



Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights

Below you will find a questionnaire filled in by Svetislav Kostic and Lidija Živković, Professors at the *University of Belgrade* and OPTR National Reporters of Serbia.

This set of questionnaires comprise the National Reporters' assessment on the country practice during 2018 in the protection of taxpayers' rights (Questionnaire # 1), and the level of fulfilment of the minimum standards and best practices on the practical protection of taxpayers' rights identified by Prof. Dr. Philip Baker and Prof. Dr. Pasquale Pistone at the 2015 IFA Congress on "*The Practical Protection of Taxpayers' Fundamental Rights*" (Questionnaire # 2). These questionnaires were filled in considering the following parameters:

1. *For Questionnaire # 1*, an assertive assessment (yes/no) was required on the effective implementation in domestic law of 82 legal safeguards, guarantees and procedures relevant in 12 specific areas for the practical protection of taxpayers' rights, as identified by Baker & Pistone in 2015. This line of questioning aims to get an overview of the state of protection of taxpayers' rights in the country in 2018.
2. *For Questionnaire # 2*, an impartial, non-judgmental evaluation was required on the developments, either of improvement or of decline, in the level of realisation of 57 minimum standards and 44 best practices, distributed into 87 benchmarks for the practical protection of taxpayers' rights. In this regard, a summary of events occurred in 2018 (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), that serve as grounds for each particular assessment, was also required.



Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights
Questionnaire No. 1: Country Practice

1. Identifying taxpayers and issuing tax returns			
#	Question	Yes	No
1	Do taxpayers have the right to see the information held about them by the tax authority?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	If yes, can they request the correction of errors in the information?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	In your country, is there a system of "cooperative compliance" / "enhanced relationship" which applies to some taxpayers only?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
4	If yes, are there rules or procedures in place to ensure this system is available to all eligible taxpayers on a non-preferential/non discriminatory/non arbitrary basis?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
5	Is it possible in your country for taxpayers to communicate electronically with the tax authority?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	If yes, are there systems in place to prevent unauthorised access to the channel of communication?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Are there special arrangements for individuals who face particular difficulties (e.g. the disabled, the elderly, other special cases) to receive assistance in complying with their tax obligations?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. The issue of tax assessments			
#	Question	Yes	No
8	If a systematic error in the assessment of tax comes to light (e.g. the tax authority loses a tax case and it is clear that tax has been collected on a wrong basis), does the tax authority act <i>ex officio</i> to notify all affected taxpayers and arrange repayments to them?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Does a dialogue take place in your country between the taxpayer and the tax authority before the issue of an assessment in order to reach an agreed assessment?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
10	If yes, can the taxpayer request a meeting with the tax officer?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

3. Confidentiality			
#	Question	Yes	No
11	Is information held by your tax authority automatically encrypted?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	Is access to information held by the tax authority about a specific taxpayer accessible only to the tax official(s) dealing with that taxpayer's affairs?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13	If yes, must the tax official identify himself/herself before accessing information held about a specific taxpayer?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14	Is access to information held about a taxpayer audited internally to check if there has been any unauthorised access to that information?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15	Are there examples of tax officials who have been criminally prosecuted in the last decade for unauthorised access to taxpayers' data?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
16	Is information about the tax liability of specific taxpayers publicly available in your country?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17	Is "naming and shaming" of non-compliant taxpayers practised in your country?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18	Is there a system in your country by which the courts may authorise the public disclosure of information held by the tax authority about specific taxpayers (e.g. <i>habeas data</i> or freedom of information)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19	Is there a system of protection of legally privileged communications between the taxpayer and its advisors?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20	If yes, does this extend to advisors other than those who are legally qualified (e.g. accountants, tax advisors)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Normal audits			
#	Question	Yes	No

Country: Serbia

National Reporter: Svetislav V. Kostić, Dejan Stojanović, Lidija Živković

Affiliation

Administration Tax Practitioner Judiciary Tax Ombudsman Academia

7. Criminal and administrative sanctions					
#	Question				
56	Does the principle <i>ne bis in idem</i> apply in your country to prevent either (a) the imposition of a tax penalty and the tax liability; (b) the imposition of more than one tax penalty for the same conduct; (c) the imposition of a tax penalty and a criminal liability?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
57	If <i>ne bis in idem</i> is recognised, does this prevent two parallel sets of court proceedings arising from the same factual circumstances (e.g. a tax court and a criminal court)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>		
58	If the taxpayer makes a voluntary disclosure of a tax liability, can this result in a reduced or a zero penalty?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		

8. Enforcement of taxes			
#	Question	Yes	No
59	Does the taxpayer have the right to request a deferred payment of taxes or a payment in instalments (perhaps with a guarantee)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
60	Is a court order always necessary before the tax authorities can access a taxpayer's bank account or other assets?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

9. Cross-border procedures			
#	Question	Yes	No
61	Does the taxpayer have the right to be informed before information relating to him is exchanged in response to a specific request?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
62	Does the taxpayer have a right to be informed before information is sought from third parties in response to a specific request for exchange of information?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
63	If no to either of the previous two questions, did your country previously recognise the right of taxpayers to be informed and was such right removed in the context of the peer review by the Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
64	Does the taxpayer have the right to be heard by the tax authority before the exchange of information relating to him with another country?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
65	Does the taxpayer have the right to challenge before the judiciary the exchange of information relating to him with another country?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
66	Does the taxpayer have the right to see any information received from another country that relates to him?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
67	Does the taxpayer have the right in all cases to require a mutual agreement procedure is initiated?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
68	Does the taxpayer have a right to see the communications exchanged in the context of a mutual agreement procedure?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Pursuant to Art. 24(1)(6) of the Law on Tax Procedure and Tax Administration the taxpayer has the right to gain insight into all the information relating to the assessment or payment of

10. Legislation			
#	Question	Yes	No
69	Is there a procedure in your country for public consultation before the adopting of all (or most) tax legislation?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
70	Is tax legislation subject to constitutional review which can strike down unconstitutional laws?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
71	Is there a prohibition on retrospective tax legislation in your country?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
72	If no, are there restrictions on the adoption of retrospective tax legislation in your country?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

There are general restrictions to retroactivity of all legislation, but a prohibition specifically directed to retroactivity of tax legislation does not exist.

Please, see the above comment.

11. Revenue practice and guidance			
#	Question	Yes	No

21	Does the principle <i>audi alteram partem</i> apply in the tax audit process (i.e. does the taxpayer have to be notified of all decisions taken in the process and have the right to object and be heard before the decision is finalised)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22	Are there time limits applicable to the conduct of a normal audit in your country (e.g. the audit must be concluded within so many months)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
23	If yes, what is the normal limit in months?	Months <input type="text" value=""/>	
24	Does the taxpayer have the right to be represented by a person of its choice in the audit process?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25	May the opinion of independent experts be used in the audit process?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26	Does the taxpayer have the right to receive a full report on the conclusions of the audit at the end of the process?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27	Does the principle <i>ne bis in idem</i> apply to tax audits (i.e. that the taxpayer can only receive one audit in respect of the same taxable period)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28	If yes, does this mean only one audit per tax per year?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29	Are there limits to the frequency of audits of the same taxpayer (e.g. in respect of different periods or different taxes)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
30	Does the taxpayer have the right to request an audit (e.g. if the taxpayer wishes to get finality of taxation for a particular year)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Art. 176(1)(4) of the LGAP

73	Does the tax authority in your country publish guidance (e.g. revenue manuals, circulars, etc.) as to how it applies your tax law?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
74	If yes, can taxpayers acting in good faith rely on that published guidance (i.e. protection of legitimate expectations)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
75	Does your country have a generalised system of advanced rulings available to taxpayers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
76	If yes, is it legally binding?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
77	If a binding rule is refused, does the taxpayer have a right to appeal?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

12. Institutional framework for protecting taxpayers' rights

#	Question	Yes	No
78	Is there a taxpayers' charter or taxpayers' bill of rights in your country?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
79	If yes, are its provisions legally effective?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
80	Is there a (tax) ombudsman / taxpayers' advocate / equivalent position in your country?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
81	If yes, can the ombudsman intervene in an on-going dispute between the taxpayer and the tax authority (before it goes to court)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
82	If yes to a (tax) ombudsman, is he/she independent from the tax authority?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

5. More intensive audits

#	Question	Yes	No
31	Is authorisation by a court always needed before the tax authority may enter and search premises?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
32	May the tax authority enter and search the dwelling places of individuals?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33	Is there a procedure in place to ensure that legally privileged material is not taken in the course of a search?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34	Is a court order required before the tax authority can use interception of communications (e.g. telephone tapping or access to electronic communications)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35	Is the principle <i>nemo tenetur</i> applied in tax investigations (i.e. the principle against self-incrimination)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
36	If yes, is there a restriction on the use of information supplied by the taxpayer in a subsequent penalty procedure/criminal procedure?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
37	If yes to <i>nemo tenetur</i> , can the taxpayer raise this principle to refuse to supply basic accounting information to the tax authority?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
38	Is there a procedure applied in your country to identify a point in time during an investigation when it becomes likely that the taxpayer may be liable for a penalty or a criminal charge, and from that time onwards the taxpayer's right not to self-incriminate is recognised?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
39	If yes, is there a requirement to give the taxpayer a warning that the taxpayer can rely on the right of non-self-incrimination?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Only for dwelling places.

Authorisation of the court is necessary.

Art. 51(3) of the LPTFA stipulates that doubt stemming from the taxpayer's failure to provide information in cases when he/she is, pursuant to the law, obliged to do so, may be to his/her detriment in the process of determining his/her tax obligation.

If the facts and circumstances established by the tax inspector during the tax investigation indicate that the criminal act has been committed by the taxpayer, report will be issued to the director of the Tax Police, as of which moment provisions of the Law on Criminal Procedure apply. Art. 68(1)(2) of the said law presupposes that the defendant (as well as the suspect in the course of pre-investigative procedure) has the right to silence, which, if used, cannot be to his/her detriment.

6. Review and appeals

#	Question	Yes	No
40	Is there a procedure for an internal review of an assessment/decision before the taxpayer appeals to the judiciary?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
41	Are there any arrangements for alternative dispute resolution (e.g. mediation or arbitration) before a tax case proceeds to the judiciary?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
42	Is it necessary for the taxpayer to bring his case first before an administrative court to quash the assessment/decision, before the case can proceed to a judicial hearing?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
43	Are there time limits applicable for a tax case to complete the judicial appeal process?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
44	If yes, what is the normal time it takes for a tax case to be concluded on appeal?	02 months <input type="text" value=""/>	
45	Does the taxpayer have to pay some/all the tax before an appeal can be made (i.e. <i>solve et repete</i>)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46	If yes, are there exceptions recognised where the taxpayer does not need to pay before appealing (i.e. can obtain an interim suspension of the tax debt)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47	Does the taxpayer need permission to appeal to the first instance tribunal?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
48	Does the taxpayer need permission to appeal to the second or higher instance tribunals?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Permission? The taxpayer must have utilized all the available legal remedies prior to appealing to the higher instance tribunal.

49	Is there a system for the simplified resolution of tax disputes (e.g. by a determination on the file, or by e/filing)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
50	Is the principle audi alteram partem (i.e. each party has a right to a hearing) applied in all tax appeals?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
51	Does the loser have to pay the costs in a tax appeal?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
52	If yes, are there situations recognised where the loser does not need to pay the costs (e.g. because of the conduct of the other party)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
53	Are judgments of tax tribunals published?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
54	If yes, can the taxpayer preserve its anonymity in the judgment?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
55	If there is usually a public hearing, can the taxpayer request a hearing in camera (i.e. not in public) to preserve secrecy/confidentiality)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Pursuant to Art. 89(1) of the Law on General Administrative Procedure, such an option may be granted only to the party which is unable to bear the costs without thereby adversely affecting minimum necessary means for its support and the support of his/her family members, and which has submitted the request to the Court.

Art. 112(2) of the Law on General Administrative Procedure provides for such an option, only in specific circumstances: a) if the hearing would involve discussion on information which is considered to be confidential according to the law or represents a business secret, b) if this is required by reasons of public order of morale, c) if the hearing would involve discussion on family matters, d) if there is a serious and direct danger that the public hearing could be hindered.



Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights
Questionnaire No. 2: Standards of Protection

Country: Serbia

National Reporter: Svetislav V. Kostić, Dejan Stojanović, Lidija Živković

Affiliation

Tax Administration Tax Practitioner Judiciary (Tax) Ombudsman Academia

1. Identifying taxpayers and issuing tax returns

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
1	Implement safeguards to prevent impersonation when issuing unique identification number		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Although the new Law on the Protection of Personal Information (<i>Official Gazette of the RS, no. 87/2018</i>) was enacted and is in force since 21 November 2018, it has been criticized as representing a mere translation of the EU General Data Protection Regulation and the so-called Police Directive, without being adjusted for the needs of domestic application. As such, it failed to deal with the long standing issues of TIN abuse for impersonation purposes.
2	The system of taxpayer identification should take account of religious sensitivities		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
3	Impose obligations of confidentiality on third parties with respect to information gathered by them for tax purposes		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
4		Where tax is withheld by third parties, the taxpayer should be excluded from liability if the third party fails to pay over the tax	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
5	Where pre/populated returns are used, these should be sent to taxpayers to correct errors		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
6	Provide a right to access to taxpayers to personal information held about them, and a right to correct inaccuracies	Publish guidance on taxpayers' rights to access information and correct inaccuracies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
7	Where communication with taxpayers is in electronic form, institute systems to prevent impersonation or interception		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
8	Where a system of "cooperative compliance" operates, ensure it is available on a non-discriminatory and voluntary basis		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
9	Provide assistance for those who face difficulties in meeting compliance obligations, including those with disabilities, those located in remote areas, and those unable or unwilling to use electronic forms of communication		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

2. The issue of tax assessment

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
10		Establish a constructive dialogue between taxpayers and revenue authorities to ensure a fair assessment of taxes based on equality of arms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
11		Use e-filing to speed up assessments and correction of errors, particularly systematic errors	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	According to the amended Art. 38(7) of the Law on Tax Procedure and Tax Administration (<i>Official Gazette of the RS no. 30/2018</i>), as of 1 January 2019 e-filing has been introduced for property tax as well. Additionally, in line with Art. 38(11) the taxpayer is now allowed to submit the tax return for transfer tax and inheritance and gift taxes through a notary.

3. Confidentiality

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
12	Provide a specific legal guarantee for confidentiality, with sanctions for officials who make unauthorised disclosures (and ensure sanctions are enforced).	Encrypt information held by a tax authority about taxpayers to the highest level attainable.	○	○	Without changes.
13	Restrict access to data to those officials authorised to consult it. For encrypted data, use digital access codes.	Ensure an effective fire-wall to prevent unauthorised access to data held by revenue authorities.	○	○	Without changes.
14	Audit data access periodically to identify cases of unauthorised access.		○	○	Without changes.
15	Introduce administrative measures emphasizing confidentiality to tax officials.	Appoint data protection/privacy officers at senior level and local tax offices.	○	○	Without changes.
16	Where pre/populated returns are used, these should be sent to taxpayers to correct errors.		○	○	Without changes.
17	If a breach of confidentiality occurs, investigate fully with an appropriate level of seniority by independent persons (e.g. judges).		○	○	Without changes.
18	Introduce an offence for tax officials covering up unauthorised disclosure of confidential information.		○	○	Without changes.
19	Exceptions to the general rule of confidentiality should be explicitly stated in the law, narrowly drafted and interpreted.		○	○	Without changes.
20	If "naming and shaming" is employed, ensure adequate safeguards (e.g. judicial authorisation after proceedings involving the taxpayer).		○	○	The only change relating to the practice of "naming and shaming" is that, according to the amended Art. 7(7) of the Law on Tax Procedure and Tax Administration (<i>Official Gazette of the RS, no. 30/2018</i>), the TA are now obliged to publish relevant information at least once a year, instead of the previously prescribed two times.
21	No disclosure of confidential taxpayer information to politicians, or where it might be used for political purposes.	Parliamentary supervision of revenue authorities should involve independent officials, subject to confidentiality obligations, examining specific taxpayer data, and then reporting to Parliament.	○	○	Without changes.
22	Freedom of information legislation may allow a taxpayer to access information about himself. However, access to information by third parties should be subject to stringent safeguards: only if an independent tribunal concludes that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the right of confidentiality, and only after a hearing where the taxpayer has an opportunity to be heard.		●	○	The new Law on the Protection of Personal Information is in force since 21 November 2018 and will be applicable as of 21 August 2019. The law is a result of the need to harmonize Serbian legislation with the acquis (i.e. the General Data Protection Regulation - 2016/679 and the Police Directive - 2016/690). In line with the new legislation, the taxpayer is granted several new legal remedies in cases where he/she fears that the person handling his/her information does not do so according to the law. Previous law allowed the taxpayer to file an appeal to the Commissioner for Information of Public Importance and Personal Data Protection (Commissioner) and if he/she was not satisfied with the Commissioner's decision, administrative dispute could be initiated. However, it should be taken into account that the European Commission issued an Opinion on the draft LPPI, criticizing its complexity, as well as ambiguity and underlined the fact that the matter in question should be separated in two different legal documents. The Serbian Ministry of Justice did not take into account most of the suggestions contained therein.
23	If published, tax rulings should be anonymised and details that might identify the taxpayer removed.	Anonymise all tax judgments and remove details that might identify the taxpayer	○	○	Without changes.
24	Legal professional privilege should apply to tax advice.	Privilege from disclosure should apply to all tax advisors (not just lawyers) who supply similar advice to lawyers. Information imparted in circumstances of confidentiality may be privileged from disclosure.	○	○	Without changes.
25	Where tax authorities enter premises which may contain privileged material, arrangements should be made (e.g. an independent lawyer) to protect that privilege.		○	○	Without changes.

4. Normal audits

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
---	------------------	---------------	------------	---------------	-----------------------------------

26	Audits should respect the following principles: (i) Proportionality. (2) <i>Ne bis in idem</i> (prohibition of double jeopardy). (3) <i>Audi alteram partem</i> (right to be heard before any decision is taken). (4) <i>Nemo tenetur se detegere</i> (principle against self/incrimination). Tax notices issued in violation of these principles should be null and void.		<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Art. 55 of the Law on Tax Procedure and Tax Administration has been amended (<i>Official Gazette of the RS, no. 95/2018</i>) to include new paragraph 4 specifying that if the taxpayer fails to submit tax return, the TA will issue tax assessment without previously allowing the taxpayer to be heard with respect to the facts relevant for decision making, in cases where tax assessment is conducted on the basis of data contained in official records, as well as on the basis of documents issued by competent authorities and notaries.
27	In application of proportionality, tax authorities may only request for information that is strictly needed, not otherwise available, and must impose least burdensome impact on taxpayers.		<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Art. 45 of the Law on Tax Procedure and Tax Administration has been amended (<i>Official Gazette of the RS no. 30/2018</i>) so as to contain a new paragraph 9 specifying explicitly that the TA shall not require information or data which are already contained in official records and registries. This is in line with Art. 9 of the Law on General Administrative Procedure (lex generalis with respect to the tax procedure) which, as of 2016, contains a provision explicitly requiring administrative authorities to establish all the relevant facts already contained within the records kept by various public bodies, without requiring the taxpayer to provide additional information, as was the previous practice.
28		In application of <i>ne bis in idem</i> the taxpayer should only receive one audit per taxable period, except when facts that become known after the audit was completed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
29	In application of <i>audi alteram partem</i> , taxpayers should have the right to attend all relevant meetings with tax authorities (assisted by advisors), the right to provide factual information, and to present their views before decisions of the tax authorities become final.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Please, see summary of relevant facts in section no. 26.
30	In application of <i>nemo tenetur</i> , the right to remain silent should be respected in all tax audits.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
31		Tax audits should follow a pattern that is set out in published guidelines.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
32		A manual of good practice in tax audits should be established at the global level.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
33		Taxpayers should be entitled to request the start of a tax audit (to obtain finality).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Although in line with Art. 6(4) of the Law on Inspectional Supervision (lex generalis with respect to tax audit) taxpayers are entitled to request the start of a tax audit, harmonization of the Law on Tax Procedure and Tax Administration (lex specialis regarding tax audit) has not yet been conducted with respect to this matter.
34	Where tax authorities have resolved to start an audit, they should inform the taxpayer	Where tax authorities have resolved to start an audit, they should hold an initial meeting with the taxpayer in which they spell out the aims and procedure, together with timescale and targets. They should then disclose any additional evidence in their possession to the taxpayer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
35	Taxpayers should be informed of information gathering from third parties.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
36		Reasonable time limits should be fixed for the conduct of audits.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
37	Technical assistance (including representation) should be available at all stages of the audit by experts selected by the taxpayer.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

38	The completion of a tax audit should be accurately reflected in a document, notified in its full text to the taxpayer.	The drafting of the final audit report should involve participation by the taxpayer, with the opportunity to correct inaccuracies of facts and to express the taxpayer's view.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	According to the amendments to the Law on Tax procedure and Tax Administration (<i>Official Gazette of the RS no. 30/2018</i>), what was previously referred to as <i>The audit conducted within the premises of the TA</i> (Serbian: kancelarijska kontrola) is not considered to be a part of tax audit anymore, but is labeled as <i>The processing of tax returns and other taxpayer reports</i> . Only what was previously referred to as on-site tax audit (Serbian: terenska kontrola) is now considered to be tax audit. Thanks to this delineation, the completion of a tax audit is now <i>always</i> reflected in a document, notified in its full to the taxpayer. After the audit is conducted, the tax inspector will deliver minutes on conducted tax audit to the taxpayer, who has the right to submit remarks related thereto. If within his/her remarks, the taxpayer has brought up evidence or facts that may alter the initially established factual basis or legal assessment of the facts, tax inspector will issue supplementary minutes including this evidence/facts within 5 days (Art. 128(8) of the LTPTA). The new paragraph 10 of Art. 128 presupposes that in cases when subsequently to the issuance of the minutes or supplementary minutes the tax inspector has discovered new facts influencing previously determined factual basis, he/she shall issue an appendix to previously issued minutes, which is to be delivered to the taxpayer. The taxpayer has the right to submit remarks related thereto, within 8 days.
39		Following an audit, a report should be prepared even if the audit does not result in additional tax or refund.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Please, see the comment in section 38.

5. More intensive audits

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
40		More intensive audits should be limited to the extent strictly necessary to ensure an effective reaction to non-compliance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
41	If there is point in an audit when it becomes foreseeable that the taxpayer may be liable for a penalty or criminal charge, from that time the taxpayer should have stronger protection of his right to silence, and statements from the taxpayer should not be used in the audit procedure.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
42	Entering premises or interception of communications should be authorised by the judiciary.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
43	Authorisation within the revenue authorities should only be in cases of urgency, and subsequently reported to the judiciary for <i>ex post</i> ratification.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
44	Inspection of the taxpayer's home should require authorisation by the judiciary and only be given in exceptional cases.	Where tax authorities intend to search the taxpayer's premises, the taxpayer should be informed and have an opportunity to appear before the judicial authority, subject to exception where there is evidence of danger that documents will be removed or destroyed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
45		Access to bank information should require judicial authorisation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
46		Authorisation by the judiciary should be necessary for interception of telephone communications and monitoring of internet access. Specialised offices within the judiciary should be established to supervise these actions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
47	Seizure of documents should be subject to a requirement to give reasons why seizure is indispensable, and to fix the time when documents will be returned; seizure should be limited in time.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
48		If data are held on a computer hard drive, then a backup should be made in the presence of the taxpayer's advisors and the original left with the taxpayer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

49	Where invasive techniques are applied, they should be limited in time to avoid disproportionate impact on taxpayers.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
----	--	--	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------

6. Review and appeals

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
50		E-filing of requests for internal review to ensure the effective and speedy handling of the review process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
51	The right to appeal should not depend upon prior exhaustion of administrative reviews.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
52		Reviews and appeals should not exceed two years.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
53	<i>Audi alteram partem</i> should apply in administrative reviews and judicial appeals.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
54	Where tax must be paid in whole or in part before and appeal, there must be an effective mechanism for providing interim suspension of payment.	An appeal should not require prior payment of tax in all cases.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
55		The state should bear some or all of the costs of an appeal, whatever the outcome.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
56	Legal assistance should be provided for those taxpayers who cannot afford it.		<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	The Draft of the Law on pro bono Legal Assistance (<i>Official Gazette of the RS, no. 87/2018</i>) has entered into force on 21 November 2018 and is applicable since 1 January 2019. However, it should be noted that, according to the Art. 7(1)(4) of the law in question, pro bono legal assistance will not be allowed for cases appearing before the Misdemeanor court, if the sentence prescribed for the misdemeanor in question is not imprisonment.
57	Taxpayers should have the right to request the exclusion of the public from a tax appeal hearing.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
58	Tax judgments should be published.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

7. Criminal and administrative sanctions

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
59	Proportionality and <i>ne bis in idem</i> should apply to tax penalties.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
60		Where administrative and criminal sanctions may both apply, only one procedure and one sanction should be applied.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
61		Voluntary disclosure should lead to reduction of penalties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
62	Sanctions should not be increased simply to encourage taxpayers to make voluntary disclosures.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

8. Enforcement of taxes

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
63	Collection of taxes should never deprive taxpayers of their minimum necessary for living.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
64		Authorisation by the judiciary should be required before seizing assets or bank accounts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

65	Taxpayers should have the right to request delayed payment of arrears.		<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	New paragraph 8 has been added to the Art. 78 of the Law on Tax Procedure and Tax Administration (<i>Official Gazette of the RS, no. 30/2018</i>), according to which taxpayers can submit their request for the delayed payment of arrears not only in paper form, as it was previously the case, but in electronic form as well.
66		Bankruptcy of taxpayers should be avoided, by partial remission of the debt or structured plans for deferred payment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	According to the amendments to the Law on Tax Procedure and Tax Administration (<i>Official Gazette of the RS, no. 30/2018</i>), in addition to the possibility of deferral of the tax debt during maximum 60 months, Art. 78(4) now allows the TA to grant the taxpayer a grace period of maximum 12 months.
67	Temporary suspension of tax enforcement should follow natural disasters.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

9. Cross-border procedures

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
68	The requesting state should notify the taxpayer of cross-border requests for information, unless it has specific grounds for considering that this would prejudice the process of investigation. The requested state should inform the taxpayer unless it has a reasoned request from the requesting state that the taxpayer should not be informed on grounds that it would prejudice the investigation.	The taxpayer should be informed that a cross-border request for information is to be made.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
69		Where a cross-border request for information is made, the requested state should also be asked to supply information that assists the taxpayer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
70		Provisions should be included in tax treaties setting specific conditions for exchange of information.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
71	If information is sought from third parties, judicial authorisation should be necessary.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
72		The taxpayer should be given access to information received by the requesting state.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
73		Information should not be supplied in response to a request where the originating cause was the acquisition of stolen or illegally obtained information.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
74		A requesting state should provide confirmation of confidentiality to the requested state.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
75	A state should not be entitled to receive information if it is unable to provide independent, verifiable evidence that it observes high standards of data protection.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
76		For automatic exchange of financial information, the taxpayer should be notified of the proposed exchange in sufficient time to exercise data protection rights.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
77		Taxpayers should have a right to request initiation of mutual agreement procedure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	According to the official information provided by the Ministry of Finance, so far only 3 MAPs have been initiated by the Serbian TA (and, consequently, by domestic taxpayers). However, due to the fact that Serbia signed the MLI, which entered into force on 1 October 2018, it is expected that the modifications to the covered DTTs brought about thereby will improve the present state of affairs with respect to MAPs. Serbian TA will have the obligation to implement a bilateral notification or consultation process with the competent authority of the other contracting state for cases in which it does not consider taxpayer's request as justified.
78	Taxpayers should have a right to participate in mutual agreement procedure by being heard and being informed as to progress of the procedure.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

10. Legislation

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
---	------------------	---------------	------------	---------------	-----------------------------------

79	Retrospective tax legislation should only be permitted in limited circumstances which are spelt out in detail.	Retrospective tax legislation should ideally be banned completely.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
80		Public consultation should precede the making of tax policy and tax law.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

11. Revenue practice and guidance

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
81	Taxpayers should be entitled to access all relevant legal material, comprising legislation, administrative regulations, rulings, manuals and other guidance.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
82	Where legal material is available primarily on the internet, arrangements should be made to provide it to those who do not have access to the internet.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
83	Binding rulings should only be published in an anonymised form		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
84	Where a taxpayer relies upon published guidance of a revenue authority which subsequently proves to be inaccurate, changes should apply only prospectively.		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.

12. Institutional framework for protecting taxpayer's rights

#	Minimum standard	Best practice	Shift Away	Shift Towards	Summary of relevant facts in 2018
85	Adoption of a charter or statement of taxpayers' rights should be a minimum standard.	A separate statement of taxpayers' rights under audit should be provided to taxpayers who are audited.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
86		A taxpayer advocate or ombudsman should be established to scrutinise the operations of the tax authority, handle specific complaints, and intervene in appropriate cases. Best practice is the establishment of a separate office within the tax authority but independent from normal operations of that authority.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.
87		The organisational structure for the protection of taxpayers' rights should operate at local level as well as nationally.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Without changes.