

TO: MTC Strategic Planning Steering Committee

FROM: Elizabeth Harchenko

DATE: January 17, 2012

SUBJECT: Notes from December discussion about the vision

Here are my rough notes from the discussion at our last meeting of what the three aspects of the draft vision statement might look like.

Fleshing Out the Vision

Tax Policy development – what are the qualities and characteristics of a “gold standard” tax policy development process? How will it work? What will it produce? How will you know that it is the best possible process? Why will others see it as such?

NP – the process is open for input and transparent – everyone knows what is going on and when; organized and thoughtful; timely. SS – the work product is useful, high quality “top of the line;” AB- the process is informed by a broad base of stakeholders; and internally well-informed (we’ve done our research well); CF – how will we measure success? SS- measure success by adoption of recommendations by the states. Measure success by how well proposals meet the needs of the states; and are politically actionable. Joe – not adoption – needs to be something we have control over. We are driven toward highest quality result from inquiries. Flexible enough so that many jurisdictions can use it in their deliberations. SC – recognition of our process by others – actual participation by wide range of stakeholders; SS – stakeholders see our process as relevant –CF – a process that makes a difference; one that is being called for and used. Proposals are in clear and understandable language.

NP – building something into the process that will be used. SS – ULC standard of desirable and practicable product can result. Greg – notion of timeliness is important.

Federalism – What qualities and characteristics of the MTC’s work will make it a credible and authoritative voice for {federalism} state tax sovereignty and tax fairness? How will it work? What will it produce? How will you know that it is recognized as a “champion of uniformity?”

CF – MTC would be sought after for thoughts or opinions, MTC would be recognized as best informed on these kinds of issues. Credible and consistent voice for the states. AB – MTC identifies needs for uniform legislation – doesn’t wait for things but initiates, by anticipating what we might be asked to comment on. NP- developing relationships on the hill that cause people to reach out to MTC for help. Broadly recognized, reputation and high profile of MTC as a source of information. Have a “go to” person for MTC – when issues come up on the hill, when there is an article or other communication being developed by others. JH – if we have a profile that is recognized for authoritative input, the organization has a profile of excellence – it needs to be the commission. SC - Be able to provide solutions, not just

objections. CF – a bit of a slippery slope – do we offer solutions? Are we in conflict with goal of preserving sovereignty? JH- where the line gets drawn, some want the solution to be Congress-based, some want state-based. CF- will require MTC to be “plugged in” to circles that we are not right now – cultivate different information sources. SS- when stakeholders are engaged, they will come to MTC before going to Congress.

Tax Compliance – What qualities or characteristics will make MTC a leading resource for ensuring equitable tax compliance? How will it work? What will it produce? How will you know that MTC is recognized as a leading resource for compliance? Why will states and others see it as such?

JH-majority of issues that come to MTC table come up through audit or tax administration problems – find projects that stakeholders could bring to the MTC. Identify areas that are of concern to legislators, taxpayers, business partners. SS-intrigued by the idea of legislatures recognizing need for uniformity and turning to MTC for solutions. CF – opportunity to be seen by legislators as having solutions for compliance and uniformity proposals. Our programs are used. JH – when state legislative technical people are drafting and ask for help with options that are being worked on around the country. We get in trouble with advocacy – have a broad base of knowledge about what is going on around the country. If the states turn to us as they are looking for solutions. NP – this is about expertise of the people who are involved in MTC – depth and breadth of knowledge, and others are well aware of this. JH – we don’t always know the answer, but we almost always know someone who might. CF – cost effectiveness of the compliance programs for small states – being an arm of the states’ compliance strategies. MTC will need to promote availability of programs to legislatures as they look for ways to increase revenues without increasing their own staffing. SC- engaging Governors (budget developer) about the ability to raise funds through compliance programs – have the Governors propose participation. AB – what does MTC do with findings from the audits? Is there a process for identifying hot spots and flagging them for further study in different ways? Timely process for flagging issues and sharing them. CF – need to capture more knowledge from audit program that can be used and shared to promote best practices among the states. Look at audits – compile issues and results, future alerts.