

The 2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation System

January 2025

Introduction to the Corporate Governance Evaluation System

I. Preface

The Financial Supervisory Commission (the FSC) issued a 5-year "Corporate Governance Roadmap (the Roadmap)" in December 2013, with an eye to accelerating steps to promote corporate governance (CG), assisting sound corporate development, and safeguarding the interests of investors. One major project of the Roadmap is the implementation of the Corporate Governance Evaluation (the CGE). The purpose is to provide CG performance comparisons among all listed companies so that investors and companies can better realize how well specific companies are managing CG implementation. The FSC has the goal that this evaluation system will spur companies to attach greater CG importance, thereby bringing about healthy corporate competition, raising the CG level, molding a corporate culture that encourages voluntary effort towards CG improvement and overall enhance Taiwan's global standing.

Acting upon the Roadmap, the Taiwan Stock Exchange Corporation (the TWSE) founded the Corporate Governance Center (the Center) on October 25, 2013. Under FSC supervision and with cooperation among the Center and related NGOs, the CGE System was then established, and evaluation have been conducted annually beginning from fiscal year 2014.

II. Overview of the Indicators

The 2025 evaluation indicators have been issued. To read the indicators, please note the following key points :

1. Wording of the indicators

The "Evaluation Indicators" column sets out the evaluation substance and scope of each indicator, e.g., the conditions to be met, the time period covered, and where disclosures should be made.

2. Types of indicators

The "Type of Indicators" column classifies the indicators into the following five categories :

(1) Type A Indicators

Type A indicators evaluate general matters, including legal and regulatory compliance as well as good CG practices and guidelines, the latter of which encourages companies to adopt a higher standard than mere legal compliance. Type A indicators apply to all evaluated companies.

(2) Type B Indicators

The content and issues evaluated by Type B indicators are the same as for Type A, but they are relevant only under prescribed circumstances, and thus may not be applicable to some companies.

(3) Type AA Indicators

Type AA indicators have higher weight in scoring. They evaluate superior CG practices, but particularly address those that in actual current practice in Taiwan are still "advanced" in nature, e.g., whether the company voluntarily discloses the individual remuneration details of each director in its annual report.

(4) Type A + Indicators

Type A + indicators allow for scoring by level of practice, i.e. a higher score is awarded if the company's performance reached a higher level in the specific CG area during the year under evaluation. For example, if the company disclosed the annual emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG), it will receive one point in the category; if the content of the disclosure has been verified by an external institution, one extra point will be added to the total score.

(5) Extra Credit Indicators, Point Deduction Indicators

These indicators are grounds for points being specially added to, or deducted from, a company's evaluation score, and are described, respectively, below. After the evaluation task force has gathered and organized all the relevant information, it submits the information to the CGE Committee for deliberation and resolutions for extra credit or for deduction of points.

i. Extra Credit Indicators

These indicators award extra points when a company performed especially well in the CG area, or made concrete beneficial contributions in promoting corporate governance, during the year under evaluation, e.g. voluntary participation in another CG related evaluation system and receipt of certification; other exceptional corporate governance performance or specific achievements in implementing social responsibility.

ii. Point Deduction Indicators

These indicators deduct points when a company has performed deficiently in the CG area, e.g., if the chairman or a managerial officer has been convicted by a court of a crime of violating insider trading regulations. Incidents constituting grounds for point deductions are not necessarily limited to those occurring in the year under evaluation.

III. Scoring Method

1. Weighting of indicator categories

2025 Categories of Indicators and Weight

Category	Number of Indicators by Type			Number of Indicators by Category	Category Weightings
	A and B	AA	A+		
Protecting Shareholder Rights and Interests and Treating Shareholders Equitably	10	-	1	11	16%
Enhancing Board Composition and Operation	11	2	5	18	25%
Increasing Information Transparency	4	1	2	7	10%
Promoting Sustainable Development	28	-	6	34	49%
Total	53	3	<u>14</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>100%</u>
Extra Credit Indicators	-	-	-	1	-
Point Deduction Indicators	-	-	-	1	-

2. Calculation of scores

(1) Calculation of scores by type of indicator

Type of Indicator	Scoring Method
Type A	If the indicator is satisfied, one point is awarded; otherwise, not.
Type B	If the indicator is satisfied, one point is awarded; otherwise, not. If the exception conditions are met, the indicator is not applied.
Type AA	If the indicator is satisfied, one point is awarded in the category, and one additional point is awarded to the total score.
Type A +	If the basic requirement of the indicator is satisfied, one point is awarded in the category. If the advanced requirement for extra credit is also satisfied, one additional point is awarded to the total score.
Extra Credit Indicator	One point or more is added to the total score, depending on the matters addressed in the indicator.
Point Deduction Indicator	One point or more is deducted from the total score, depending on the matters addressed in the indicator.

(2) Calculating scores for a category

Scores for a category are calculated in the following manner :

$$\frac{\text{Number of satisfied indicators in the category}}{\text{Total number of applicable indicators in the category}} \times \text{category weighting}$$

(3) Calculation of the total score

The points for all categories are summed up to obtain the total score for all categories. (The maximum possible total score for the four categories is 100 points.) Any additional points and point deductions are then added or subtracted, as the case may be, e.g., any additional points for AA indicators and A+ indicators, and any extra credit points or point deductions, to obtain the final total score.

3. Example

A hypothetical example of the 2025 CGE results for TWSE listed company XXX is illustrated in the following table, which shows the points awarded in the four categories, and two points added and five points deducted, respectively, for the extra credit indicators and point deduction indicators :

Category	Total Number of Indicators	Points for Satisfied Indicators (Example)				Number of Inapplicable Type B Indicators (Example)	Weighting
		Type A Indicators	Type B Indicators	Type AA Indicators	Type A+ Indicators		
Category 1	11	8	-	-	-	1	16%
Category 2	18	9	-	2	3	-	25%
Category 3	7	3	-	1	-	-	10%
Category 4	34	25	-	-	1 (Only the basic requirement is satisfied)	-	49%
Extra Credit Indicators: 2 points							
Point Deduction Indicators: 5 points							

The score is calculated as follows :

[(Category 1 score) x assigned weighting + (Category 2 score) x assigned weighting + (Category 3 score) x assigned weighting + (Category 4 score) x assigned weighting] x 100 + (additional points for type AA indicators) + (additional points for type A+ indicators) + (additional points for extra credit indicators) – (points deducted for point deduction indicators) = Total score :

$$\left[\frac{8}{(11-1)} \times 16\% + \frac{(9+2+3)}{18} \times 25\% + \frac{(3+1)}{7} \times 10\% + \frac{(25+1)}{34} \times 49\% \right] \times 100 + (2 + 1) + 3 + 2 - 5 = 78.43$$

IV. Self-Evaluations

1. Self-evaluation period

Self-evaluations for the year 2025 will commence on October 1, 2025, and must be completed by no later than January 31, 2026.

2. Self-evaluation process

Prior to the self-evaluation commencement date, letters will be issued to notify each evaluated company of the self-evaluation system's website URL, the company's account number and password. Beginning from the commencement date, the company can log in to the system and carry out its self-evaluation. The company can also log in again to make revisions at any time before the day the system is closed.

V. Questionnaires

1. Questionnaire procedures

In Q4 of 2025, questionnaires will be sent to the chief internal auditor and the external auditors of all the companies under evaluation, to collect their observations regarding the degrees to which the boards and board members of the companies under evaluation are conscious of and take seriously their duty to oversee CG. The feedback and practical suggestions collected in the returned questionnaires will be gone through and organized, and will be used for reference in reviewing and cross-comparing the scoring of the evaluation indicators, assigning extra credit points, and making subsequent revisions to the indicators.

2. Questionnaire response period

The chief internal auditor and the external auditors of the companies under evaluation are required to complete the questionnaires no later than December 31, 2025.

VI. Evaluation Schedule

1. The 2025 CGE procedures and indicators were announced in December 2024.
2. Self-evaluations will commence and questionnaires will be sent out in October 2025.
3. The review will be completed in March 2026.
4. The results of the 2025 CGE are to be completed in April 2026.
5. After public announcement of the evaluation results, commendations will be issued to recognize companies that have performed especially well.

VII. Other Information

1. Companies subject to evaluation

All companies listed on either the Taiwan Stock Exchange (the TWSE) or the Taipei Exchange (the TPEx) are evaluated. However, a listed company shall be excluded from the evaluation rankings if any of the following circumstances happened within the period under evaluation and before the announcement of the evaluation results:

- (1) A company listed for less than one year during the period evaluated.
- (2) A company whose securities have been placed under an altered trading method (pursuant to Article 49, 49-1, 49-2, 49-3, or 49-4 of the “Operating Rules of the TWSE”, or to Article 12 of the “TPEx Rules Governing Securities Trading on the TPEx”).
- (3) A company whose securities are subject to a suspension of trading (pursuant to Article 50, 50-3, or 50-9 of the “Operating Rules of the TWSE”, or to Article 12-1 of the “TPEx Rules Governing Securities Trading on the TPEx”).
- (4) A company whose securities have been delisted (pursuant to Article 50-1, 50-3, or 50-10 of the “Operating Rules of the TWSE”, or to Article 12-2 of the “TPEx Rules Governing Securities Trading on the TPEx”).

- (5) Other grounds for exclusion from evaluation, as resolved by a meeting of the CGE Committee.

2. Evaluation period

The evaluations are conducted annually based on the CG practices of the evaluation year.

3. Scope of information evaluated

The 2025 evaluations will be based on information disclosed by evaluated companies from January 1 to December 31 in 2025, including CG information posted to the Market Observation Post System (MOPS) website, in annual reports and on official company websites; CG incidents that occurred during the year; information on the operations or exercise of duties at the shareholders' meetings, board meetings, and the independent directors; the questionnaires completed by the external auditors and the chief internal auditor; the supervisory records of the FSC, the TWSE, and the TPEx; and information entered by companies on the self-evaluation website. However, the examination of information on material failures by a company to comply with CG principles (i.e. incidents constituting grounds for point deductions) is not necessarily limited to those occurring in the year under evaluation.

4. Restrictions on use of the evaluation results

- (1) The CGE shall be performed under due care to ensure that the various evaluation indicators are properly implemented and the information is transparent. However, the evaluation results merely reflect a company's CG performance with respect to the indicators examined. All evaluated companies shall still act in accordance with their ethical corporate management best practice principles, and continue striving to safeguard shareholder rights and interests and achieve sustainable development.

- (2) The CGE System is based on the predetermined scope of evaluation information and indicators. The sources of information are public information disclosed by evaluated companies during the evaluated year, such as annual reports and information posted to corporate websites and MOPS website. For this reason, evaluation results only indicate a company's CG performance during the fiscal year evaluated, and cannot reflect a company's future CG level, or the prospect regarding the company's business performance and financial soundness. An evaluated company is prohibited from using the evaluation results for the purposes of commercial advertising or investment solicitations.
- (3) This evaluation system has been designed by the Center to carry out evaluations of all TWSE/TPEX listed companies. The results of self-evaluations conducted by companies on the basis of these evaluation indicators are intended only for use in evaluation and comparison, and a self-evaluating company may not make its self-evaluation results public in any way.

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
I. Protecting Shareholder Rights and Interests and Treating Shareholders Equitably		
1.1	Did the company report at the AGM the remuneration received by directors, including the remuneration policy, the content and amount of individual remuneration?	A
1.2	Has the company adopted written rules for the procedures for financial and business operations between the company and related parties, the content of which should include procedures for managing transactions such as purchase and sale, acquisition or disposal of assets, etc., and the requirement that material transactions be approved by the board and approved by or reported at the shareholders' meeting?	A
1.3	Did the chairman of the board, more than half of the directors, and the audit committee convener attend the AGM in person, and did the company disclose in the minutes the names of those who attended?	A
1.4	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
1.5	Has the company adopted specific measures to enhance corporate value and reported them to the board of directors, and has it disclosed the relevant information on the "Enhancing Corporate Value Plan" section of the MOPS?	A
1.6	Did the company hold the AGM before the end of May?	A
1.7	Did the company upload the Chinese and English versions of its shareholders meeting agenda handbook and supplemental meeting materials to the designated Internet information reporting website 30 days prior to the day of the AGM, and upload the Chinese and English versions of its annual report 18 days prior to the day of the AGM?	A
1.8	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
1.9	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
1.10	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
1.11	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
1.12	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
1.13	If the company distributed cash dividends during the year being evaluated, were all such distributions completed within 30 days after the ex-dividend date?	B
1.14	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
1.15	Did the company adopt bylaws prohibiting insiders, including directors and employees, from using information not publicly disclosed in the market to trade securities, with content including (but not limited to) a prohibition against directors trading the company's	A

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators

Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
	stock during a blackout period of 30 days before the publication of the company's annual financial report and 15 days before the publication of each quarterly financial report, and were those bylaws and the status of their implementation disclosed on the company's website?	
1.16	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
1.17	Is it true that the company did not have any government agencies or any single legal entity and its subsidiaries accounting for one-third or more of the board? <i>[If the company did not have any government agency, juristic person, or representative thereof serve as a director, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
1.18	Did the company record in the AGM minutes the important contents of shareholders' questions and the company's replies?	A
1.19	Was the company's shareholders' meeting broadcast live online or was an uninterrupted audio and video recording of the entire proceedings uploaded after the shareholders' meeting?	A

II. Enhancing Board Composition and Operation

2.1	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.2	Did the company adopt a board diversity policy and disclose the specific management objectives as well as the status of implementation of the diversity policy on the company's website and in the annual report?	A
2.3	Is it true that the company's chairman and its general manager or other equivalent officer (chief executive officer) are neither the same person nor spouses or first-degree relatives?	A
2.4	Is it true that there were no more than two directors having a relationship of spouse or of kinship within the second degree?	A
2.5	Is it true that the number of the directors on the company's board of directors who are employees of the company or of its parent, subsidiary, or sister company is less than or equal to one-third of the total number of directors?	A
2.6	Did the company's board members include at least one director of different gender? <i>[If directors of each gender accounted for at least one-third of all of the directors, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
2.7	Did the company's independent directors reach one-third or more of all of the directors? <i>[If the company's independent directors reached one-half or more of all of the directors, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
2.8	Were the continuous terms of service of one-half or more of the independent directors not more than three terms each?	A
2.9	Has the company adopted succession planning for board members and key executives, and disclosed the operational status of such planning on its website and in its annual report?	A
2.10	Did the company disclose the professional qualifications and experience of the Audit Committee and Remuneration Committee members as well as the key tasks and status of operations of the Audit Committee and Remuneration Committee for that fiscal year?	A
2.11	Were the company's interim financial reports all approved by the Audit Committee and submitted to the board for discussion and resolution?	A
2.12	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.13	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.14	Did the company have a nomination committee, and did it have not less than three members, with at least half of the members being independent directors, and with an independent director serving as convener and meeting chair, and did the company disclose the organization, functions, and operations of the committee?	A
2.15	Did the company disclose on its website how independent directors communicate on their own with the chief internal auditor and the external auditors (e.g., the manner of communication, the matters discussed, and the results of such communication regarding the company's financial reports and its financial and operating status)?	A
2.16	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.17	Did the board regularly (at least once a year) refer to the Audit Quality Indicators (AQIs) to review the independence and suitability of the external auditors and fully and accurately disclose the assessment procedures in the annual report?	A
2.18	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.19	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.20	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.21	(Deleted)	(Deleted)

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
2.22	Was the company's risk management overseen by the audit committee or a board-level functional committee (e.g., risk management committee), and has the company adopted risk management policies and procedures that have been passed by the board, and disclosed the organizational structure in place for risk management, the risk management procedures, and the status of risk management operations, and did it report to the board of directors on these at least once a year?	AA
2.23	Have the rules adopted by the company for assessing the performance of the board of directors been passed by the board, with the express requirement that an external assessment be carried out at least once every three years, and has it furthermore carried out the assessment during the year being evaluated or the preceding two fiscal years, and disclosed the implementation status and assessment results on its website or in its annual report?	AA
2.24	Has the company established a cyber security risk management framework, adopted cyber security policies and concrete management programs, and invested in resources for cyber security management? Did it furthermore disclose these on the company's website or in its annual report? <i>[If the company has adopted information security system standards ISO27001, CNS27001, or other systems or standards of equal or greater effect, and furthermore has obtained third-party certification, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
2.25	Did all of the company's independent directors complete the number of hours of continuing education required by the Directions for the Implementation of Continuing Education for Directors and Supervisors of TWSE Listed and TPEx Listed Companies? <i>[If all of the directors completed the required hours of continuing education, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
2.26	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.27	Has the company adopted an intellectual property management plan linked to the company's operational objectives, and disclosed the status of its implementation on the company's website or in its annual report, and did it report on the plan to the board of directors at least once a year? <i>[If the company has adopted the Taiwan Intellectual Property Management System (TIPS), ISO 56005, or similar intellectual property management system standards, and</i>	A+

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
	<i>furthermore has obtained third-party certification, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	
2.28	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.29	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
2.30	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
III. Increasing Information Transparency		
3.1	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.2	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.3	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.4	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.5	Was the annual financial report in English filed to MOPS by 18 days before the AGM? <i>[If the company disclosed the interim financial reports in English within two months after the deadline for reporting of the Chinese versions, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
3.6	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.7	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.8	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.9	Did the company upload the changes in the shareholding of insiders in the previous month to MOPS by the 10th (inclusively) of each month?	A
3.10	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.11	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.12	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.13	Did the company voluntarily disclose the individual remuneration details of each director in its annual report?	AA
3.14	Did the company disclose the connection between director and managerial officer performance assessment and remuneration in its annual report?	A
3.15	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.16	Did the company disclose on its Chinese and English websites the list of substantial shareholders and information related to the company's finances, business, and corporate governance?	A
3.17	(Deleted)	(Deleted)

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
3.18	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.19	(Deleted)	(Deleted)
3.20	<p>Did the company attend or voluntarily hold investor conferences at least two times in the year being evaluated, and disclose the link information for the complete audiovisual records of at least two conferences, and were the first and last investor conferences in the year held at least three months apart?</p> <p><i>[If the company held at least one investor conference each quarter or held investor conferences to address the operating results of each quarter, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i></p>	A+
3.21	Did the company voluntarily disclose in the annual report the individual remuneration details of the general manager (chief executive officer) and assistant general manager(s)?	A
IV. Promoting Sustainable Development		
4.1	Did the company have a designated unit in charge of promoting sustainable development that, following the principle of materiality, conducted risk assessment on environmental, social, or corporate governance issues related to the company's operations, and adopted relevant risk management policies or strategies, and did the board of directors oversee the promotion of sustainable development, and did it disclose the same on the company's website and in its annual report?	A
4.2	Did the company have a designated unit in charge of promoting ethical corporate management, with responsibility for establishing and supervising the implementation of the ethical corporate management policies and prevention programs, and disclose the unit's operations and implementation on the company's website and in its annual report, and did the unit report to the board of directors at least once a year?	A
4.3	Did the company regularly disclose on the company website or in its annual report or sustainability report its concrete plans for promoting environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices and the results of the implementation of those plans?	A
4.4	Did the company's sustainability report refer to the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) standards to disclose ESG information?	A
4.5	Did the company obtain a third-party verification or assurance for its sustainability report?	A

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
4.6	Did the company, following the International Bill of Human Rights, adopt policies and concrete management plans to protect human rights, and disclose the policies and their implementation on the company website and in its annual report?	A
4.7	Did the company upload the English version of its sustainability report to MOPS and the company website?	A
4.8	Has the company adopted a policy to adequately reflect business performance or results in employee remuneration, and disclosed it on its website or in its annual report?	A
4.9	Did the company disclose its employee welfare measures, retirement plan, and the implementation thereof on its website and in the annual report?	A
4.10	Did the company disclose on its website and in its annual report the measures it takes to provide its employees with personal security and a safe working environment and the implementation thereof?	A
4.11	Did the company disclose the water consumption and total weight of waste for the past two years? <i>[If the data of the water consumption or total weight of waste for the past two years has been verified by an external institution, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
4.12	Did the company set management policies for reduction of water use or other waste/pollutants, including reduction targets, promotion measures and achievement status?	A
4.13	Has the company established an environmental management system, and disclosed the status of its implementation on the company's website or in its annual report or sustainability report? <i>[If it has adopted ISO 14001 or similar environmental management system standards, and furthermore has obtained third-party certification, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
4.14	Did the company disclose on its website or in its annual report the identities, issues of concern to, channels of communication with, and means for responding to, stakeholders that it has identified? <i>[If the company regularly reported the status of communication with its various stakeholders to the board, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
4.15	Did the company disclose on its website or in its annual report its ethical corporate management policy passed by its board of directors, expressly prescribing its specific ethical management practices and its programs to prevent unethical conduct, and specify the status of implementation?	A
4.16	Did the company adopt and disclose in detail on its website a whistle blower system for company insiders and outsiders to report illegal behavior (including corruption) and unethical behavior?	A
4.17	Did the company disclose on its website or in its annual report or sustainability report the supplier management policies it adopted, and require suppliers to comply with the relevant provisions regarding issues such as environmental protection, occupational safety and health, or labor rights, and specify the status of implementation?	A
4.18	Did the company disclose information about the company's governance, strategies, risk management, metrics, and targets for climate-related risks and opportunities in accordance with the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosure (TCFD) recommendation framework?	A
4.19	Did the company invest in machinery and equipment for energy conservation or green energy related environmental sustainability, or invest in Taiwan's green energy industry (e.g., renewable energy plants), or issue or invest in sustainable bonds, and disclose the status of investment therein and the specific benefits?	A
4.20	Did the company have a policy to promote diversity or gender equality in the workplace and disclose its implementation?	A
4.21	Did the company assess risks or opportunities to the community and take corresponding measures, and disclose the specific measures and implementation results on the company's website or in its annual report or sustainability report?	A
4.22	Did the company invest resources to support domestic cultural development, and disclose the methods and results of that support on the company's website or in its annual report or sustainability report?	A
4.23	Did the company disclose its policy on the connection between senior managerial officer remuneration and ESG-related performance assessment?	A
4.24	Was the sustainability report prepared by the company submitted to and passed by the board of directors?	A

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
4.25	Did the company disclose the Scope 1 and Scope 2 annual emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) for the past two years? <i>[If the Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas emissions data for the past two years has been verified by an external institution, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
4.26	Did the company set management policies for reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including reduction targets, promotion measures, and achievement status? <i>[If it has disclosed its 2030 carbon reduction targets, strategies, and action plan, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
4.27	Has the company disclosed the types and annual emission volumes of Scope 3 greenhouse gases (GHG) for the past year?	A
4.28	Has the company adopted an energy management plan, and disclosed the status of its implementation on the company's website or in its annual report or sustainability report? <i>[If it has adopted ISO50001 or similar energy management system standards, and furthermore has obtained third-party certification, one additional point will be added to the total score.]</i>	A+
4.29	Has the company adopted internal carbon pricing, to estimate the impact of climate change on the company's finances and operations?	A
4.30	Has the company adopted an employee training and development program to enhance the career skills of employees, and disclosed its content and implementation status?	A
4.31	Has the company regularly conducted employee satisfactions surveys, and disclosed the status of implementation and plans for improvement?	A
4.32	Has the company adopted a personal data protection policy, and disclosed its content and implementation status?	A
4.33	Has the company established consumer or customer rights protection policies and complaint procedures regarding its products and services with respect to issues such as customer health and safety, marketing, or labeling?	A
4.34	Has the company established a board-level sustainability committee with no less than three members, who shall possess corporate sustainability expertise and ability, and with at least one director participating in its supervision, and disclosed its composition, duties, and operations?	A

2025 Corporate Governance Evaluation Indicators		
Item No.	Evaluation Indicator	Type of Indicator
Extra Credit and Point Deduction Indicators		
Extra Credit Indicators	<p>Did the company perform especially well in the area of corporate governance, or make concrete beneficial contributions in promoting corporate governance?</p> <p>1. Did the company voluntarily participate in any other corporate governance related evaluation system and receive certification?</p> <p>2. Did the company have other excellent corporate governance performance or specific achievements in fulfilling social responsibilities, e.g., did the company hold a physical shareholders' meeting assisted by video conferencing (hybrid AGM), etc.?</p>	
Point Deduction Indicators	<p>Did the company materially violate ethical corporate management best practice principles, corporate social responsibility, or the internal control system, or otherwise materially fail to comply with the corporate governance principles?</p> <p>1. Was the company or its responsible person named as a defendant in any litigation brought by the Securities and Futures Investors Protection Center?</p> <p>2. Did the company materially violate its internal control system, resulting in material loss or a significant sanction by the competent authority?</p> <p>3. Was the company subject to any significant administrative sanction by the competent authority, or to any search, litigation, or sentencing by a judicial agency, for any other circumstance in violation of corporate governance principles, including but not limited to insider trading, stock price manipulation, false financial reporting, defalcation of assets, managerial control dispute, tax evasion, or violation of corporate governance regulations?</p> <p>4. Was the company subject to any significant administrative sanction by the competent authority, or to any search, litigation, or sentencing by a judicial agency, for any material violation of corporate social responsibility such as damage to labor rights, environmental pollution, or product safety related or other material violation?</p> <p>5. If the company is a financial or insurance enterprise, has any of its independent directors served for more than 3 consecutive terms?</p> <p>6. Other, e.g.: Did the company carry out any repurchase of shares into treasury stock, in which the repurchase execution rate was lower than 50% and the reason was obviously unreasonable? Did there occur, in the company's holding of a virtual-only shareholders' meeting, any material damage to shareholders' rights and interests?</p>	