



Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights

Below you will find a questionnaire filled in by Alfredo Rodriguez and Alejandra Fuentes Pieruccini, both Associates at *Consortium Legal*, and both OPTR National Reporters of Guatemala.

This set of questionnaires comprises the National Reporter's assessment of the country's practice during 2024 in protecting taxpayers' rights 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."

OPTR - 2024 Questionnaire 1 - Country Practice

Dear National Reporter,

I would like to thank you for your participation in the IBFD's Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights (OPTR).

This form collects the information on the practical implementation in domestic law of legal procedures, safeguards and guarantees associated with taxpayers' rights in a wide range of situations for the practical protection of taxpayers' rights, as monitored by the IBFD Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights.

We kindly ask you to assess assertively (yes/no) the level of practical implementation of said procedures, safeguards and guarantees associated with taxpayers' rights in your country. When answering, please bear in mind the actual practice regarding each situation, regardless of whether a given procedure, safeguard or guarantee has been formally adopted in your country.

This form should be filled in as soon as any of the events mentioned above occurs and edited as many times as necessary to cover all relevant developments occurred in 2024, until no later than 10 January 2025. We appreciate very much your cooperation in this regard.

Feel free to contact us for any clarification you may need. We look forward to your valuable contribution to this remarkable project.

Kind regards,

Dr Sam van der Vlugt
Scientific Coordinator
IBFD Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights.

* Better if filled in using Google Chrome © or Mozilla Firefox ©

Email *

afuentespieruccini@consortiumlegal.com

Reporters' info

Name: *

Alfredo Rodríguez / Alejandra Fuentes-Pieruccini

Country: *

Guatemala

Affiliation *

☒ Taxpayers / Tax Practitioners

☐ Tax Administration

☐ Judiciary

☐ (Tax) Ombudsperson

☐ Academia

☐ Other:

Questionnaire 1 - Country Practice

Instructions:

1. Please answer all questions. The form will not allow you to continue/submit your responses until you have answered all questions.
2. For assertive questions, please answer with "yes" or "no" by clicking on the corresponding button.
3. For questions that require you to specify a period of time (namely, Q. 26 and Q. 45), please select the time applicable in your country to carry out the procedures indicated in the questions in practice, within the options provided.
4. For questions with more than one possible answer (namely, Q. 56), please check all necessary boxes to reflect better the practical situation of your country regarding the issue, by clicking on them.
5. When completed, please submit the survey.
6. Once you have submitted the survey, you will receive an email acknowledging your participation in the OPTR and providing a backup of your answers.

7. The email will also include an "edit your survey" link, in case you want to modify any of your answers. You will receive this email every time you submit partial responses.

8. An option to quit the survey and save your answers is provided at the end of each section.

9. If answering partially, please select "Yes" at the end of the section in which you are to submit your partial answers to the survey. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this survey.

10. For editing your answers, please use the last "edit your response" link provided to you via email. Please bear in mind that this is the only way the system will acknowledge your previous answers. If you use a link other than the last one provided, some (or all) changes might not be retrieved by the system.

11. When clicking on the last "edit your response" link, the system will lead you to the front page of the survey. Click on "Next" as many times as needed to get to the section you want to continue in. Once you have reached said section, please remember to change your answer to the question "Do you want to save your results and quit?" to "No", in order to be able to continue.

Area 1 - Identification of taxpayers, issuing tax returns and communicating with taxpayers

1. Do taxpayers have the right to see the information held about them by the tax authority? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

2. If yes, can they request the correction of errors in the information? *

☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to the previous question)

☒ Yes

☐ No

3. Is it possible in your country for taxpayers to communicate electronically with the tax authority? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

4. If yes, are there systems in place to prevent unauthorised access to the channel of communication? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

5. In your country, is there a system of "cooperative compliance" / "enhanced relationship" which applies to some taxpayers only? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

5A. 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? *

☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 5)

☐ Yes

☒ No

6. Are compliance obligations imposed on third parties subject to limits that ensure they are necessary and proportionate? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

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? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

7A. Are there special arrangements in circumstances of force majeure? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

7B. If yes to 7A, do said arrangements operate automatically? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 7A)

☐ Yes

☐ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 2 - The issue of tax assessment

8. 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? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

9. If yes, can the taxpayer request a meeting with the tax officer? *

☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 8)

☒ Yes

☐ No

10. 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 ex officio to notify all affected taxpayers and arrange repayments to them? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 3 - Confidentiality and data protection

N.B. From 2024 all questions of this area also refer to data protection

11. Is information held by your tax authority automatically encrypted? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

11A. Do data protection rights apply to all information held by tax authorities? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

11B. If yes to 11A, does it include the right to access data and correct inaccuracies? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 11A)

11C. If yes to 11A, is all data (at some point) destroyed once its purpose has been fulfilled? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 11A)

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? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

13. If yes, must the tax official identify himself/herself before accessing information held about a specific taxpayer? *

- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 12)
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

14. Is access to information held about a taxpayer audited internally to check if there has been any unauthorised access to that information? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

14A. If yes to 14, are victims of an unauthorised disclosure entitled to be informed and paid a *
compensation?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 14)

15. Are there examples of tax officials who have been criminally prosecuted in the last *
decade for unauthorised access to taxpayers' data?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

15A. Are tax officials entitled to work remotely? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

15B. If yes to 15A, are equivalent measures taken to ensure confidentiality and data *
protection to the ones that apply when the official is working from a tax office?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 15A)

15C. If yes to 15B, are those measures audited? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 15A & 15B)

16. Is information about the tax liability of specific taxpayers publicly available in your country? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

16A. If yes to 16, is access limited only to those who have a legitimate interest? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 16)

16B. Can information held by tax authorities be supplied to other authorities? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

16C. If yes to 16 B, is the supply to other public authorities permitted only when authorised by law and with appropriate safeguards? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 16B)

17. Is "naming and shaming" of non-compliant taxpayers practised in your country? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

17A. If yes to 17, is personal data that places the individual at risk not disclosable? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 17)

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. habeas data or freedom of information)? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

18A. Is there legislation that protects whistleblowers that disclose confidential information held by revenue authorities (or third parties holding data for tax purposes)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

19. Is there a system of protection of legally privileged communications between the taxpayer and its advisors? *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

☒ Yes

☐ No

20. If yes, does this extend to advisors other than those who are legally qualified (e.g. accountants, tax advisors)? *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 19)

☐ Yes

☒ No

20A. Are there mandatory disclosure requirements (e.g. mandatory disclosure of tax planning arrangements)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

20B. If yes to 20A, are those mandatory disclosure obligations so drafted as not to affect the relations with professional advisers? *

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 20A)

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 4 - Normal audits

21. Does the principle ne bis in idem apply to tax audits (i.e. that the taxpayer can only receive one audit in respect of the same taxable period)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

22. If yes, does this mean only one audit per tax per year? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 21)

☐ Yes

☐ No

23. Does the principle audi alteram partem 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)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

23A. If yes to 23, does this principle also apply to online meetings? *

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 23)

24. 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)? *

☐ Yes


☒ No

25. 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)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

26. If yes, what is the normal limit in months? *

 Dropdown

1. There is no limit (click here if you answered "No" to question 25)

2. 1-3 months

3. 4-6 months

4. 7-9 months

5. 10-12 months

6. 13-15 months

7. 16-18 months

8. 19-21 months

9. 22-24 months

10. More than 24 months

27. Does the taxpayer have the right to be represented by a person of its choice in the audit process? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

28. May the opinion of independent experts be used in the audit process? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

29. Does the taxpayer have the right to receive a full report on the conclusions of the audit at the end of the process? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

29A. Once a tax audit is completed, are there rules that prevent further evidence being collected, further arguments being put forward and no further tax charges being brought? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

30. Are there limits to the frequency of audits of the same taxpayer (e.g. in respect to different periods or different taxes)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 5 - More intensive audits

31. Is the principle nemo tenetur applied in tax investigations (i.e. the principle against self-incrimination)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

32. If yes, is there a restriction on the use of information supplied by the taxpayer in a subsequent penalty procedure/criminal procedure? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 31)

☐ Yes

☐ No

33. If yes to nemo tenetur, can the taxpayer raise this principle to refuse to supply basic accounting information to the tax authority? *

- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 31)
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

34. 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? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

35. If yes, is there a requirement to give the taxpayer a warning that the taxpayer can rely on the right of non-self-incrimination? *

- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 34)
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

36. Is authorisation by a court always needed before the tax authority may enter and search premises? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

37. May the tax authority enter and search the dwelling places of individuals? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

38. Is a court order required before the tax authority can use interception of communications (e.g. telephone tapping or access to electronic communications)? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

38A. Does access to bank information for tax purposes require prior judicial authorisation? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

39. Is there a procedure in place to ensure that legally privileged material is not taken in the course of a search? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

39A. If evidence is collected as a result of a search that was not authorised by the judiciary is ^{*} that evidence admissible?

☐ Yes

☒ No

39B. If digital data is copied or removed, are there provisions to ensure that this does not ^{*} affect the normal operation of the electronic information system?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? ^{*}

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 6 - Reviews and appeals

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

40. Is there a procedure for an internal review of an assessment/decision before the taxpayer appeals to the judiciary? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

40A. Do taxpayers have an alternative of taking an appeal to an arbitration tribunal in place of the tax courts? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

41. Does the taxpayer need permission to appeal to the first instance tribunal? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

42. Does the taxpayer need permission to appeal to the second or higher instance tribunals? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

43. 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? *

☒ Yes


☐ No

44. Are there time limits applicable for a tax case to complete the judicial appeal process? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

45. If yes, what is the normal time it takes for a tax case to be concluded on appeal? *

 Dropdown

1. There is no limit (click here if you answered "No" to question 44)
2. 1-3 months
3. 4-6 months
4. 7-9 months
5. 10-12 months
6. 13-15 months
7. 16-18 months
8. 19-21 months
9. 22-24 months
10. More than 24 months

46. Are there any arrangements for alternative dispute resolution (e.g. mediation or arbitration) before a tax case proceeds to the judiciary? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

46A. Does a taxpayer have the right to request an online hearing or object to it? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

47. Is there a system for the simplified resolution of tax disputes (e.g. by a determination on the file, or by e/filing)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

48. Is the principle audi alteram partem (i.e. each party has a right to a hearing) applied in all tax appeals? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

49. Does the taxpayer have to pay some/all the tax before an appeal can be made (i.e. solve et repete)? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

50. 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)? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 49)

☐ Yes

☐ No

51. Does the loser have to pay the costs in a tax appeal? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

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)? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 51)

☐ Yes

☐ No

53. If there is usually a public hearing, can the taxpayer request a hearing in camera (i.e. not in public) to preserve secrecy/confidentiality? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

54. Are judgments of tax tribunals published? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

55. If yes, can the taxpayer preserve its anonymity in the judgment? *

☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 54)

☐ Yes

☒ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

56. Does the principle ne bis in idem apply in your country to prevent either: *

- ☐ The principle does not apply in my country
- ☐ The imposition of a tax penalty and the tax liability
- ☐ The imposition of more than one tax penalty for the same conduct
- ☒ The imposition of a tax penalty and a criminal liability

57. If ne bis in idem 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)? *

- ☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 56)
- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

58. If the taxpayer makes a voluntary disclosure of a tax liability, can this result in a reduced or a zero penalty? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

58A. Is there a legislative cap to prevent interest, penalties and surcharges to exceed the amount of tax due? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 8 - Enforcement of taxes

59. Is a court order always necessary before the tax authorities can access a taxpayer's bank *
account or other assets?

☒ Yes

☐ No

60. Does the taxpayer have the right to request a deferred payment of taxes or a payment in *
instalments (perhaps with a guarantee)?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 9 - Cross-border situations

61. Does the taxpayer have the right to be informed before information relating to him is exchanged in response to a specific request? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

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? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

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? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to either question 61 or question 62)

☐ Yes

☐ No

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? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

65. Does the taxpayer have the right to challenge before the judiciary the exchange of information relating to him with another country? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

65A. If information is sought from a third party, does that third party have the right to challenge the legality of the request before the judiciary? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

65B. Is exchange of information prohibited with any state if it is foreseeable that the data would be used in a way that is repressive or that it would undermine the protection of fundamental rights? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

66. Does the taxpayer have the right to see any information received from another country that relates to him? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

66A. In the event of a leak of confidential information, is exchange of information with that state suspended? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

66B. Are there time-limits after which data that has been exchanged are to be destroyed or anonymously archived? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

67. Does the taxpayer have the right in all cases to require a mutual agreement procedure is initiated? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

68. Does the taxpayer have a right to see the communications exchanged in the context of a mutual agreement procedure? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

68A. Does a taxpayer have a right to be given a statement of reasons how a solution was reached through mutual agreement procedures? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 10 - Legislation

69. Is there a prohibition on retrospective tax legislation in your country? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

70. If no, are there restrictions on the adoption of retrospective tax legislation in your country? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "Yes" to question 69)

☐ Yes

☐ No

71. Is there a procedure in your country for public consultation before the adopting of all (or most) tax legislation? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

72. Is tax legislation subject to constitutional review which can strike down unconstitutional laws? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 11 - Revenue practice and guidance

73. Does the tax authority in your country publish guidance (e.g. revenue manuals, circulars, etc.) as to how it applies your tax law? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

74. Does your country have a generalised system of advanced rulings available to taxpayers? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

75. If yes, is it legally binding? *

☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 74)

☒ Yes

☐ No

76. If a binding ruling is refused, does the taxpayer have a right to appeal? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

77. If your country publishes guidance as to how it applies your tax law, can taxpayers acting in good faith rely on that published guidance (i.e. protection of legitimate expectations)? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 76)

☐ Yes

☐ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 12 - Institutional framework for protecting taxpayers' rights

78. Is there a taxpayers' charter or taxpayers' bill of rights in your country? *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

☒ Yes

☐ No

79. If yes, are its provisions legally effective? *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to the previous question)

☒ Yes

☐ No

80. Is there a (tax) ombudsman / taxpayers' advocate / equivalent position in your country? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

81. If yes, can the ombudsman intervene in an on-going dispute between the taxpayer and the tax authority (before it goes to court)? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 80)

☐ Yes

☐ No

82. If yes to a (tax) ombudsman, is he/she independent from the tax authority? *

☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 80)

☐ Yes

☐ No

83. Is there a taxpayers' charter or taxpayers' bill of rights in your country? *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

☒ Yes

☐ No

84. If yes, are its provisions legally effective? *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

- ☐ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to the previous question)
- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

85. Is there a (tax) ombudsman / taxpayers' advocate / equivalent position in your country? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

86. If yes, can the ombudsman intervene in an on-going dispute between the taxpayer and the tax authority (before it goes to court)? *

- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 85)
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

87. If yes to a (tax) ombudsman, is he/she independent from the tax authority? *

- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 80)
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 13 - Artificial Intelligence (AI)/Automated Analytical Systems (AAS)

88. Are taxpayers who are subject to a tax compliance procedure that involves AI/AAS informed of that fact? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not applicable (in case no AI/AAS is used)

89. In communications between a tax authority and a taxpayer that employs AI/AAS, is it stated that the tax authorities is represented only by a machine? *

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Not applicable

90. If a decision relating to tax administration has been taken by the use of AI/AAS, is the taxpayer provided with basic details of the procedure applied? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Not applicable

91. Do the tax authorities publish details of the type of AI/AAS employed with specific information about the purpose for which they are used? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

92. Does a system exist for voluntary registration of AI/AAS? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

93. If yes to 92, does the tax authority register all AI/AAS tools or algorithms with that system? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to question 92)

94. Are decisions that may have a significant impact on a taxpayer taken exclusively by AI/AAS? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Not applicable

95. If decisions impacting a taxpayer are taken by AI/AAS, are they overseen by a suitably qualified individual before the decision is notified? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Not applicable

96. If an audit employs material generated by AI/AAS, is that material available to taxpayers and their advisors? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Not applicable

97. If yes to 96, is an explanation provided and does the taxpayer have an effective remedy against unlawful or inaccurate use of AI/AAS? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not applicable (click here if you answered "No" to Question 96)

98. Do tax authorities publish guidance notes explaining the way in which they use AI/AAS? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

99. If revenue authorities use AI/AAS, do they publish guidelines and points of contact for taxpayers who have questions or concerns about those procedures? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not applicable

100. Does the tax administration appoint a senior official with overriding responsibility for AI/AAS in the tax administration? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Not applicable

Google Forms

OPTR - 2024 Questionnaire 2 - Standards of Protection

Dear National Reporter,

I would like to thank you for your participation in the IBFD Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights (OPTR).

This form collects the information on developments occurred in 2024 regarding the implementation of 57 minimum standards and 44 best practices, distributed into 86 benchmarks, for the practical protection of taxpayers' rights as monitored by the OPTR.

We kindly ask you to provide an impartial, non-judgmental summary of events occurred in 2024 that in your opinion affect the level of compliance of a given minimum standard/best practice in your country. These events may include, without limitation, legislation enacted, administrative rulings and/or circulars issued, case law and tax administration practices implemented, among others, as requested by this form.

In ALL cases back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials, and provide full details for identifying the documents related to the reported developments. Either a (soft) copy or internet links to make said documents available (and therefore, quotable) are greatly appreciated.

You are also kindly required to assess whether the events you described represent either a step towards or a step away from the practical implementation of the given minimum standard/best practice in your country. Full instructions are provided below.

This form should be filled in as soon as any of the events mentioned above occurs and edited as many times as necessary to cover all relevant developments occurred in 2024, until no later than 10 January 2025. We appreciate very much your cooperation in this regard.

Feel free to contact us for any clarification you may need. We look forward to your valuable contribution to this remarkable project.

Kind regards,

Dr Sam van der Vlugt
Scientific Coordinator
IBFD Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights.

* Better if filled in using Google Chrome © or Mozilla Firefox ©

Email *

afuentespieruccini@consortiumlegal.com

Reporters' info

Name: *

Alfredo Rodríguez / Alejandra Fuentes-Pieruccini

Country: *

Guatemala

Affiliation *

☒ Taxpayers / Tax Practitioners

☐ Tax Administration

☐ Judiciary

☐ (Tax) Ombudsperson

☐ Academia

☐ Other:

Instructions

1. Please answer all questions. The form will not allow you to continue/submit your responses until you have answered all questions.

2. All questions are two or three-tiered (namely, either with parts "MS" and/or "BP", and "S"). They comprise a minimum standard (MS) and /or a best practice (BP), and a "summary of relevant facts in 2024" (S). The latter is a space for providing a summarized account on facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way.

3. Please Indicate, by clicking on the corresponding button, whether there was an improvement or a

decrease of the level of compliance of the relevant standard/best practice in your country in 2024. If there were no changes, please indicate so by clicking on the corresponding button.

4. In ALL cases where an assessment of either improvement or decrease is reported, please refer the relevant novelties in the space provided under "summary of relevant facts in 2024", for each question. Please give a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. In case there is nothing to report for a given minimum standard/best practice, please answer "no changes".

5. If any, make additional, non-judgmental commentaries at the space provided under "summary of relevant facts in 2024".

6. In ALL cases back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcomed to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org.

7. When completed, please submit the survey.

8. Once you have submitted the survey, you will receive an email acknowledging your participation in the OPTR and providing a backup of your answers.

9. The email will also include an "edit your survey" link, in case you want to modify any of your answers. You will receive this email every time you submit partial responses.

10. An option to quit the survey and save your answers is provided at the end of each section. This survey has 12 sections, as many as those identified by Baker and Pistone in their 2015 IFA General Report.

11. If answering partially, please select "Yes" at the end of the section in which you are to submit your partial answers to the survey. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this survey.

12. For editing your answers, please use the last "edit your response" link provided to you via email. Please bear in mind that this is the only way the system will acknowledge your previous answers. If you use a link other than the last one provided, some (or all) changes might not be retrieved by the system.

13. When clicking on the last "edit your response" link, the system will lead you to the front page of the survey. Click on "Next" as many times as needed to get to the section you want to continue in. Once you have reached said section, please remember to change your answer to the question "Do you want to save your results and quit?" to "No", in order to be able to continue.

Area 1 - Identification of taxpayers, issuing tax returns and communicating with taxpayers

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org)
an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's
legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations

of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated.
Thank you.

1 (MS). Implement safeguards to prevent impersonation when issuing a unique identification number *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

1. (BP) Methods of identifying taxpayers should employ the highest levels of identification security, including dual authentication (without imposing an excessive burden on taxpayers to log in when accessing private information or engaging in communication with the revenue authorities) *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

1 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

2 (MS). The system of taxpayer identification should take account of religious sensitivities *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

2 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

3 (MS). Impose obligations of confidentiality on third parties with respect to information gathered by them for tax purposes *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

3 (BP). Where tax is withheld by third parties, the taxpayer should be excluded from liability if * the third party fails to pay over the tax

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

3 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

4 (MS). Where pre/populated returns are used, these should be sent to taxpayers to correct * errors.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

4 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

5 (MS). Provide a right to access to taxpayers to personal information held about them, and a right to correct inaccuracies. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

5 (BP). Publish guidance on taxpayers' rights to access information and correct inaccuracies *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

5 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

6 (MS). Where communication with taxpayers is in electronic form, institute systems to prevent impersonation or interception *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

6 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

7 (MS). Where a system of "cooperative compliance" operates, ensure it is available on a non-discriminatory and voluntary basis *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

7 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration was very active with the negotiations of taxpayers, however, the criteria to determine which taxpayers would be called to discussed potential liabilities was unclear, thus creating a risk of discrimination. There are no publications from the tax administration regarding its policies.

8 (MS). 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 *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

8 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

All tax declarations must be filled and paid through electronic means, which increases the difficulty for those in remote areas to comply with their obligations. The news shared in the attachment shows that the tax administration has done a great job at promoting the electronic platforms of the tax administration. However, there are no means in place to 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

9 (MS). Compliance obligations on third parties should only be imposed where necessary and in all cases the burden imposed on third parties should be proportionate and not excessive *

- ☒ No Changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

9 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024.

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

10 (MS). In circumstances of force majeure (e.g. pandemics / natural disasters), mechanisms should automatically apply to relieve taxpayers of compliance obligations that have become excessively difficult due to the circumstances. The point at which such circumstances start to apply and cease to apply should be clearly and publicly announced *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

10 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024.

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

11 (BP). Tax compliance obligations should be designed so as to ensure that taxpayers can fulfil their compliance obligations without excessive cost and without the compulsory use of a tax agent, due regard being had to the type of taxpayer (individual / corporate / others) and to the complexity of the taxpayer's tax affairs *

- ☐ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☒ Shifted towards

11 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024.

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The Law 31-202 Creates two special and simplified regimens, which simplifies the compliance for the commercialization of livestock and agricultural products. A summary of both regimens is attached.

12 (MS). Compliance obligations on third parties should only be imposed where necessary * and in all cases the burden imposed on third parties should be proportionate and not excessive

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

12 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024.

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 2 - The issue of tax assessment

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org)
an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's
legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations
of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated.
Thank you.

13 (BP). Establish a constructive dialogue between taxpayers and revenue authorities to ensure a fair assessment of taxes based on equality of arms *

☒ No changes

☐ Shifted away

☐ Shifted towards

13 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

14 (BP). Use e-filing to speed up assessments and correction of errors, particularly systematic errors

*

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

14 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

15 (MS). Where a tax assessment indicates a repayment is due, that repayment should be made without undue delay or unnecessary formalities. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

15 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Area 3 - Confidentiality and data protection

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

16 (MS). Provide a specific legal guarantee for confidentiality and data protection, with sanctions for officials who make unauthorised disclosures (and ensure sanctions are enforced).

*

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

16 (MS). Encrypt information held by a tax authority about taxpayers to the highest level attainable.

*

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

16 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

17 (MS). Introduce an offence for tax officials covering up unauthorised disclosure of confidential information. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

17 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

18 (MS). Restrict access to data to those officials authorised to consult it. For encrypted data, use digital access codes. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

18 (MS). Ensure an effective fire-wall to prevent unauthorised access to data held by revenue authorities. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

18 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

19 (MS). Data protection rights apply to all information held by tax authorities. This includes rights to access data and correct inaccuracies and the destruction (or anonymous archiving) of all data once its purpose has been fulfilled. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

19 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

20 (MS). Audit data access periodically to identify cases of unauthorised access. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

20 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

21 (MS). Introduce administrative measures emphasizing confidentiality to tax officials. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

21 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

22 (MS). Where tax officials are permitted to work remotely (e.g. from home), equivalent measures should be taken to ensure confidentiality and data protection as if the official were working from a tax office. The measures taken to ensure confidentiality and data protection should be audited on a regular basis. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

22 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

23 (MS). Appoint data protection/privacy officers at senior level and local tax offices. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

23 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

24 (MS). If a breach of confidentiality occurs, investigate fully with an appropriate level of seniority by independent persons (e.g. judges). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

24 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

25 (MS). Introduce an offence for tax officials and others covering up unauthorised disclosure of confidential information

*

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

25 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

26 (MS). Taxpayers who are victims of unauthorised disclosure of confidential information *
should be entitled: a) to be informed as soon as possible of the unauthorised disclosure; and
b) to full compensation, including damages (in cases where tax authorities and third parties
have not maintained adequate standards of data protection).

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

26 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

27 (MS). Exceptions to the general rule of confidentiality should be explicitly stated in the *
law, narrowly drafted and interpreted. Data held by tax authorities (or third parties for tax
purposes) should only be accessible to those who can show a legitimate interest in access to
that data

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

27 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Decree 31-2024 creates the obligation to automatically share information held by other government institutions with the tax administration about the taxpayers. A summary of the applicable law is attached.

28 (MS). Information held by a tax authority (or by third parties for tax purposes) should not be supplied to other public authorities unless the transfer is authorised by law and there are appropriate safeguards (e.g. a requirement of judicial authorisation). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

28 (BP). Require judicial authorisation before any disclosure of confidential information by revenue authorities *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

28 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

29 (MS). If "naming and shaming" is employed, ensure adequate safeguards (e.g. judicial authorisation after proceedings involving the taxpayer). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

29 (BP). If "naming and shaming" is employed by any governmental body on the basis of tax information, then personal data that places the individual at risk (e.g. the individual's home address) should not be disclosed. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

29 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

There have been several instances in which the tax administration and the prosecution has shared personal details regarding cases of tax fraud, such as the example attached.

30 (BP). Legislation should protect whistleblowers in appropriate cases (including where the information disclosed demonstrates that a crime has been committed), in particular where the whistleblower discloses breaches of confidentiality and data protection by revenue authorities (and by third parties holding data for tax purposes). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

30 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

31 (MS). No disclosure of confidential taxpayer information to politicians, or where it might be * used for political purposes.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

31 (BP). Parliamentary supervision of revenue authorities should involve independent * officials, subject to confidentiality obligations, examining specific taxpayer data, and then reporting to Parliament.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

31 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

32 (MS). Freedom of information legislation should allow a taxpayer to access information relevant to the tax system and how it impacts on that taxpayer (including all information about themselves). 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. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

32 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Decree 31-2024 obligates several governmental offices to share information automatically with the tax administration.

33 (MS). If published, tax rulings should be anonymised and details that might identify the taxpayer removed. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

33 (BP). Anonymised tax rulings should be published to allow taxpayers to understand administrative practices. This should be subject to exceptions where publication would be potentially damaging to the taxpayer concerned *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

33 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

34 (BP). Anonymise all tax judgments and remove details that might identify the taxpayer. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

34 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

35 (MS). Legal professional privilege should apply to tax advice. *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

35 (BP). 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. *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

35 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration authorities have mention the possibility to go after tax advisors regarding certain tax adjustments, thus making the privilege from disclosure more vulnerable. However, have not been specific publications about this topic.

36 (MS). Where tax authorities enter premises which may contain privileged material, arrangements should be made (e.g. an independent lawyer) to protect that privilege. *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annexe with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

36 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The Courts have ruled that the tax administration requirements of information are not subject to any legal recourse, which venerates the right to deny the disclosure of privileged materials.

37 (MS). Mandatory disclosure requirements (if adopted) should be clearly drafted and only * apply to cases in which such disclosure is strictly necessary and proportionate. The disclosure obligation should not operate to adversely affect the relationship with professional advisors and other third parties to a disproportionate extent.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

37 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Area 4 - Normal audits

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated.

Thank you.

38 (MS). Audits should respect the following principles: (i) Proportionality. (2) Ne bis in idem * (prohibition of double jeopardy). (3) Audi alteram partem (right to be heard before any decision is taken). (4) Nemo tenetur se detegere (principle against self/incrimination). Tax notices issued in violation of these principles should be null and void.

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

38 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Since the ruling states that it is not possible to object or discussed the requirement of information that initiates the audit, this can affect the proportionality and Nemo Tenetur principles.

39 (MS). 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.

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

39 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

There are no limits regarding the information that the tax administration can request. In some cases if the taxpayers objects, the tax administration have mention the possibility to initiate cimnal prosecution. This has been mention in meetings but there are no publications regarding the matter

40 (BP). In application of ne bis in idem the taxpayer should only receive one audit per taxable period, except when facts that become known after the audit was completed. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shift away
- ☐ Shift towards

40 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

There have been cases in which the tax administration uses the information gather in one audit to formalize a tax adjustment for other taxable periods. There are no publitations regarding this matter.

41 (MS). In application of audi alteram partem, 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. This should apply equally to on-line meetings. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

41 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

42 (MS). In application of nemo tenetur, the right to remain silent should be respected in all tax audits. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

42 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

This is the same situation as in question 36.

43 (BP). Tax audits should follow a pattern that is set out in published guidelines. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

43 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

44 (BP). A manual of good practice in tax audits should be established at the global level. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

44 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

45 (BP). Taxpayers should be entitled to request the start of a tax audit (to obtain finality). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

45 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

46 (MS). Where tax authorities have resolved to start an audit, they should inform the taxpayer

*

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

46 (BP). 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.

*

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

46 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration has implemented a system that allows it to audit and make decisions regarding potential tax adjustments, without the knowledge of the taxpayers.

47 (MS). Taxpayers should be informed of information gathering from third parties. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

47 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

48 (MS). For normal audits there should be a limitation period for the start of the audit; this should only be extended where information comes to light that could not reasonably have been obtained previously. Once an audit has commenced, it should be conducted with a view to achieving certainty and finality as soon as reasonable, and adequate resources should be devoted to achieving that objective. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

48 (BP). Reasonable time limits should be fixed for the conduct of audits. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

48 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

49 (MS). Technical assistance (including representation) should be available at all stages of the audit by experts selected by the taxpayer. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

49 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

In some cases the tax administration has expressed their disapproval for tax advisors to attend certain meetings with the tax administration.

50 (MS). The completion of a tax audit should be accurately reflected in a document, notified * in its full text to the taxpayer.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

50 (BP). 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.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

50 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

51 (MS). Once a tax audit is completed, no further evidence should be collected or included, *
no further arguments brought forward by the tax authorities, and no further tax charges brought, unless in exceptional circumstances (e.g. where information comes to light that the taxpayer has concealed).

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

51 (BP). Following an audit, a report should be prepared even if the audit does not result in *
additional tax or refund.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

51 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 5 - More intensive audits

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org)
an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's
legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of
such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated.
Thank you.

52 (BP). More intensive audits should be limited to the extent strictly necessary to ensure an effective reaction to non-compliance. *

☒ No changes

☐ Shifted away

☐ Shifted towards

52 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

53 (MS). 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. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

53 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration usually decides that a case would be criminalized before they inform the taxpayers. In some instances there have been media publications regarding criminal cases before the notification to the taxpayers.

54 (MS). Entering premises should be authorised by the judiciary. Judicial supervision of the search should be available at all times. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

54 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

55 (MS). Authorisation within the revenue authorities should only be in cases of urgency, and subsequently reported to the judiciary for ex-post ratification. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

55 (BP). Evidence obtained as a result of a search that was not authorised by the judiciary *
should not be admissible.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

55 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

56 (MS). Inspection of the taxpayer's home should require authorisation by the judiciary and *
only be given in exceptional cases.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

56 (BP). 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.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

56 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

57 (BP). Access to bank information for tax purposes (including automatically-supplied * information) should require judicial authorisation.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

57 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

58 (MS). Authorisation by the judiciary should be necessary for the interception of telephone communications and monitoring of internet access. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

58 (BP). Specialised offices within the judiciary should be established to supervise the interception of telephone communications and monitoring of internet access. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

58 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

59 (MS). Seizure of documents or data held on computer drives should be subject to a requirement to give reasons why seizure is indispensable, and to fix the time when the documents and data will be returned; seizure should be limited in time. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

59 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

60 (BP). 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. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

60 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

61 (BP). If digital data is copied or removed, it should be done in a way that does not prevent or affect the normal operations of the electronic information system. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

61 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

62 (MS). Where invasive techniques are applied, they should be limited in time to avoid a disproportionate impact on taxpayers. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

62 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 6 - Reviews and appeals

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

63 (BP). E-filing of requests for internal review to ensure the effective and speedy handling of * the review process.

☒ No changes

☐ Shifted away

☐ Shifted towards

63 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

64 (MS). The right to appeal should not depend upon prior exhaustion of administrative reviews. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

64 (BP). Taxpayers may have an alternative of taking an appeal to an arbitration tribunal in place of the tax courts. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

64 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

65 (MS). Taxpayers should have a remedy to accelerate or terminate (including through reference to mediation or ADR) reviews and appeals in cases of excessive delay. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

65 (BP). Reviews and appeals should not exceed two years. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

65 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

66 (MS). Audi alteram partem should apply in administrative reviews and judicial appeals. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

66 (BP). The review or appeal of tax decisions should not place on the taxpayer an excessive or impossible burden of evidence. This should apply, in particular, where the burden is on the taxpayer to prove a negative (e.g. to prove the absence of motive) or to prove facts that occurred significantly in the past (e.g. more than 10 years previously).

*

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

66 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration, in some administrative appeals has changed the original motives for the tax adjustments, thus creating a burden to the taxpayer. In the judicial process the courts in some cases has repeated the arguments of the tax administration without considering the evidence presented by the taxpayers.

67 (MS). Where tax must be paid in whole or in part before an appeal, there must be an effective mechanism for providing interim suspension of payment.

*

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

67 (BP). An appeal should not require prior payment of tax in all cases. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

67 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

68 (BP). The state should bear some or all of the costs of an appeal, whatever the outcome. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

68 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

69 (MS). Legal assistance should be provided for those taxpayers who cannot afford it. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

69 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

70 (MS). Taxpayers should have the right to request the exclusion of the public from a tax appeal hearing. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

70 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

71 (MS). Taxpayers should have the right to request an online hearing or to object to an online hearing. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

71 (MS). Tax judgments should be published. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

71 (BP). If tax judgments are published, the taxpayer should be able to ensure anonymity (or at least the removal of confidential information). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

71 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Area 7 - Criminal and administrative sanctions

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

72 (MS). Proportionality and ne bis in idem should apply to tax penalties. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

72 (BP). The cumulative effect of penalties, interest and surcharges should not exceed the amount of tax due (and should only reach this amount in cases of the most serious violations). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

72 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

73 (BP). Where administrative and criminal sanctions may both apply, only one procedure and one sanction should be applied. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

73 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

74 (BP). Voluntary disclosure should lead to reduction of penalties. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

74 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

75 (MS). Sanctions should not be increased simply to encourage taxpayers to make voluntary disclosures. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

75 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 8 - Enforcement of taxes

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

76 (MS). Collection of taxes should never deprive taxpayers of their minimum necessary for living. *

☒ No changes

☐ Shifted away

☐ Shifted towards

76 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

77 (BP). Authorisation by the judiciary should be required before seizing assets or bank accounts *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

77 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

78 (MS). Taxpayers should have the right to request delayed payment of arrears. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

78 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

79 (BP). Bankruptcy of taxpayers should be avoided, by partial remission of the debt or structured plans for deferred payment. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

79 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

80 (MS). Temporary suspension of tax enforcement should follow natural disasters. *

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

80 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Area 9 - Cross-border situations

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated.

Thank you.

81 (MS). 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. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

81 (BP). The taxpayer should be informed that a cross-border request for information is to be made. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

81 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

82 (MS). The taxpayer should have a right to bring a legal challenge to test the legality of the request for exchange of information. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

82 (BP). Where a cross-border request for information is made, the requested state should also be asked to supply information that assists the taxpayer. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

82 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

83 (BP). Provisions should be included in tax treaties setting specific conditions for exchange *
of information.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

83 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

84 (MS). If information is sought from third parties, judicial authorisation should be *
necessary and the third party should have a right to bring a legal challenge to test the legality
of the request for exchange of information (on the same grounds as the taxpayer).

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

84 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

85 (MS). In the case of exchange of information on request, the taxpayer should be given access to information received by the requesting state (unless there are good justifications for not doing so). *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

85 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration requested information for the first time to the Netherlands regarding Airbnb information in Guatemala, however the taxpayers did not have the access to the information obtained.

86 (BP). Information should not be supplied in response to a request where the originating cause was the acquisition of stolen or illegally obtained information. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

86 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

87 (BP). A requesting state should provide confirmation of confidentiality to the requested state. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

87 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

88 (MS). 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. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

88 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

89 (MS). In the event of a leak of confidential information or data held by the tax authority of a requesting state, all exchange of information with that state should be suspended until verifiable evidence has been provided that the cause of the leak has been permanently rectified. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

89 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

90 (MS). Data protection safeguards should apply to all exchanges of information. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

90 (BP). For automatic exchange of financial information, the taxpayer should be notified of the proposed exchange in sufficient time to exercise data protection rights. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

90 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

91 (MS). The taxpayer should be notified of an exchange of information and given sufficient time to exercise data protection rights (including the right to correct inaccurate data). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

91 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

92 (MS). Time limits should apply to the retention of data that is exchanged (and the data should be destroyed or anonymously archived within this time limit). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

92 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

93 (MS). No exchange of information should be permitted with respect to any state if it is reasonably foreseeable that the recipient state will use the data in a way that is repressive or that would undermine the protection of fundamental rights. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

93 (BP). No exchange of information should be permitted with respect to any state if that state does not guarantee adequate data protection in its law and in practice. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

93 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

94 (MS). Taxpayers should have a right to request initiation of mutual agreement procedure. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

94. (BP). Where mutual agreement procedure (or arbitration following mutual agreement procedure) reaches a solution or fails to reach a solution, the taxpayer should be given a statement of reasons how that solution was reached (or why no solution was reached). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

94 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

95 (MS). Taxpayers should have a right to participate in mutual agreement procedure by being heard and being informed as to the progress of the procedure. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

95 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Area 10 - Legislation

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

96 (MS). Retrospective tax legislation should only be permitted in limited circumstances which are spelt out in detail (and that respect the rule of law and the principle of legitimate expectation). *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

96 (BP). Retrospective tax legislation should ideally be banned completely. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

96 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

97 (BP). Public consultation should precede the making of tax policy and tax law. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

97 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

98 (MS). All tax legislation should be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that it supports the gradual realisation of the rights set out in the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural rights. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

98 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

99 (MS). All tax legislation should be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that it is consistent with the realisation of the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

*

- ☒ No changes.
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

99 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 11 - Revenue practice and guidance

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org)
an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's
legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations
of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated.
Thank you.

100 (MS). Taxpayers should be entitled to access all relevant legal material, comprising
legislation, administrative regulations, rulings, manuals and other guidance. *

☒ No changes

☐ Shifted away

☐ Shifted towards

100 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

101 (MS). 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. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

101 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

102 (MS). Where a state has a system of advance rulings, they should be binding on the tax ^{*} authorities (unless based on an incorrect presentation of the relevant circumstances).

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

102 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

103 (MS). Where a taxpayer relies upon published guidance of a revenue authority which ^{*} subsequently proves to be inaccurate, changes should apply only prospectively.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

103 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 12 - Institutional framework for protecting taxpayers' rights

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org)

an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

104 (MS). Adoption of a charter or statement of taxpayers' rights should be a minimum standard. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

104 (BP). A separate statement of taxpayers' rights under audit should be provided to taxpayers who are audited. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

104 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

105 (BP). A charter or statement of taxpayers' rights should be legally enforceable. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

105 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

106 (BP). 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. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

106 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

107 (BP). The organisational structure for the protection of taxpayers' rights should operate at local level as well as nationally. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

107 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

Do you want to save your results and quit? *

If "Yes", please submit the form. If "Yes", bear in mind that there are still several questions that need to be answered later. To edit/complete your answers later, please use the "edit your response" link sent to your email after submitting this form. If not, click "Next" to continue.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Area 13 - Artificial intelligence / Automated analytical systems

Please provide separately (via optr@ibfd.org) an annex with the actual wording of relevant excerpts of your country's legislation regarding this matter. Technically accurate translations of such material into English, if possible, would be very appreciated. Thank you.

108 (MS). All taxpayers who are subject to a tax compliance procedure that involves artificial intelligence or automated analytical systems should be informed that such procedures will be applied. *

☐ No changes

☒ Shifted away

☐ Shifted towards

108 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration has been using an AI system to audit the taxpayer without their knowledge, and has not shared the details regarding its use.

109 (MS). All communications between a tax authority and a taxpayer that employ artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems (e.g. via “chatbots” or automated correspondence) should state whether the tax authority is represented only by a machine or whether there is (or has been) human intervention. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

109 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

110 (MS). Where any decision relating to tax administration has been taken in respect of a taxpayer by the use of artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems, the taxpayer should be informed of that fact together with basic details of the procedure that has been applied. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

110 (BP). Where any decision relating to tax administration has been taken in respect of a taxpayer by the use of artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems, the taxpayer should be given full details of the criteria and algorithms that were used to reach that decision. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

110 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration has been using an AI system to audit the taxpayer without their knowledge, and has not shared the details regarding its use or or any details.

111 (BP). Tax authorities should publish details of the types of artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems employed by the revenue authority with specific details about the purposes for which the artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems are being used. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

111 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

112 (BP). Where a system exists for voluntary registration of artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems tools or algorithms the tax authority should register all such tools and algorithms it employs. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

112 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

113 (MS). No decisions that may have a significant impact on a taxpayer may be taken exclusively by artificial intelligence/automated analytical systems. All decisions affecting a taxpayer should be overseen by a suitably qualified individual before the decision is notified. This applies both to decisions by the tax authorities and by judicial authorities. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

113 (BP). No decisions impacting a taxpayer should be taken exclusively by artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems. All decisions affecting a taxpayer should be overseen by a suitably qualified individual before the decision is notified. This applies both to decisions by the tax authorities (in connection with audits and reviews) and by judicial authorities. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

113 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

114 (MS). When an audit (or a more intense audit) employs any material generated by artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems, the material generated should be made available to taxpayers and their advisers, together with an explanation of how the material was derived by artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems. The taxpayer's legal remedies should be effective against unlawful or inaccurate use of artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

114 (BP). Where artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems are to be employed by a tax authority (e.g. to identify under-declarations or evasion of tax), any taxpayers who may be impacted (which may include all taxpayers) should be given prior warning of the proposed action and given an opportunity to make voluntary disclosure (without any additional potential penalty). *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

114 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

The tax administration has been using an AI system for its analysis and has not shared the details nor has given any warning to the taxpayers.

115 (MS). All revenue authorities should publish guidance notes explaining the ways in which they use artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems in connection with tax compliance and administration, together with guidelines for the use of those procedures and points of contact for taxpayers who have questions or concerns about those procedures. *

- ☐ No changes
- ☒ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

115 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

There has been no publications regarding the use of AI

116 (MS). Algorithms used by tax authorities should not use criteria that are foreseeably likely to have a discriminatory or distortive or disproportionate effect on the decisions taken as a consequence of the use of those algorithms. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

116 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

117 (MS). Where the use of artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems by a tax authority risks infringing any fundamental rights (e.g. the right to privacy) additional safeguards for those should be required. *

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

117 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

118 (MS). All tax administrations should appoint a senior official with overriding responsibility *
for the use of artificial intelligence / automated analytical systems in tax administration by
that tax authority.

- ☒ No changes
- ☐ Shifted away
- ☐ Shifted towards

118 (S). Summary of relevant facts in 2024

Only if answered "shifted away" or "shifted towards", please give here a summarized account of facts (legislation enacted, administrative rulings, circulars, case law, tax administration practices), in a non-judgmental way. Specify if some content is no longer applicable, due to other developments. If applicable, indicate whether the fact reported is under a minimum standard or fully complies with the best practice. IN ALL CASES please back up your assertions with the relevant documentary materials. While it is not mandatory, a short summary of such materials in English is appreciated. You are welcome to send us these materials to our email: optr@ibfd.org. Thank you.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Question 8 (s)

<https://portal.sat.gob.gt/portal/noticias/atencion-a-los-contribuyentes-sera-mas-agil-y-eficiente/>

Marco Livio Díaz Reyes, Superintendent of Tax Administration, accompanied by Armando Gabriel Pokus Yaquián, Intendant of Taxpayer Services, presented the Multichannel Platform, which enables the integrated management of all communication channels and optimizes taxpayer assistance to make it more agile and efficient.

The Multichannel Platform unifies services such as telephone support via Contact Center 1550, the SAT Chat on the website, email, social media, and the RITA chatbot. Taxpayers now have access to:

- Personalized assistance for each inquiry.
- Real-time monitoring to track the status of their requests, ensuring greater transparency and trust.
- Traceability of inquiries for effective follow-up.

This platform is the result of an innovation process using software to manage official communication channels. It strengthens institutional actions to address inquiries and handle taxpayers' requests related to updating the Taxpayer Registration (RTU), vehicle transfers, filing returns, activity cessation, and Virtual Agency activation, among other services.

Through the multichannel platform, taxpayers can also receive assistance via the Telegram channel. The platform's chat and video call capabilities enhance interaction with taxpayers.

As of October 31, 2024, the platform has handled 497,000 taxpayer inquiries nationwide, achieving a service effectiveness rate of 97.91% and user satisfaction of 86.29%. This reaffirms the SAT's institutional commitment to providing high-quality taxpayer service, facilitating compliance with tax obligations, and contributing to the country we all strive for.

Question 11 (S)

Decree 31-2024 was enacted in December 2024, which creates two special simplified regimens.

1. Special Regime for the Production and Commercialization of Agricultural Products and Handicrafts Produced in Guatemala (Primary Regime)

This regime is designed to promote the formalization and competitiveness of small and medium-sized producers of agricultural products and Guatemalan handicrafts. It simplifies tax obligations to encourage compliance.

Scope: Producers and sellers of agricultural products and handicrafts made in Guatemala.

Tax Rates: 1.5% monthly on gross sales for domestic transactions. 2% monthly on gross sales for exports.

Taxpayer Obligations:

- Monthly declaration and payment.
- No deductions for costs or expenses.
- Maintenance of a special ledger for recording gross sales, as authorized by the tax administration.

Benefits:

- Simplified tax filing and payment process.
- Access to government support programs.
- Incentives to boost export activities.

2. Special Regime for the Production and Commercialization of Livestock, Aquaculture, and Beekeeping Products (Livestock Regime)

This regime aims to support the formalization and sustainability of small and medium-sized producers in the livestock, aquaculture, and beekeeping sectors. It includes specific provisions for intermediaries in the bovine product trade.

Scope: Producers and sellers in the livestock, aquaculture, and beekeeping industries, as well as intermediaries dealing with bovine products.

Tax Rates: 1.5% monthly on gross sales for domestic transactions. 2% monthly on gross sales for exports. 10% on profits for intermediaries involved in the commercialization of bovine products.

Taxpayer Obligations:

- Monthly tax declaration and payment.
- Special reporting for intermediaries to determine taxable profits.

Benefits:

- Enhanced support for producers and intermediaries.
- Simplified compliance processes.
- Promotion of formal trade and economic growth in the sector.
- These simplified tax regimes are tailored to facilitate compliance, promote economic activity, and foster transparency and formalization within key sectors of Guatemala's economy.

Question 27 (S) and 32 (S)

Decree 31-2024 establishes the obligation to share information automatically to the tax administration. This is contained in article 19 of the law, that modifies article 120 of the Guatemalan Tax Code. This article states:

“A Unified Tax Registry (Registro Tributario Unificado) is established, encompassing the registration, updating, ratification of data, and cessation of activities of obligated parties in accordance with this Code, as established by tax, customs, and related laws.

The creation, integration, and maintenance of the Unified Tax Registry—or any future equivalent—shall fall under the jurisdiction of the Superintendency of Tax Administration (SAT), which must ensure its formation and consolidation.

The following entities are required to register in the Unified Tax Registry: individuals, legal entities, public and private entities, profit or non-profit, and their responsible parties, before initiating activities.

State entities, prior to granting operating permits or licenses, must verify that applicants are registered with the Tax Administration as VAT taxpayers.

Taxpayers or responsible parties must submit their registration requests through appropriate means established by the Tax Administration, which must include at a minimum:

- a) Full names of the individual;
- b) Legal name or business name of the legal entity, as applicable;
- c) Name of the taxpayers referred to in Article 22 of this Code;
- d) Commercial name, if applicable;
- e) Full names of the legal representative of the legal entity or the taxpayers referred to in Article 22 of this Code, as well as of administrators, managers, or agents as stated in

the articles of incorporation or amendments, and a copy of the document certifying representation, duly registered when applicable;

f) Full names, or legal name, of shareholders or partners of the legal entity and their percentage of participation, when applicable, through the means provided by the Tax Administration;

g) Tax domicile;

h) Main and secondary economic activities;

i) Start date of activities;

j) Registration for applicable taxes;

k) For foreign legal entities, specify whether they operate as an agency, branch, or other format;

l) Tax Identification Number (NIT) of the accountant, when required to maintain complete accounting records.

Additionally, as determined by the Tax Administration, taxpayers must:

a) Provide at least one confirmed email address and telephone number through established mechanisms.

b) Provide geolocation data for each operational center, business establishment, or other locations where taxable activities are conducted.

If obligated parties fail to register, the Tax Administration may register them ex officio in the Unified Tax Registry and relevant tax regimes, notifying them of the resolution, which will outline their tax obligations and the start date of their monthly tax period, without prejudice to applicable penalties.

The Tax Administration will assign a Tax Identification Number (NIT) to obligated parties. This function is exclusive to SAT, which may utilize authorized third parties at no cost. The NIT issuance process must be conducted personally or through a legal representative, depending on the type of taxpayer.

Entities responsible for registering individuals and legal entities must provide all necessary information electronically, free of charge, and in real-time to the Tax Administration for its functions.

The Tax Identification Number (NIT) must be used in all civil, commercial, and labor relations, financial transactions, notarial acts, administrative and judicial processes,

and included in all dealings with the Tax Administration, invoices, or other tax-related documents.

The State and its centralized, decentralized, autonomous, and semi-autonomous agencies, as well as private sector entities, are required to request and incorporate the NIT in their own records.

The Tax Administration, in coordination with the registration authorities for individuals and legal entities, must establish procedures to ensure the simultaneous issuance of the NIT and registration certificates with the issuance of the Personal Identification Document or Unique Identification Code, or with recognition of the legal entity's status. The Commercial Registry will not register individual or corporate merchants who are not registered in a VAT and Income Tax regime, as applicable. Registration will occur simultaneously. Similarly, it will not authorize the dissolution of companies or the cancellation of individual businesses without evidence of tax compliance.

Any changes to registration data must be reported to the Tax Administration within 30 days of the change. The cessation or temporary suspension of activities must also be reported within the same timeframe after the last applicable declaration is submitted.

Legal entity registries must notify the Tax Administration electronically of any registration changes and the supporting documentation.

Temporary cessation will be valid for the period specified by the taxpayer, not exceeding the statutory limitation period. Permanent cessation may be requested if the taxpayer no longer continues the registered activities or may be declared ex officio by the Tax Administration in specific circumstances.

Taxpayers whose registration data is inconsistent and cannot be located will be given a 15-day notice to correct the issue, after which their VAT regime registration may be suspended, and their electronic invoicing system (FEL) disabled.

Taxpayers must update or confirm their registration data annually, no later than their birth month or corporate anniversary. Failure to comply will result in restrictions on conducting transactions with the Tax Administration.

The Tax Administration will suspend registration for inconsistencies or false information, notify the relevant parties, and file applicable complaints."

Question 29 (BP)

<https://portal.sat.gob.gt/portal/noticias/sat-presento-caso-por-posible-defraudacion-de-q6-9-millones/>

The Superintendent of Tax Administration, Marco Livio Díaz Reyes, accompanied by his top-tier team, announced the identification of a State supplier taxpayer suspected of committing tax fraud amounting to more than Q6.9 million.

This discovery resulted from actions taken by the Intelligent Auditing Units and the use of the Relationship Module. It was determined that the taxpayer received State Entity awards totaling approximately Q133.5 million between 2021 and 2024 (primarily in 2022, which accounted for 54% of the total). The taxpayer also had untraceable fiscal and commercial addresses in San Benito, Flores, and Santa Elena, Petén, as well as in Residenciales Eureka in Zone 21, without demonstrating installed capacity. Furthermore, the taxpayer displayed atypical tax behavior, paying only 2.15% in VAT and 0.01% in Income Tax (ISR) relative to their income.

Following the inability to locate the taxpayer, their VAT registration was suspended under the provisions of Article 120 of the Tax Code. In response, the taxpayer changed their address to one located in Residenciales Eureka, Zone 21...

<https://www.mp.gob.gt/noticia/mp-presenta-resultados-de-primera-fase-del-caso-defraudacion-y-corrupcion-b410/>

The Metropolitan Regional Prosecutor, Dimas Jiménez y Jiménez, in relation to the “B410 Fraud and Corruption” case, began by emphasizing that, in tax matters, the Tax Code, under Article 89, establishes that all complaints must be filed in writing before the competent judge and that specialized jurisdictional bodies exist for tax and customs-related crimes: First Instance Court, Sentencing Tribunal, and Court of Appeals.

He further explained that, in this case, the Economic Crimes Prosecutor's Office, since taking control of the investigation, has carried out over 40 procedures following the complaint filed by the Superintendency of Tax Administration (SAT) on August 14 of this year. Additionally, they have collected various investigative materials that have helped build an objective investigation.

“The information we have gathered has allowed us to operationalize only one phase of the investigation today, as it is an extremely extensive case requiring many hours of work and highly technical and specialized efforts,” he highlighted.

As a result, he stated, the Public Prosecutor's Office (MP) conducted 18 raids today: 13 in the capital, two in Cobán, Alta Verapaz; one in La Antigua Guatemala, Sacatepéquez; one in Mixco, and one in San Juan Sacatepéquez, both in the Department of Guatemala.

Finally, Jiménez y Jiménez noted that this demonstrates the MP's commitment to investigating every reported criminal act. He emphasized that investigations are carried out within established timelines and not under media or social pressure. Judges are presented with solid evidence that allows the prosecution of those who committed a crime, thereby avoiding the risk of a lack of merit due to defective technical investigations.

Four Arrested and Over 400 Companies Investigated

The prosecutor in charge of the case, Mario Francisco Pérez Zapeta, stated that today's proceedings resulted in the arrest of four individuals:

- Attorney **David Francisco Barrera Maldonado**, for the crime of money laundering or other assets.
- **Carlos René Ayala Morales**, legal representative of PCS Constructores, S.A., for the crime of tax fraud.
- **Eder Medardo López Morales**, Head of Purchasing and Contracts at the San Juan de Dios General Hospital, for fraud.

Question 36 (MS), 38 (S), 42 (MS)

The Constitutional Court ruling stated the following: “The Court has determined that, in matters of administrative tax law, a request for information, by its nature, constitutes a solicitation based on the powers granted to tax auditors and supervisors by laws and regulations. Its purpose is to obtain information as part of their function to verify compliance with tax obligations by taxpayers. Therefore, it does not fall under any of the scenarios provided in the recently cited article that would make it subject to challenge through annulment. This is because it is neither a procedural act nor a resolution that, in itself, could result in a violation of constitutional guarantees, legal provisions, or essential formalities of the administrative file, nor does it involve an error in determining the tax obligation, penalties, surcharges, or interest.” The ruling was a change in its criterion in 2024.

Translation of the Constitutional Court Ruling.

The Court has held that, in matters of tax administration, a request for information, by its nature, constitutes a petition made under the powers granted by laws and regulations to tax auditors and supervisors. Its purpose is to obtain information in the exercise of their duty to verify taxpayers' compliance with tax obligations. Therefore, such a request does not fall under any of the scenarios provided in the aforementioned article that would make it subject to a challenge through annulment, as it is not a procedural act or a resolution that, in itself, could violate constitutional guarantees, legal provisions, or essential formalities of the administrative file, nor does it involve an error in the determination of tax liability, fines, surcharges, or interest.

In light of this, the legal position has been established that annulment is not an appropriate means to object to the content of a request for information. (Rulings of October 4, 2018; August 26, 2019; and September 22, 2022, issued in cases 1645-2018, 1047-2019, and 3654-2022, respectively).

This legal doctrine has not been overturned and therefore remains binding pursuant to Articles 43 and 185 of the Law on Amparo, Habeas Corpus, and Constitutionality.

Moreover, the appellant's claim that this legal doctrine was superseded by a new interpretation contained in the order issued in case 4358-2023, formed due to an appeal of the suspension of an amparo proceeding, is inaccurate. That decision does not present any jurisprudential innovation or substantive criterion regarding the matter under review in this case. It merely outlines the reasons for which it was considered necessary to continue with the constitutional proceeding in that specific case.

In summary, that legal doctrine was not modified as a result of the 2016 reform of the Tax Code either, which added Article 21 "A", regulating taxpayer rights, and stating: "...17. Any request for information made by SAT to taxpayers or third parties, for auditing purposes, must be made through the request for information that initiates the administrative process. Any extensions to such request must be related to the same process."

In other words, the regulatory clarification that the request for information initiates the administrative process does not undermine the rationale behind that legal doctrine; on the contrary, it reinforces it, since it highlights that such an act—being the means to initiate the procedure in question or to extend the initial management—cannot, in itself, contain any of the substantive flaws outlined in the aforementioned Article 160 of the Tax Code. It is simply the means by which the Tax Administration initiates the relevant procedure in the exercise of its legally assigned functions of verification, auditing,

control, and investigation. This includes its authority to request and obtain from the taxpayer all necessary information to determine their true tax situation, to require them to declare taxes, and to request any information aimed at verifying the determination or generation of such taxes (as provided, among others, in Articles 98, 98 "A", and 100 of the aforementioned Code).

EXPEDIENTE 1432-2024

CORTE DE CONSTITUCIONALIDAD: Guatemala, dieciocho de diciembre de dos mil veinticuatro.

En apelación, se examina la sentencia de veintinueve de febrero de dos mil veinticuatro, dictada por la Sala Cuarta del Tribunal de lo Contencioso Administrativo, constituida en Tribunal de Amparo, en la acción constitucional de amparo promovida por Seguridad 2614, Sociedad Anónima, por medio de su Gerente General y Representante Legal, Carlos Alberto Lemus Birnie, contra la Superintendencia de Administración Tributaria. La entidad postulante actuó con el auxilio del abogado Emilio Alejandro De León Reynoso. Es ponente en el presente caso la Magistrada Vocal I, Leyla Susana Lemus Arriaga, quien expresa el parecer del Tribunal.

ANTECEDENTES

I. EL AMPARO

A) Solicitud y autoridad: presentado el dieciocho de enero de dos mil veinticuatro en el Centro de Servicios Auxiliares de la Administración de Justicia en Materia Civil, Económico Coactivo y Contencioso Administrativo del Organismo Judicial y remitido, posteriormente, a la Sala Cuarta del Tribunal de lo Contencioso Administrativo. **B) Acto reclamado:** providencia PRO-SAT-GEM-DFI-SOA-2023-22-01-000872 de quince de diciembre de dos mil veintitrés, mediante la cual la Superintendencia de Administración Tributaria rechazó la “*nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento*” que Seguridad 2614, Sociedad Anónima interpuso contra el requerimiento de información 2023-8-1544-2 formulado por tal autoridad en el expediente administrativo 2023-22-01-44-0001919. **C)**

Violaciones que denuncia: a los derechos de tutela administrativa, defensa y



petición, así como a los principios de legalidad, seguridad jurídica y del debido proceso. **D) Relación de los hechos que motivan el amparo:** de lo expuesto por la postulante en el escrito de planteamiento de la acción y de las constancias procesales se resume: **D.1) Producción del acto reclamado:** a) el ocho y veintitrés de agosto de dos mil veintitrés la Superintendencia de Administración Tributaria nombró auditores para verificar el adecuado cumplimiento de las obligaciones tributarias de Seguridad 2614, Sociedad Anónima, correspondientes a los periodos de imposición comprendidos del uno de enero al treinta y uno de diciembre de dos mil veintiuno; b) derivado de ello, se formularon los requerimientos de información 2023-8-1544-1 y 2023-8-1544-2; y c) la contribuyente interpuso “*nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento*” contra este último requerimiento, el cual fue rechazado por improcedente en providencia PRO-SAT-GEM-DFI-SOA-2023-22-01-000872 –**decisión reprochada**-, por estimar la entidad fiscalizadora que el requerimiento de presentar información no puede ser objeto de enmienda o susceptible de impugnarse en la vía de la nulidad. **D.2) Agravios que se reprochan al acto reclamado:** la postulante estima que se han transgredido los derechos y principios aludidos, en atención a que: a) con relación al requerimiento de información cuestionado de nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento, indica: a.1) este es ilegal, carece de fundamento de derecho y excede las facultades legales de la citada Superintendencia, porque se pretende la presentación de información de una manera que la ley no establece, por lo que es evidente lo arbitrario que actuó al requerir la información en soporte papel, cuando, en su mayoría, los contratos se encuentran en electrónico; a.2) en dicho requerimiento se debió tomar en cuenta lo establecido en la Ley para el Reconocimiento de las Comunicaciones y Firmas Electrónicas, por lo que resultó



contrario a la normativa jurídica; **b)** respecto al acto reclamado, la autoridad reprochada arbitrariamente le limita su derecho de interponer un medio de impugnación idóneo, así como obtener una resolución apegada a derecho y debidamente fundamentada, en virtud que: **b.1)** no se emitió pronunciamiento definitivo o de fondo sobre lo alegado y pedido en la impugnación presentada y no se proporciona ninguna solución, pues no se analizan sus argumentos; tampoco se interpretan los artículos en los que dicha autoridad funda su postura, ni se aplica adecuadamente la ley, lo que configura exceso en el ejercicio de sus facultades legales. Aquella autoridad únicamente adujo, bajo consideraciones irrazonables, equivocadas, injustificadas y sin fundamento legal ni técnico, que el requerimiento de información no puede ser susceptible de impugnación mediante “*nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento*” y, que tal requerimiento se funda en su facultad de fiscalización, limitándose a citar la doctrina legal de esta Corte; **b.2)** sin fundamento legal, se abstrae de conocer y resolver la “*nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento*” planteada, respecto de la cual está obligada constitucionalmente a dar una solución apegada a derecho; **b.3)** del artículo 160 del Código Tributario se extrae que la nulidad es inviable cuando proceda el recurso de revocatoria y cuando se interponga fuera del plazo de ley; sin embargo, estos supuestos no acaecen en el presente caso; **b.4)** no da certeza del ordenamiento jurídico en relación con los medios de impugnación a los que puede acudir para oponerse al requerimiento de información; **b.5)** los contribuyentes deben colaborar con la Administración Tributaria y para ello, de acuerdo al artículo 98 del Código Tributario, están obligados a presentarle la información necesaria para que se determinen correctamente los impuestos; sin embargo, la ley no obliga a presentar documentación de una forma específica, mucho menos establece que



el soporte debe ser en papel; **b.6)** convalida un acto evidentemente nulo por contener vicio sustancial en el procedimiento administrativo; y **b.7)** abusa de su facultad de fiscalización y hace presumir mala fe en el ejercicio de su facultad pública, generando desconfianza en su actuar y en el Estado de Derecho, que gira en torno al procedimiento administrativo tributario; y **c)** estima que el amparo es la vía idónea para discutir las infracciones constitucionales provocadas por el rechazo de la *“nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento”* instada contra un requerimiento de información, porque: **c.1)** si bien, la jurisprudencia de esta Corte dispone que el requerimiento de información no puede ser objeto de enmienda o nulidad —debido a que lo realiza la Administración Tributaria con base en sus facultades, por lo que no es un acto procedimental o una resolución que, en sí misma, pueda provocar violaciones constitucionales—, también lo es que este criterio jurisprudencial ha sido superado y no es aplicable cuando la queja se dirige a cuestionar que la entidad fiscalizadora realizó un requerimiento excediéndose en sus facultades legales, situación que, en todo caso, debe constituir la excepción a la regla de la citada doctrina; **c.2)** en el expediente 4358-2023, esta Corte estableció que *“... de momento, no puede determinarse fehacientemente y con certeza la aplicación de la doctrina legal utilizada por el Tribunal de Amparo de primer grado para suspender el trámite del amparo, particularmente, en cuanto a la determinación de la viabilidad o no del recurso de nulidad interpuesto por la contribuyente al tenor de los supuestos de impugnabilidad objetiva que delimitan la interposición de esa impugnación de acuerdo a lo establecido en la legislación tributaria y lo alegado por la postulante en cuanto a la naturaleza de ‘acto procesal’ del requerimiento de información. Por ello, es necesario que ese punto sea analizado en pronunciamiento de*



sentencia..."; por ende, es viable el planteamiento de amparo contra el rechazo o denegatoria de la "*nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento*" instada para impugnar el requerimiento de información; **c.3)** el requerimiento de información es susceptible de causar agravio constitucional pues el incumplimiento de lo pedido, dentro del plazo legal, provoca sanciones de índole administrativa (multa pecuniaria) y, si se persiste en el incumplimiento, una vez requerido por el juez competente, la repercusión es de índole penal, por el delito de resistencia a la acción fiscalizadora; **c.4)** cuestiona si el contribuyente puede impugnar los requerimientos de información que de forma ilegal realiza la Administración Tributaria, si todas las solicitudes que este ente realiza están apegadas a Derecho y de acuerdo con sus facultades, o si existe margen de error. Al respecto, es claro que cuando se emite un requerimiento de información que no se encuentra conforme a las facultades legales de dicha Superintendencia, se produce un vicio sustancial de procedimiento que debe ser impugnado por medio de la nulidad prevista en el artículo 160 del Código Tributario; **c.5)** no toda la información pedida por la Administración Tributaria debe ser entregada por el contribuyente; existen casos de excepción. Entre estos, la información referente a periodos impositivos prescritos, la que constituye secreto bancario, la que está protegida bajo secreto comercial o de confidencialidad, la que el contribuyente no está obligado a tener y la que se solicita en un formato sin fundamento legal; como en este asunto, en el que la queja es que el ente fiscalizador realizó un requerimiento contrario a Derecho. En estos casos resulta idóneo pedir la nulidad o la enmienda del procedimiento; **c.6)** la doctrina legal se origina en expedientes formados entre los años dos mil trece a dos mil quince, en la que se afirmaba que el requerimiento de información no es un acto procedimental o resolución que pueda



provocar violación a garantías constitucionales, disposiciones legales o formalidades esenciales del expediente. Sin embargo, esta no está actualizada, porque el artículo 50 del Decreto 37-2016 del Congreso de la República de Guatemala, que entró en vigencia el treinta y uno de agosto de dos mil dieciséis, adicionó el artículo 21 “A” al Código Tributario, cuyo inciso diecisiete regula: *“Toda solicitud de información que haga la SAT a los contribuyentes o a terceros, con fines de fiscalización, deberá hacerla en el requerimiento de información que origina el proceso administrativo.”*. Del análisis de esta norma se puede concluir que el requerimiento de información es el origen del procedimiento administrativo, por lo que es susceptible de violar garantías constitucionales, disposiciones legales o formalidades esenciales del expediente; y **c.7)** en varios casos la propia Administración Tributaria ha decretado de oficio la nulidad administrativa o la anulación del requerimiento de información, por no haberse realizado conforme a derecho; por ejemplo, cuando no se indica el periodo impositivo que se pretende fiscalizar, a qué impuesto se refiere, o cuando se solicita información que el contribuyente no está obligado a presentar, como en el presente caso. De manera que existe la posibilidad de que tal solicitud contenga vicio sustancial, por lo que resulta razonable que el contribuyente pueda impugnar dichos aspectos por esa misma vía y, en tal caso, si la nulidad es denegada, el agravio que se cause debe ser verificable mediante amparo, con fundamento en el artículo 265 constitucional.

D.3) Pretensión: solicitó que se otorgue la acción instada. **E) Uso de recursos:** ninguno. **F) Casos de procedencia:** invocó las literales a), b), d) y e) del artículo 10 de la Ley de Amparo, Exhibición Personal y de Constitucionalidad. **G) Normas que se estiman violadas:** citó los artículos 2º, 12, 28 y 154 de la Constitución de la República.



II. TRÁMITE DEL AMPARO

A) Amparo provisional: no se otorgó. **B) Tercera interesada:** Procuraduría General de la Nación. **C) Informe circunstanciado:** La Superintendencia de Administración Tributaria manifestó: **a)** la postulante utilizó la enmienda del procedimiento y la nulidad indistintamente, cuando ambas figuras se encuentran dirigidas a regular supuestos distintos; **b)** su actuar se fundamenta en el artículo 3, literal a), de su Ley Orgánica que regula su objeto y sus funciones, así como en los artículos 98 y 100 del Código Tributario, los cuales la obligan a verificar el cumplimiento de las leyes tributarias y la facultan a requerir documentación a los contribuyentes para cumplir sus atribuciones; **c)** el requerimiento de información es una herramienta de ayuda al proceso de verificación y fiscalización, con el objeto de obtener información en el ámbito propio de su labor; **d)** cita doctrina legal respecto de la improcedencia de instar nulidad contra el requerimiento de información en materia tributaria; **e)** señala que debe suspenderse el trámite de la presente acción porque la postulante interpuso un medio de impugnación (nulidad) que de conformidad con la normativa aplicable al caso concreto y la jurisprudencia de esta Corte, es inidóneo, denotándose falta de definitividad; **f)** con relación al argumento esgrimido por la postulante, relacionado con que el amparo es la vía idónea para discutir las infracciones constitucionales que provoca el rechazo de la “*nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento*” planteada contra un requerimiento de información, indica que es importante mencionar que la cita jurisprudencial que realiza la accionante se refiere a las resultas del recurso de apelación interpuesto contra el auto de suspensión de una acción de amparo, en el que se discutía el requerimiento de información de la conciliación cuadrática, escenario distinto al de la presente garantía; además, se trata de una sola



sentencia dictada en ese sentido, por lo que se encuentra vigente la doctrina legal antes referida que, de conformidad con el artículo 43 de la Ley de Amparo, Exhibición Personal y de Constitucionalidad es de obligado cumplimiento; y **g)** adjuntó la documentación relacionada con el asunto de mérito, contenida en el expediente 2023-22-01-44-0001919, así como el informe circunstanciado INF-SAT-GEM-DFI-SOA-056-2024, de treinta y uno de enero de dos mil veinticuatro, rendido por Diego Abimael de León Petzey y Melvin Enrique Lau Peña, profesionales de la División de Fiscalización, Gerencia de Contribuyentes Especiales Medianos de esa Superintendencia, en el cual se expone la secuencia de actos que conforman dicho expediente y se indica que, le dio respuesta a la solicitud de “*nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento*” interpuesta. **E) Medios de comprobación:** durante el periodo de prueba se tuvo como medios de comprobación los documentos siguientes: **a)** el informe circunstanciado presentado en el proceso de amparo, respecto del expediente administrativo número 2023-22-01-44-0001919); **b)** informe rendido por la entidad amparista respecto al requerimiento de información relacionado; y **c)** providencia PRO-SAT-GEM-DFI-SOA-2023-22-01-000872 emitida por la autoridad denunciada el quince de diciembre de dos mil veintitrés. **F) Sentencia de primer grado:** la Sala Cuarta del Tribunal de lo Contencioso Administrativo, constituida en Tribunal de Amparo, consideró: “...este Tribunal considera que, la Superintendencia de Administración Tributaria, resolvió de conformidad con las constancias administrativas y de acuerdo a la ley, específicamente rechazar por improcedente el recurso de nulidad y enmienda, siendo que el requerimiento de información no puede ser objeto de enmienda o nulidad como lo estipula el artículo 160 del Código Tributario (...) En el presente caso, la providencia emitida por la Superintendencia



de Administración Tributaria que constituye el acto reclamado, se encuentra dentro del ejercicio de sus facultades legales y conforme a la norma invocada siendo evidente que dicha actuación no conculca derecho constitucional alguno, y al resolver de conformidad con la ley de la materia, no se están violentando los derechos constitucionales que indica el amparista, acceder sería desnaturalizar el Amparo, siendo que no existe ninguna violación a sus derechos constitucionales, por lo que no existe agravio constitucional; y en cuanto a que indica la amparista en su acto reclamado que la Administración Tributaria en todo el proceso administrativo ha vulnerado el derecho de defensa dejándola en un total estado de indefensión y vulnerabilidad, no es procedente por esta vía siendo que el Amparo no es una instancia revisora...”. **Y resolvió:** “...I. Deniega el amparo solicitado por la entidad Seguridad 2614, Sociedad Anónima a través de su Representante Legal en contra de la Superintendencia de Administración Tributaria. II. No se hace especial condena en costas. III. Se le impone multa de mil quetzales (Q. 1,000.00) al abogado patrocinante, al tenor del artículo cuarenta y siete (47) de la Ley de Amparo, Exhibición Personal y de Constitucionalidad misma que deberá hacerse efectiva en la Tesorería de la Corte de Constitucionalidad, dentro de los tres días siguientes de la fecha en que el presente fallo quede firme...”.

III. APELACIÓN

Seguridad 2614, Sociedad Anónima, -postulante-, impugnó. Expresó que es incongruente con la última jurisprudencia emitida por esta Corte, la cual establece la posibilidad de instar nulidad contra el requerimiento de información, de acuerdo con la reforma del Código Tributario que entró en vigencia en el año dos mil dieciséis, mediante la cual se le adicionó el artículo 21 “A. De ahí que, el acto



reclamado sí provoca las infracciones constitucionales descritas en el escrito inicial de amparo, las cuales replicó.

IV. ALEGATOS EN EL DÍA DE LA VISTA

A) Seguridad 2614, Sociedad Anónima, postulante, reiteró los argumentos que esgrimió en apelación. Solicitó revocar el fallo impugnado. **B) La Superintendencia de Administración Tributaria**, ratificó los razonamientos que expuso en el trámite del amparo y enfatizó: **a)** el punto toral de la controversia giró en torno a que la postulante malinterpretó el requerimiento de información, ya que no solicitó los documentos en un formato en específico, por lo que, la interposición del medio de impugnación solo retarda más el proceso; **b)** la postulante insiste en que, en la resolución emitida (por apelación de auto de suspensión de amparo) en el expediente 4358-2023 de esta Corte, se indicó la procedencia de la nulidad contra el requerimiento de información; sin embargo, tal afirmación carece de veracidad, porque del contenido de esa resolución se evidencia que no se dictó un giro jurisprudencial, ni se aseveró la procedencia del recurso de nulidad, por lo que tal argumento no puede considerarse válido; **c)** la accionante incumplió con el presupuesto procesal de definitividad, ya que contra el asunto que se somete a discusión constitucional no existe recurso alguno que instar; **d)** el requerimiento de información realizado a la contribuyente no viola ningún derecho constitucional, porque está apegado a las facultades que la ley le ha asignado a ese ente fiscalizador. Pidió declarar sin lugar el recurso de apelación. **C) La Procuraduría General de la Nación**, tercera interesada, señaló que la autoridad reclamada actuó en ejercicio de sus facultades constitucionales y legales, por lo que su proceder no demuestra que haya causado agravio de relevancia constitucional, ni violado derecho fundamental alguno. Requirió declarar sin lugar la apelación. **D)**



El Ministerio Público argumentó que comparte lo considerado en la sentencia dictada por el Tribunal de Amparo de primer grado, debido a que la diligencia impugnada no es susceptible de recurrirse a través de enmienda del procedimiento o nulidad, puesto que esta no consiste en una resolución en sí que pueda provocar violaciones constitucionales, sino que es una solicitud efectuada por auditores y supervisores tributarios dentro de sus facultades legales, lo que evidencia que ningún agravio se le generó a la interponente. Pidió declarar sin lugar el recurso instado.

CONSIDERANDO

-I-

Debe confirmarse la denegatoria de amparo cuando lo que se cuestiona es la resolución de improcedencia de un medio de defensa inidóneo, pues cualquier decisión desestimatoria de una impugnación inviable no puede calificarse como vulneradora de derechos.

-II-

Seguridad 2614, Sociedad Anónima acude en amparo contra la Superintendencia de Administración Tributaria, señalando como acto reclamado la providencia PRO-SAT-GEM-DFI-SOA-2023-22-01-000872 de quince de diciembre de dos mil veintitrés, mediante la cual la referida entidad rechazó la “*nulidad y enmienda del procedimiento*” que interpuso contra el requerimiento de información 2023-8-1544-2.

El Tribunal de Amparo de primer grado denegó la protección constitucional. La amparista apeló.

-III-

La autoridad reclamada al rendir el informe circunstanciado y evacuar la



audiencia en alzada, afirmó que se incumplió el principio de definitividad, porque la postulante interpuso un medio de impugnación inidóneo (nulidad) para oponerse al requerimiento de información que se le formuló.

En respuesta a dicho argumento se cita el último párrafo del artículo 160 del Código Tributario que dispone: “... *La Administración Tributaria resolverá la enmienda o la nulidad dentro del plazo de quince (15) días de su interposición. Esta resolución no será impugnable.*”. Esto pone de manifiesto que, contra la resolución que rechaza el trámite de la nulidad y contra aquella que declara la nulidad de las actuaciones, no existe recurso ni proceso idóneo que deba agotarse previamente para poder acudir a la vía constitucional. En el primer caso, porque el pronunciamiento no decide el fondo del asunto objeto de cuestionamiento y, en el segundo, por imperativo legal.

En el caso concreto se comprueba que contra la resolución reclamada la postulante no interpuso ningún medio de defensa distinto al amparo, por no existir ningún proceso, recurso o remedio procesal ordinario e idóneo para reparar los agravios que, a su juicio, le genera aquella decisión; por consiguiente, el planteamiento de esta acción no puede considerarse prematuro.

-IV-

La apelante afirma que la sentencia de primer grado es incongruente con la última jurisprudencia emitida por esta Corte, la cual establece la posibilidad de instar nulidad contra el requerimiento de información, de acuerdo con la reforma del Código Tributario que entró en vigencia en el año dos mil dieciséis, mediante la cual se le adicionó el artículo 21 “A”. Por ello estima que el acto reclamado sí provoca las infracciones constitucionales denunciadas.

El artículo 160 del Código Tributario, en su parte conducente, regula: “... *La*



Administración Tributaria o la autoridad superior jerárquica, de oficio o petición de parte, podrá: 1. Enmendar el trámite, dejando sin efecto lo actuado, cuando se hubiere incurrido en defectos u omisiones de procedimiento. 2. Declarar la nulidad de actuaciones cuando se advierta vicio sustancial en ellas. En cualquiera de ambos casos, podrá resolverse la enmienda o la nulidad de la totalidad o de parte de una resolución o actuación. En ningún caso se afectará la eficacia de las pruebas legalmente rendidas. Para los efectos de este Código, se entenderá que existe vicio sustancial, cuando se violen garantías constitucionales, disposiciones legales o formalidades esenciales del expediente o cuando se cometa error en la determinación de la obligación tributaria, multas, recargos o intereses. La enmienda o la nulidad será procedente en cualquier estado en que se encuentre el proceso administrativo...".
(Las negrillas fueron añadidas).

La Corte ha considerado que en materia administrativa tributaria, el requerimiento de información, por su contenido, constituye una solicitud que se realiza con fundamento en las facultades que las leyes y reglamentos otorgan a los auditores y supervisores tributarios, con el objeto de obtener información en ejercicio de su función de verificación del cumplimiento de obligaciones tributarias por parte de los contribuyentes, por lo cual no encaja en ninguno de los supuestos previstos en el artículo recientemente citado para ser susceptible de impugnación por vía de la nulidad, debido a que no es un acto procedimental o una resolución que, en sí misma, pueda provocar violación a garantías constitucionales, disposiciones legales o formalidades esenciales del expediente administrativo, o que contenga error en la determinación de la obligación tributaria, multas, recargos o intereses.



Y a la luz de ello, se ha concluido en el criterio legal que la nulidad no es idónea para objetar el contenido de un requerimiento de información. (Sentencias de cuatro de octubre de dos mil dieciocho, veintiséis de agosto de dos mil diecinueve y veintidós de septiembre de dos mil veintidós, dictadas en los expedientes 1645-2018, 1047-2019 y 3654-2022, respectivamente).

Esta doctrina legal no ha sido innovada, por lo que continúa siendo de observancia obligatoria por virtud de los artículos 43 y 185 de la Ley de Amparo, Exhibición Personal y de Constitucionalidad.

Por otra parte, carece de veracidad lo afirmado por la recurrente en cuanto a que la citada doctrina legal fue superada por un nuevo criterio contenido en el auto emitido en el expediente 4358-2023, formado por apelación de suspensión del trámite de un amparo, en virtud que dicha resolución no expresa ninguna innovación jurisprudencial, ni criterio de fondo sobre el asunto objeto de conocimiento en esta acción, sino únicamente expone las razones por las que se estimó necesario proseguir el trámite de la acción constitucional en ese caso concreto.

En suma, aquella doctrina legal tampoco fue modificada derivado de la reforma del Código Tributario que entró en vigencia en el dos mil dieciséis, mediante la cual se le adicionó el artículo 21 "A", el cual regula los derechos de los contribuyentes, destacando que: "... 17. *Toda solicitud de información que haga la SAT a los contribuyentes o a terceros, con fines de fiscalización, deberá hacerla en el requerimiento de información que origina el proceso administrativo. Las ampliaciones posteriores a dicha solicitud, deberán guardar relación con el mismo proceso.*"

Es decir, la precisión normativa respecto de que el requerimiento de



información origina el proceso administrativo no trastoca la razón fundante de aquel criterio legal; contrario a ello, la refuerza, pues pone de manifiesto que ese acto, al ser el medio para iniciar el referido procedimiento —o para ampliar la gestión inicial— no puede, en sí mismo, contener alguno de los vicios sustanciales previstos en el citado artículo 160 del Código Tributario, pues es la forma en la que la Administración Tributaria genera el procedimiento correspondiente, en el ejercicio de sus funciones de verificación, fiscalización, control e investigación, legalmente asignadas, lo cual incluye su potestad de requerir y obtener del contribuyente toda la información necesaria para establecer su verdadera situación tributaria, así como de solicitarle que declare impuestos y de pedirle cualquier información dirigida a verificar la determinación o generación de estos (así lo disponen, entre otros, los artículos 98, 98 “A” y 100 del citado Código).

En atención a lo argumentado, el Tribunal concluye que los motivos de impugnación no pueden acogerse y que los argumentos esgrimidos por la amparista contra el acto reclamado [desarrollados en la literal b), sub numerales b.1), b.2), b.3), b.4) y b.6) del segmento D.2) de los Antecedentes contenidos en los resultandos de este fallo] no pueden ser atendidos en sede constitucional, debido a que, como se indicó, interpuso un medio de impugnación que de conformidad con la normativa aplicable al caso concreto y la firme jurisprudencia de esta Corte resulta inidóneo; de ahí que, sea cual fuere la razón por la que la autoridad denunciada determinó improcedente acceder al correctivo relacionado, esta decisión no puede resultar agravante a la postulante. (Sentencias de dieciocho de marzo y veintiséis de agosto, ambas de dos mil diecinueve, y veintidós de septiembre de dos mil veintidós, dictadas en los expedientes 5121-



2018, 1047-2019 y 3654-2022, respectivamente)

En ese contexto, lo expresa y claramente considerado previamente basta para desvirtuar los agravios expresados por la postulante en la literal c) del segmento D.2), de los Antecedentes, inserto en los resultandos de este pronunciamiento, relacionados con la supuesta procedibilidad del amparo y la alegada idoneidad de la nulidad para señalar vicios sustanciales en el citado requerimiento de información.

Finalmente, el Tribunal no se pronuncia sobre los supuestos agravios que, según la accionante, le genera el requerimiento de información mencionado, ni sobre las razones por las que, a su juicio, tal acto es nulo [expuestos en las literales a) y b), sub numeral b.5), del segmento D.2), de los Antecedentes contenidos en las resultas de este fallo], en virtud que no tienen conexión directa con el acto reclamado.

Es igualmente inviable analizar si, como aduce la amparista, la autoridad reclamada abusa de su facultad de fiscalización, genera desconfianza y hace presumir mala fe en el ejercicio de su facultad pública [alegado contenido en el sub numeral b.7) del segmento D.2) de los resultandos de esta sentencia] por ser estas meras afirmaciones carentes de sustento legal y de relevancia constitucional.

Derivado de lo asentado con anterioridad, se confirma el fallo apelado en cuanto denegó el amparo.

LEYES APLICABLES

Artículos citados y 265, 268 y 272, literal c), de la Constitución Política de la República de Guatemala; 8°, 10, 42, 43, 60, 61, 66, 67, 149, 163, literal c), 179 y 185 de la Ley de Amparo, Exhibición Personal y de Constitucionalidad; 7 *Bis* del



Acuerdo 3-89; y 36 del Acuerdo 1-2013, ambos de la Corte de Constitucionalidad.

POR TANTO

La Corte de Constitucionalidad, con fundamento en lo considerado y leyes citadas, resuelve: **I. Por ausencia temporal** del Magistrado Roberto Molina Barreto, se integra el Tribunal con el Magistrado Walter Paulino Jiménez Texaj, para conocer y resolver el presente asunto. **II. Sin lugar** el recurso de apelación interpuesto por Seguridad 2614, Sociedad Anónima. **III.** Como consecuencia, **confirma** el fallo apelado. **IV.** Notifíquese y con certificación de lo resuelto, devuélvase la pieza de amparo al Tribunal de origen.



