did not report said amount	US\$204,795.07 as amount due and amount paid  (b) MLME reported the same amount as amount due but no indication that the amount was paid.	US\$ 30,000.00 as amount due and amount paid  (b) MLME reported the same amount as amount due but no indication that the amount was paid.			
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>				
<b>32</b>	<b>Find Mineral International (TIN: 411164004)</b>	(a) MLME reported US\$15,000.00 as amount due but no indication that the amount was paid	(a) MLME reported US\$5,000.00 as amount due but no indication that the amount was paid				
		<b>Dealer License</b>					
<b>33</b>	<b>All Dealership Companies (TIN: N/A)</b>	(a) MLME reported US\$ 225,000.00 as amount due but no indication that said amount was paid  (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template (c) No Schedule attached No Tin #					

		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>				
34	Massa Investment Corp (TIN: 409886019)	(a) MLME reported US\$29,500.00 as amount due but no indication that said amount was paid (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template	(a) MLME reported US\$10,000.00 as amount due but no indication that said amount was paid (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template				
		<b>Royalty</b>					
35	<b>Africa Diamond Resource Ltd (TIN: N/A)</b>	(a) MLME Reported US\$ 34,673.23 as amount due and amount paid (b) No TIN # (c) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template					
		<b>Royalty</b>					
36	<b>West Africa Gold And Diamond Inc. (TIN:402254009)</b>	(a) MLME Reported US\$36,931.71 as amount due and amount paid (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template					
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>				
37	<b>Naya Mining Company Ltd (TIN: 422495002)</b>	(a) MLME Reported US\$ 70,102.75 as	(a) MLME Reported US\$10,000.00 as				



		amount due and amount paid  (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template	amount due and amount paid  (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template				
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>				
<b>38</b>	<b>Trans-Atlantic Petroleum &amp; Oil Resources (TIN: 430109000)</b>	(a) MLME Reported US\$ 64,864.13 as amount due but no indication that said amount was paid in to GOL'S account  (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template	(a) MLME Reported US\$10,000.00 as amount due but indication to show that the amount due was paid in GOL's Account  (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template				
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Exploration License Fees</b>				
<b>39</b>	<b>BG Minerals (Liberia) Ltd (TIN: 432589005)</b>	(a) MLME Reported US\$48,363.42 as amount due but no indication that said amount was paid in to GOL'S account  (b) MOF Reported USD 48,363.42 as amount due and amount paid	(a) MLME Reported US\$5,000.00 as amount due but indication to show that the amount due was paid in GOL's Account  (b) MOF Reported USD 5,000.00 as amount due and amount paid				

		<b>Royalty</b>					
<b>40</b>	<b>Royal Company (TIN: N/A)</b>	(a) MLME Reported US\$25,972.51 as amount due but no indication that said amount was paid in to GOL'S account (b) MOF did not Filed in Corresponding Template (c) MLME Supporting Schedule shows US\$35,902.69 e					
		<b>Royalty</b>					
<b>41</b>	<b>West Africa Diamond (TIN:408279003)</b>	(a) MLME Reported US\$ 21,345.73 as amount due and paid  (b) MOF did not filed in the Corresponding Template					
		<b>Template</b>					
<b>42</b>	<b>Hummingbird Resources (TIN: 407712005)</b>	(a) MLME did not Filed in Corresponding Template					
		<b>Template</b>					
<b>43</b>	<b>Elephant Fall (TIN: 424414000)</b>	(a) MLME did not Filed in Corresponding Template					

**SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS FROM THE REVIEW OF LEITI TEMPLATES SUBMITTED BY THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) AND SUPERVISING MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES (M&As) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011/2012 FOR COMPANIES OPERATING IN THE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY OF LIBERIA**

**ANNEX III**

**NATIONAL OIL COMPANY OF LIBERIA (NOCAL) TEMPLATES vs. MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) TEMPLATES**

	<b>Extractive company</b>	<b>Social Welfare Contribution</b>	<b>Annual Training</b>	<b>Surface Rental</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>Chevron (TIN:404154001)</b>	(a) NOCAL reported US\$450,000.00 as amount due and amount paid of US\$750,000.00 leaving a variance of US\$300,000.00  (c) MOF did not Filed in the Corresponding Template  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported templates.	(a) NOCAL reported US\$325,000.00 as amount due and amount paid of US\$525,000.00  (c) MOF did not Filed in the Corresponding Template  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported templates.	(a) NOCAL reported US\$238,561.79 as amount due and amount paid  (b) MOF did not filed in the Corresponding Template  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported templates.	
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>NOCAL Others (Contribution to UL)</b>	<b>Hydrocarbon Development Fund</b>	<b>Annual Training</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Africa Petroleum/ European Hydro (TIN: 404154001)</b>	(a) NOCAL reported US\$214,071.60 as amount due and amount paid of US\$535,179.00  (b) MOF did not Filed in the Corresponding Template  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported	(a) NOCAL reported US\$150,000.00 as amount due and amount paid of US\$250,000.00  (b) MOF did not filed in the Corresponding Template  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported	(a) NOCAL reported USD 250,000.00 as amount due and amount paid of US\$ 200,000.00  (b) MOF did not filed in the Corresponding Template  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported	(a) NOCAL reported US\$ 200,000.00 as amount due and amount paid of US\$ 200,000.00  (b) MOF did not Filed in the Corresponding Template  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported

		templates.	templates.	templates.	templates.
		<b>Surface Rental</b>			
<b>4</b>	<b>Broadway (TIN:404154001)</b>	(a) NOCAL reported US\$123,750.00 as amount due and paid (b) MOF did not Filed in the Corresponding Template (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported templates.			
		<b>Surface Rental</b>	<b>Social Welfare Contribution</b>	<b>Survey Fees</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>National Oil Company of Liberia (TIN:404154001)</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$1,353,629.47 as amount paid but did not indicate the due.  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported templates.	(a) MOF reported US\$2,760,763.98 as amount paid but did not the amount due  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported templates.	(a) MOF reported US\$3,989.83 as amount paid but did not indicate the amount due.  (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported templates.	
		<b>Surface Rental</b>			
<b>5</b>	<b>Anadarko (TIN:404154001)</b>	(a) NOCAL reported US\$430,850 as amount due and paid (b) MOF did not Filed in the Corresponding Template (d) NOCAL and MOF should reconcile their reported templates.			

**SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS FROM THE REVIEW OF LEITI TEMPLATES SUBMITTED BY THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) AND SUPERVISING MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES (M&As) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011/2012 FOR COMPANIES OPERATING IN THE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY OF LIBERIA**

**ANNEX IV**

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (MOA) TEMPLATES vs. MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MOF) TEMPLATES**

	<b>Extractive company</b>	<b>Rubber Sales Tax PT 30</b>	<b>MOA Response</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>Lee Group of Enterprise (419363006)</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$ 125,795.26 as amount due and paid  (b) MOA did not report/ capture the amount  (c) MOF and MOS should reconcile their reported data and resubmit the templates for verification.	<i>MOA reported the same amount as due and paid( US\$ 125,795.26</i>	
		<b>Surface Rental PT 18</b>	<b>Personal Income Withholding PT 14</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Cavalla Rubber Corporation (407075005)</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$ 10,000.00 as amount due  (b) No indication that the amount was paid MOA also reported US\$ 10,000.00 as amount due but no indication on amount paid	<i>(a) MOF Reported US\$282,617.38 as amount due and US\$324,539.23as amount paid  (b) The remained an unexplained variance of US\$41,291.85 MOF Only</i>	
		<b>Template</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Liberia Agriculture Company (400206007)</b>	(a) MOA & MOF reported blank Templates (b) MOF and MOS should reconcile their reported data and resubmit		

		the templates for verification MOA reported US\$ 3,350.70, 99,648.86 and 100.00 for Surface Rental, Rubber sales tax and Export Collection Respectively. As amount due and amount paid.		
		<b>Business Registration pt 11.a</b>	<b>Opr./Prof. License pt 11.c</b>	
4	<b>Maryland Oil Palm Plantation (424893005)</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$ 900.00 as amount due and US\$1,800.00 as amount paid (b) There remained an unexplained variance of US\$900.00 (c) MOF should reconcile its reported data MOF Issue	(a) MOF reported L\$ 4,200.00 as amount due and L\$8,200.00 as amount paid (b) There remained as unexplained variance of L\$4,000.00  (c) MOF should reconcile its reported data MOF Issue	
		<b>Personal Income Withholding PT 14</b>	<b>Phyto Sanitary/Export collection PT 29 b</b>	<b>Rubber Sales Tax PT 30</b>
5	<b>Salala Rubber Corporation (400587019)</b>	(a) MOF reported US\$123,227.69 as amount due and US\$ 151,137.92 as amount paid  (b) There remained an unexplained variance of US\$27,910.23 MOA submitted the Template (c) MOF should reconcile its reported data	(a) MOF & MOA reported US\$400.00 as amount paid but did not report the amount paid  (b) MOF and MOA should reconcile the amount due and paid reported on their templates. MOA submitted the Template	(a) MOF reported US\$ 782,383.75 as amount paid with no indication on the amount due (b) MOF should reconcile its reported data MOA submitted the Template
		<b>Phyto Sanitary Fee</b>		
6	<b>Firestone Rubber Plantation (400184003)</b>	(a) MOA reported US\$1,500.00 as amount due and paid. (b) MOF did not report/capture the		

	amount (c) MOF should reconcile its reported data MOA has no issue for now		
--	--	--	--

### 5 Amount Due reported by the Forestry Development Authority (FDA) ANNEX V:

No	Name of Extractive Company	Payment Type	Ref.	Amount US\$ PER FDA
1	Bulgar & Vincent Timber- (407339002)	Contract Adm. Fees	PT#32	1,000.00
2	Bulgar & Vincent Timber- (407339002)	Area Fees	PT #35	6,250.00
3	Forest Venture (421700001)	Bid Premium	PT#41	100,000.00
4	International Consultant Capital (not available)	Contact Adm. Fees	PT#32	1,000.00
5	International Consultant Capital (not available)	Area Fee	PT #35	2,815,900.50
6	International Consultant Capital (not available)	Bid premium	PT#41	667,275.00
7	International Consultant Capital (not available)	Block Inspection Fees	PT#31	1,300.00
8	Akewa Group of Company	Bid Premium	PT#41	26,000.00
9	Alpha logging Company	Area Fee	PT#35	298,100.00
10	Alpha logging Company	Bid Premium	PT#41	1,198,362.00
11	Alpha logging Company	Log export Fee	PT#43	491,549.38
12	Geblo Logging Company	Area Fee	PT#35	328,665.00
13	Geblo Logging Company	Bid Premium	PT#41	1,413,259.50
14	Sun Yeun	Stumpage Fee	PT#36	45,428.35
15	Bargor and Bargor	Bid Premium	PT#41	9,550.00
	<b>Total</b>			<b>7,403,639.73</b>

### ANNEX VI: AMOUNT DUE REPORTED BY MLME ANNEX VI:

NO	TAXPAYER	PAYMENT TYPE	Ref	AMOUNT DUE (MLME)
1.	Pedsam Mining Limited (1430675001)	Others	PT#32	7,500.00
2.	Investment Development (429720001)	Surface rental	PT #35	116,164.84
3.	Investment Development (429720001)	Exploration Fees	PT#41	15,000.00

NO	TAXPAYER	PAYMENT TYPE	Ref	AMOUNT DUE (MLME)
4.	Investment Development (429720001)	Others	PT#32	5,565.62
5.	China Union Investment ( TIN: 415979002)	Minerals License Fees	PT#35	50,000.00
6.	Amlib United Minerals Inc. (TIN:400777004)	Surface rental	PT#41	220,207.20
7.	Knights Group Inc. (TIN:41349009)	Exploration License Fees	PT#	55,515.84
8.	Liberia Development Initiative (TIN: 433939000)	Surface Rental	PT#	24,811.05
9.	Jonah Capital (TIN: 431093006)	Surface Rental	PT#	204,795.07
10.	Jonah Capital (TIN: 431093006)	Exploration License Fees	PT #	30,000.00
11.	Find Mineral International (TIN: 411164004)	Surface Rental	PT#	15,000.00
12.	Find Mineral International (TIN: 411164004)	Exploration License Fees	PT#	5,000.00
13.	All Dealership Companies (TIN:N/A)	Dealer License	PT#	225,000.00
14.	Massa Investment Corp (TIN: 409886019)	Surface Rental	PT#	29,500.00
15.	Trans-Atlantic Petroleum & Oil Resources (TIN: 430109000)	Surface Rental	PT#	64,864.13
16.	Trans-Atlantic Petroleum & Oil Resources (TIN: 430109000)	Exploration License Fees	PT#	10,000.00
17.	BG Minerals (Liberia) Ltd (TIN: 432589005)	Surface Rental	PT#	48,363.42
18.	BG Minerals (Liberia) Ltd (TIN: 432589005)	Exploration License Fees	PT#	5,000.00
19.	West Africa Diamond (TIN:408279003)	Royalty	PT#	21,345.73
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b><u>1,153,632.90</u></b>



## **ANNEX VII**

### **59 LEITI TEMPLATES SUBMITTED BY M&AS FOR WHICH MOF DID NOT SUBMIT CORRESPONDING TEMPLATES**

<b>No.</b>	<b>TAXPAYER</b>	<b>MOF Template</b>	<b>M&amp;As Template</b>
1	West Africa Resources	NO	YES
2	Voila International INC	NO	YES
3	Shankil Resources	NO	YES
4	Noya Mining Company Ltd	NO	YES
5	Liberia Agricultural Company	NO	YES
6	Liberia Development Initiative	NO	YES
7	Archean Gold	NO	YES
8	BCM International	NO	YES
9	Bassa Logging Company	NO	YES
10	Euro Liberia Logging	NO	YES
11	Golden mass Trading	NO	YES
12	Esiaka B. Konneh	NO	YES
13	Castle Gem (Liberia) Ltd	NO	YES
14	ALL CLASS' C'	NO	YES
15	Nimba Resources	NO	YES
16	Bea Mountain	NO	YES
17	Mass Investment Corporation	NO	YES
18	All Dealership Companies	NO	YES
19	Birianan Gold	NO	YES
20	Estmon Gold Mining Company	NO	YES
21	Bopolu Commercial Limited	NO	YES
22	ALL CLASS' B'	NO	YES
23	Winestock Dev. Liberia LTD	NO	YES
24	All Brokership Company	NO	YES
25	Task International Ltd	NO	YES
26	Hamana Business International	NO	YES
27	West Brother	NO	YES
28	Acquarian Commercial Holding INC	NO	YES
29	Indo Gold Liberia Ltd	NO	YES
30	Monnet Global (Liberia) ltd	NO	YES
31	Gemrock mining INC	NO	YES
32	Afric Diam Company INC	NO	YES
33	REV. Augustus B. Menyogan	NO	YES
34	Tonkara Amadu	NO	YES
35	Varney H. Jones	NO	YES
36	J. Nathaniel Williams Jr	NO	YES
37	Almar Jalloh	NO	YES
38	Bailey Group of Companies	NO	YES
39	Madas Corporation	NO	YES
40	ADMT	NO	YES

<b>No.</b>	<b>TAXPAYER</b>	<b>MOF Template</b>	<b>M&amp;As Template</b>
41	Africa Diamond Resources	NO	YES
42	West Africa Gold and Diamond INC	NO	YES
43	Nyan Bartee Corporation	NO	YES
44	Charis Minerals, INC	NO	YES
45	Fortress (Liberia) LTD	NO	YES
46	Diamond Star PLUS	NO	YES
47	SRPI Group Africa LTD	NO	YES
48	Ansu V. Bility	NO	YES
49	Dr. Eugene H.Shannon	NO	YES
50	Victor A. Okafor	NO	YES
51	Aaron Sonyah	NO	YES
52	Clifford S. Pitt	NO	YES
53	Mohammed Sheriff	NO	YES
54	Cooper Cornelius Jones	NO	YES
55	Star Diamond Company	NO	YES
56	Rod Trading INC	NO	YES
57	B-2 (Bereket D. Tesfamariam)	NO	YES
58	Jodflin Liberia Limited	NO	YES
59	Papa Musa K. Smythe	NO	YES

## **13 SCHEDULES FOR CBL VS MOF (SEE DISK)**