



Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights

Below you will find a questionnaire filled in by Stefan Huang Shih Chou, Professor at the *National Taipei University of Business*, and OPTR National Reporter of (Chinese) Taipei.

This set of questionnaires comprises the National Reporter's assessment of the country's practice during 2025 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 - 2025 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 2025, until no later than 16 January 2026. 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 *

shanehua@ntub.edu.tw

Reporters' info

Name: *

Stefan, Shih Chou Huang

Country: *

Taiwan

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 2025 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? *

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

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?

*

7-9 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 - 2025 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 2025 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 2025 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 2025, until no later than 16 January 2026. 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 *

shanehua@ntub.edu.tw

Reporters' info

Name: *

Shih Chou Huang

Country: *

Taiwan

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 2025" (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 2025. 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 2025", 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 2025".

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 2025

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 2025

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.

Taiwan's system of taxpayer identification has not include any place related with taxpayer's religion.

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 2025

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 question is not applicable in Taiwan, since taxpayer assumes ultimate obligation to pay.

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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.

Taiwan does not have any established system of "cooperative compliance". It's not applicable.

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 2025

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.

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 2025.

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.

From 2025.1.1, the withholding obligation goes to the paying company rather than the person responsible of paying company. See: <https://www.ctee.com.tw/news/20250808702207-430503>

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 2025.

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 2025.

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.

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 2025.

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.

12MS is the same with 9MS.

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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.

to clarify 16(MS), in Taiwan tax administration, only when tax administration is disclosing certain practices or statistics, the taxpayers' name and details involved will be encrypted.

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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.

To clarify, Taiwanese tax officers are not allowed to work as home office.

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 2025

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 Taiwan's tax regulation, no person responsible on data protection, only has personal data liaison post.

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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.

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 2025

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.

28 (MS)

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 2025

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.

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 2025

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 2025

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.

To clarify, there is no legal requirement for "Parliamentary supervision of revenue authorities should involve independent officials" in Taiwan.

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 2025

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.

To clarify, access to taxpayers' information by third parties only limited to the situation that the third parties have proven themselves having legitimate rights to know taxpayers' valuable assets in order to perform compulsory execution.

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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.

To clarify, there is no such regulation in Taiwan which permits "Legal professional privilege should apply to tax advice".

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 2025

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.

To clarify, there is no such requirement in Taiwan: arrangements should be made (e.g. an independent lawyer) for the situation tax authorities enter premises which may contain privileged material.

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 2025

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.

To clarify, in Taiwan there is no such : Mandatory disclosure.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, the principles mentioned at 38 (MS)(2) and (4) are not applicable to tax audit.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, the though tax audit is subject to principle of proportionality, however, no case has been declared any audit action had violated such principle.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, ne bis in idem is not applicable to tax audit in Taiwan.

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 2025

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 2025

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.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, there is no such guideline, at least public available, governing the tax audit's pattern.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, there is no such guideline, at least public available, governing the tax audit's pattern.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, Taiwanese taxpayers do not have such right.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, the right and process mentioned at 46(MS)and (BP) do nit exist in Taiwan.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, taxpayers won't be informed if third party, like bank, provide their information to tax administration.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, there is no regulation regulating the length of audit period. There might be a control in the internal regulation.

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 2025

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.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, the drafting of the final audit report do not involve participation by the taxpayer.

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 2025

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.

As of 51 (BP), to be clarified, there should be an audit report to finalize the process. However, such audit report is deemed as an internal documents and do not provided to public.

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 2025

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.

With application of AI in Audit selection, the tax administration is purporting such narrative that taxpayer's best policy is to comply with honesty, otherwise AI will find you and tax 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 2025

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.

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 2025

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 2025

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.

As for 55(MS), Taiwan has no such authorisation within the revenue authorities.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, the judicial authorization is not necessary to inform taxpayer.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, Access to bank information for tax purposes (including automatically-supplied information) in Taiwan do not require judicial authorisation..

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, there is no such requirement in Taiwan. It should be not applicable.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, there is no such requirement in Taiwan. It should be not applicable.

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 2025

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.

To be clarified, there is no such requirement in Taiwan. It should be not applicable.

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 2025

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 is no such system in Taiwan: E-filing of requests for internal review to ensure the effective and speedy handling of the review process

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 2025

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.

As for 64(MS) and (BP), they are not applicable to Taiwan. 1. The right to appeal depends upon prior exhaustion of administrative reviews. 2. no alternative to arbitration or appear to tax courts if taxpayer does not exhaust the administrative review.

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 2025

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.

To 65(MS) no ADR is applicable to tax disputes in Taiwan. 65(BP) ordinary yes. However, if the case is complicated, no time limitation for administrative review and appeals.

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 2025

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.

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 2025

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 2025

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 Taiwan, the state bears of part of costs of an appeal if the tax court rules partially or in total against the tax administration. However, the amount of court fees is quite low, at most 350 USD.

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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.

Such principle "The cumulative effect of penalties, interest and surcharges should not exceed the amount of tax due" is not applicable in Taiwan, where tax evasion and avoidance will be treated with penalty at least 0.3~0.5 time of underpaid tax. In some tax laws, even amount to 10 times of tax due.

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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 2025

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.

Taxpayers have the right to request delayed payment of arrears. Taxpayer has to apply in advance and be reviewed by tax administration. Then the delayed payment should be added with interests.

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 2025

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.

Actually, Taiwanese judicial practice prevent most of individuals and legal persons from being allowed into bankruptcy process.

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 2025

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 2025

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.

81(MS)(BP)are not applicable in Taiwan. No requirement to inform taxpayer when exchanging information with treaty partner.

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 2025

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)(BP)are not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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.

Article 86(BP) is not applicable in Taiwan. There is no corresponding right granted under the regulations governing tax collection. Although there is a provision that prevents tax authorities from using illegally obtained information, this rule applies only where the tax administration itself is involved in, or directly engages in, the illegal conduct. Where a third party unlawfully obtains information and reports it to the tax authorities for personal gain, such information may still be used against the taxpayer, even though the taxpayer is the victim of the third party's illegal acts.

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 2025

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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 2025

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(BP) is not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. Such requirement on the recipient nation is not regulated in regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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)(BP)is not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. There is not such right given by regulations governing exchange of information.

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 2025

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 principle prohibiting retrospective tax legislation is formally recognized, but it lacks effective force in practice. In Taiwan, the Ministry of Finance routinely announces changes to tax rules shortly before the annual tax filing season and applies them retroactively to the beginning of the relevant tax year. A typical example would be an increase in the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) rate, which may be announced in January or February 2026 but applied as from 1 January 2025.

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 2025

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 2025

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.

Not applicable. Taiwan has no such prescribed system requiring: 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.

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 2025

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.

Not applicable. Taiwan has no such prescribed system requiring: 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.

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 2025

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.

100(MS) is officially right. However, there are some manuals guiding tax officers to select and audit cases, and are classified as confidential, not available to public.

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 2025

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.

Taiwan tax bureaus have physical contact assisting taxpayers who are not able to use internet resources.

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 2025

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 2025

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) is not the situation in Taiwan. See the Article 1-1(1) of Tax Collection Act regulates: "The effectiveness of any interpretative letter or directive issued by the Ministry of Finance (hereinafter referred to as the MOF) in accordance with this Act or any relevant tax act shall inure to the underlying case for which the interpretative letter or directive is issued; however, in the event that the interpretative letter or directive is favorable to other taxpayer(s), the same shall be applicable to the case(s) pending final decision(s)." Link: <https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=G0340001>

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 2025

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.

104(BP) is not applicable in Taiwan, whereas there is no such requirement "A separate statement of taxpayers' rights under audit should be provided to taxpayers who are audited."

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 2025

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) Taiwan has a Taxpayers' Right Protection Act, which has some articles with more strong and direct legal force - able to be considered as enforceable.

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 2025

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.

Per Taxpayers' Right Protection Act, taxpayer's right protection agents or ombudsmen in Taiwan are selected between senior tax officers, who tend to act a man between taxpayers and tax officers and assist with communications. Intervention is a word too strong for such character in Taiwan.

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 2025

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 2025

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.

108(MS) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

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 2025

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 2025

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) (BP) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

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 2025

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.

111(BP) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

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 2025

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)(BP) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases. However, any conducts against or tax assessment on taxpayers shall be signed and taken responsible by a tax officer.

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 2025

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)(BP) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

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 2025

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.

115(MS) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

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 2025

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.

116(MS) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

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 2025

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) is not applicable in Taiwan. No special regulation requiring informing taxpayers of such application of AI in their cases.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Dear Sirs of OPTR,

I have completed Questionnaire 1 for 2025 and have provided additional explanations to several of my responses, as set out below. These explanations are intended to help enhance your understanding of the practical realities of the situation in Taiwan.

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?)

Stefan explains: Although there is no statutorily prescribed time limit for tax audits in Taiwan, each audit is subject to an internally regulated timeframe, typically around two to three months based on my recent experience. Upon the expiry of this period, the responsible tax officer is required to conclude the audit and file an internal audit report. From the taxpayer's perspective, these procedures form part of the tax authority's internal administrative process and are not disclosed to, nor accessible by, the audited taxpayer.

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

Stefan explains: Taxpayers may apply for a remote hearing through the court-designated teleconferencing application. However, approval of such an application is subject to the presiding judge's discretion, based on an assessment of whether a remote hearing is necessary under the prevailing circumstances. In practice, traditional in-person court appearances remain the dominant and preferred approach.

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

Stefan explains: Yes; however, court costs in tax appeal proceedings are relatively low. Under the regulations governing judicial court costs, administrative litigation and appeals are subject to fixed fees: NTD 4,000 (approximately USD 130) for the first instance and NTD 6,000 (approximately USD 200) for the second instance. Although the general rule provides that the losing party bears the court costs, these fixed and relatively modest amounts are negligible when compared to tax assessments that often reach the millions.

In addition, attorneys' fees are not classified as court costs and must be borne by the respective parties themselves.

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)

Stefan explains: Yes; however, in most cases, judges rule that the appellant partially prevails and partially fails. In such circumstances, the court costs—see the explanation at item 51—are apportioned between the parties in accordance with the extent to which each party succeeds or fails.

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?

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

Stefan explains: For the two items mentioned above, a more accurate characterization is that there are, to date, no specific regulations or case law addressing these issues. Although there is a special regulatory framework governing the exchange of taxpayers' information with treaty partners (namely Australia, Japan, and the United Kingdom), it does not contain provisions dealing with the situations described in items 65B and 66A. Moreover, there have been no cases in which an affected taxpayer has challenged an exchange of information on the grounds of an alleged infringement of fundamental rights.

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

Stefan explains: Taiwan's tax administration has introduced AI-assisted audit selection mechanisms. Where a particular tax period of a taxpayer is selected by the AI system, a tax officer will subsequently review that period and notify the taxpayer to supplement relevant facts and supporting documentation. During this process, the tax authority will disclose to the taxpayer the information and materials necessary for the assessment of tax liability. However, such disclosure does not extend to the underlying AI algorithms, selection models, or other technical components of the system.

Also, you may find the Taiwanese Taxpayers' Right Protection Act, English translated version: <https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=G0340142>

with regards

Stefan Huang in Taipei