

**Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and
Functional committees (Internal & External assessment)**

● Internal Assessment (Once Per Year)	2
2025 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees.....	2
2024 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees.....	4
2023 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees.....	8
2022 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees.....	12
● External Assessment (Once Per 3 Years).....	17
2024 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees by external professional institution	17

● **Internal Assessment (Once Per Year)**

2025 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees

2025 Board of Directors’ performance evaluation and progress

1. Basis: “Performance Evaluation Policy for the Board of Directors and Its Functional Committees.”

2. Evaluation cycle and frequency

The Company’s Board of Directors and functional committees are subject to internal performance evaluation at the end of each year.

3. Evaluation indicators

⊙ Board of Directors’ performance is evaluated using 48 indicators across 6 different areas, including board engagement in the Company’s operations, improving the quality of board decisions, the board’s composition and structure, election and continuing education of board members, enforcement of internal control, and engagement in sustainable operation (ESG).

⊙ Directors’ (individual) performance is evaluated using 23 indicators across 6 different areas, including director awareness towards the Company’s goals and missions, their respective duties, level of engagement in the Company’s operations, maintenance of internal relations and communication, continuing education, and enforcement of internal control system.

⊙ Functional committees’ performance is evaluated using 19–22 indicators across 5 different areas, including committee engagement in the Company’s operations, awareness of committee duties, improvement of committees’ decisions, the committee’s composition and member selection, and enforcement of internal control.

4. Evaluation procedures

⊙ At the end of each year, the Company evaluates year’s performance using various indicators. Results of internal and external performance assessments are presented for discussion by the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee and the Board of Directors within 3 months of the following financial year.

⊙ 2025 performance of the Board of Directors and functional committee was reported and discussed during the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee meetings dated March 12, 2026.

5. Assessment results

The Board of Directors and functional committees have performed in accordance with corporate governance principles. All committees have duly performed their duties and supported the board.

Item	Evaluation outcome
The Board of Directors’ performance valuation	<p>⊙ A total of 6 main criteria were used for evaluation. The Company attained an average score of 4.88 this year (compared to 4.95 the previous year); it scored higher than average in 4 criteria, equal to average in 1 criterion, and lower than average in 1 criterion.</p> <p>⊙ Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.</p>
Board member (self) performance assessment	<p>⊙ A total of 6 main criteria were used for evaluation. Average score for the year was determined at 4.99 (compared to 4.96 the previous year); out of all the criteria used this year, 1 of which scored higher than average, 3 of which scored equal to average, and 2 of which scored lower than average.</p> <p>⊙ Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.</p>
Performance evaluation for the Audit and Risk Management Committee	<p>⊙ There were 5 main evaluation criteria in total. Average score for the year was determined at 4.96 (compared to 4.99 the previous year); out of all the criteria used this year, 2 of which scored higher than average, 1 of which scored equal to average, and 2 of which scored lower than average.</p>

	◎ Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.
Performance evaluation for the Remuneration and Nomination Committee	◎ There were 4 main evaluation criteria in total. Average score for the year was determined at 4.96 (compared to 4.97 the previous year); out of all the criteria used this year, 1 of which scored higher than average, 1 of which scored equal to average, and 2 of which scored lower than average. ◎ Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.
Performance evaluation for the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee	◎ There were 4 main evaluation criteria in total. The Company attained an average score of 4.99 this year (compared to 5 the previous year); it scored higher than average in 3 criteria and lower than average in 1 criterion. ◎ Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.

Note : The Board/Functional Committee Performance Self-assessment Questionnaire Template published by Taiwan Stock Exchange Corporation gathers responses on scale of 5: “1 – Extremely poor (Strongly disagree); 2 – Poor (Disagree); 3 – Moderate (Neutral); 4 – Good (Agree); 5 – Excellent (Strongly Agree).”

◎ Improvement measures:

Potential improvements based on the outcome of this year’s performance evaluation generally fall into the following three categories: 1. Composition and member selection for the Board of Directors and functional committees; 2. Level of participation in the Company’s operations and internal controls; 3. Directors’ ongoing education and awareness of functional committees’ duties.

The following improvement measures have been suggested based on the above:

① Composition and member selection for Board of Directors and functional committees:

The Company will observe Paragraph 2, Article 29 of Corporate Governance Best-Practices Principles for Financial Holding Companies and nominate director candidates for the next board by taking background information such as gender, professional knowledge, and skills into consideration, and thereby increase the diversity of board and functional committee members.

② Level of participation in the Company’s operations and internal control:

In an attempt to help directors and committee members become more involved in company operations and gain a better understanding of the internal control system, the Company will arrange for CPAs to be physically present to address queries at quarterly board meetings and Risk Management Committee meetings, and will invite CPAs to discuss annual audit plans with committee members at least twice a year. Furthermore, the Company will arrange to have managers or appropriate personnel provide explanations to whatever queries the directors or committee members may have.

③ Directors’ ongoing education and awareness of functional committees’ duties:

The Company will observe “Directions for the Implementation of Continuing Education for Directors and Supervisors of TWSE Listed and TPEX Listed Companies” previously amended on December 5, 2025 by arranging on-site tuition courses for 2026 that aim to help directors develop the professional knowledge needed.

2024 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees

2024 Board of Directors' performance evaluation and progress

1. Basis: "Performance Evaluation Policy for the Board of Directors and Its Functional Committees."

2. Evaluation cycle and frequency

The Company's Board of Directors and functional committees are subject to internal performance evaluation at the end of each year.

3. Evaluation indicators

◎ Board of directors' performance is evaluated using 48 indicators across 6 different areas, including board engagement in the Company's operations, improving the quality of board decisions, the board's composition and structure, election and continuing education of board members, enforcement of internal control, and engagement in sustainable operation (ESG).

◎ Directors' (individual) performance is evaluated using 23 indicators across 6 different areas, including director awareness towards the Company's goals and missions, their respective duties, level of engagement in the Company's operations, maintenance of internal relations and communication, continuing education, and enforcement of internal control system.

◎ Functional committees' performance is evaluated using 19–22 indicators across 5 different areas, including committee engagement in the Company's operations, awareness of committee duties, improvement of committees' decisions, the committee's composition and member selection, and enforcement of internal control.

4. Evaluation procedures

◎ At the end of each year, the Company evaluates year's performance using various indicators. Results of internal and external performance assessments are presented for discussion by the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee and the Board of Directors within 3 months of the following financial year.

◎ 2023 performance of the Board of Directors and functional committee was reported and discussed during the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee meetings dated March 14, 2025.

5. Assessment results

The Board of Directors and functional committees have performed in accordance with corporate governance principles. All committees have duly performed their duties and supported the board.

Item	Evaluation outcome
The Board of Directors' performance valuation	The evaluation covered six main aspects using a total of 48 evaluation indicators. Overall, performance improved in 22 indicators and remained unchanged in 21 indicators; all evaluation aspects averaged a score of 4.95 and above, up 0.01 from the previous year. Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.
Board member (self) performance assessment	The evaluation covered six main aspects using a total of 23 evaluation indicators. Overall, performance improved in 12 indicators and remained unchanged in 7 indicators; all evaluation aspects averaged a score of 4.96 and above, up 0.02 from the previous year. Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.
Performance evaluation for the Audit and Risk Management Committee	Overall, out of a total of 22 evaluation indicators, performance remained unchanged in 18 indicators and deteriorated in 2 indicators; all evaluation aspects averaged a score of 4.99 and above, which was comparable to the previous year. Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.

Performance evaluation for the Remuneration and Nomination Committee	Overall, out of a total of 21 evaluation indicators, performance improved in 2 indicators and remained unchanged in 17 indicators; all evaluation aspects averaged a score of 4.97 and above, up 0.01 from the previous year. Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.
Performance evaluation for the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee	Overall, out of a total of 19 evaluation indicators, performance improved in 1 indicator and remained unchanged in 18 indicators; in four evaluation aspects the committee averaged a full score of 5.00 and above, up 0.01 from the previous year. Outcome of performance evaluation: Excellent.

Note: Scores are assigned using a 5-scale system: “Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Good (3), Fair (2), Improvement Required (1).” A perfect score is 5 for all assessments.

⊙ Improvement measures:

① With regard to Board of Directors performance evaluation and director self-evaluation, below is an explanation to aspects that scored less than last year:

➤ The Board of Directors’ performance valuation

Evaluation indicators	Current progress or other recommendations
A. Participation in company operations 2. Did the directors exhibit good attendance at shareholder meetings? (3 points for an attendance rate of 1/2; 4 points for an attendance rate of 2/3; 5 points for an attendance rate of 3/4) (averaged 4 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 1-point deterioration)	After resolving the date and venue of the Shareholders’ Meeting during the Board of Directors meeting held in January, the board handed each director a Board Meeting schedule for 2025 (including the Shareholders’ Meeting to be held on June 13 2025), so that Directors can make time for the Shareholders’ Meeting.
F. Participation in ESG 46. Are board members aware of the ESG issues pertaining to the industry that the Company operates in? (Averaged 4.93 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 0.07-point deterioration) 47. Does the board hold discussions on the execution of the annual ESG plan and the outcome report on a regular basis? (Averaged 4.93 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 0.07-point deterioration)	In addition to the semiannual progress reports and execution plan reports for the second half of the year, the Board of Directors was briefed on the framework of the Company’s sustainability report and on the identification of material topics during the Board Meeting held in April, followed by another briefing of the sustainability report later in May. These briefings enabled directors to fully participate and discuss international sustainability trends as well as the authority’s efforts toward promoting sustainability. Each director was given an exquisitely printed copy of the sustainability report after it was published in July. Furthermore, the department shares quarterly ESG reports and e-newsletters and related news from time to time with outside directors; important information that is relevant to directors is also made available on the Company’s website, whereas any progress updates to the four major ESG strategies and

	any awards and recognitions are conveyed during quarterly investor seminars.
--	--

➤ The Board and director (individual) performance assessment

Evaluation indicators	Current progress or other recommendations
<p>A. Comprehension of the Company's goals and missions</p> <p>2. Do the directors have a clear understanding of all strategic goals that the board has set for the Company? (Averaged 4.93 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 0.07-point deterioration)</p>	<p>Reports on business operations and major motions are presented to the Board on an ongoing and regular basis, so that directors may have a better understanding of all of the Company's strategic goals. Presidents of key subsidiaries are also invited to take part in budget meetings.</p>
<p>B. Directors' duty awareness</p> <p>5. Are new directors aware of their duties and are they familiar with the Company's operations and environment? (Averaged 4.93 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 0.07-point deterioration)</p>	<p>The Board had a change of directors in March, April, and June. To help new directors become familiar with the business, the Company provided them with brief introductions to the Company's history, the management team, the Board of Directors, and functional committees including their authority, members, and obligations, the recusal rules, and regulations to be complied with by directors. The Company also answers whatever queries the new directors may have from time to time, in order to familiarize them with the Company's operations.</p>
<p>D. Internal relationship management and communication</p> <p>15. Do directors maintain good interaction with the management? (Averaged 4.93 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 0.07-point deterioration)</p>	<p>An internal unit has been charged with the responsibility of making regular arrangements for independent directors to communicate with the chief internal auditor and CPAs, and tracking the recommendations discussed in meetings. The unit also helps arrange meetings if outside directors have any specific issues that they would like to discuss with the management.</p>

- ② With regard to the evaluation of functional committee performance, below are shown with explanations and suggestions that scored less than last year:

Evaluation indicators	Current progress or other recommendations
<p>Audit and Risk Management Committee C. Improvements to the quality of decisions made by functional committees</p> <p>15. Are functional committee resolutions tracked appropriately? (Averaged 4.83 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 0.17-point deterioration)</p> <p>16. Do all functional committees conduct performance evaluations in a regular and efficient manner? (Averaged 4.83 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 0.17-point deterioration)</p>	<p>Resolutions or recommendations raised in functional committee meetings will be tracked afterwards, and any supplementary information would be distributed to directors along with the meeting minutes.</p> <p>Additionally, the Company examines its “Policy for Performance Appraisal on the Board of Directors and Functional Committees” (including the evaluation indicators and procedures) on a regular basis and conducts internal performance evaluation of the Board of Directors every year as required by policy. At the end of 2024, the Company engaged an external independent institution to conduct a triennial evaluation (external evaluation) of Board of Directors’ performance.</p>
<p>Remuneration Committee C. Improvements to the quality of decisions made by functional committees</p> <p>12. The Company provides functional committees with complete and timely information of certain quality, so that they may duly perform their duties. Managers, internal auditors, CPAs, legal consultants, or other personnel of relevant expertise may be invited to meetings if necessary (Averaged 4.83 points; compared to the score of 5 in the previous year, the performance represented a 0.17-point deterioration)</p>	<p>The Company observes its “Remuneration and Nomination Committee Charter” by providing timely information to the Remuneration Committee,” and may have managers of relevant departments present at meetings to provide explanations on related motions if necessary. Where a meeting requires the human resources department to explain a proposal, the Company would invite its President to make supplementary explanations on the annual bonuses of the financial holding company and subsidiaries, as well as the attainment of performance targets by subsidiaries.</p>

2023 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees

2023 Board of Directors' regular performance evaluation and progress

1. Basis: "Performance Evaluation Policy for the Board of Directors and Its Functional Committees."

2. Evaluation cycle and frequency

The Company's Board of Directors and functional committees are subject to internal performance evaluation at the end of each year.

3. Evaluation indicators

⊙ Board of directors' performance is evaluated using 48 indicators across 6 different areas, including board engagement in the Company's operations, improving the quality of board decisions, the board's composition and structure, election and continuing education of board members, enforcement of internal control, and engagement in sustainable operation (ESG).

⊙ Directors' (individual) performance is evaluated using 23 indicators across 6 different areas, including director awareness towards the Company's goals and missions, their respective duties, level of engagement in the Company's operations, maintenance of internal relations and communication, continuing education, and enforcement of internal control system.

⊙ Functional committees' performance is evaluated using 19–22 indicators across 5 different areas, including committee engagement in the Company's operations, awareness of committee duties, improvement of committees' decisions, the committee's composition and member selection, and enforcement of internal control.

4. Evaluation procedures

⊙ At the end of each year, the Company evaluates year's performance using various indicators. Results of internal and external performance assessments are presented for discussion by the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee and the Board of Directors within 3 months of the following financial year.

⊙ 2023 performance of the Board of Directors and functional committee was reported and discussed during the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee meetings dated March 14, 2024.

5. Assessment results

The Board of Directors and functional committees have performed in accordance with corporate governance principles. All committees have duly performed their duties and supported the board.

⊙ Out of the 48 board performance indicators, average performance scores ranged between 4.9 and 5.0 (out of 5) across all categories.

Area of assessment	Average score
	2023
1. Engagement in the Company's operations	4.90
2. Improvement of the Board's decision quality	4.96
3. Composition and structure of the Board of Directors	4.92
4. Election and continuing education of directors	4.91
5. Internal control	4.93
6. Engagement in sustainable management (ESG)	5.00

⊙ Out of the 23 individual director performance indicators, average performance scores ranged between 4.8 and 5.0 (out of 5) across all categories.

Area of assessment	Average score
	2023
1. Comprehension of the Company's targets and missions	4.98

2. Directors' duty awareness	5.00
3. Participation in the Company's operations	4.83
4. Management and communication of internal relations	4.96
5. Professionalism and continuing education of directors	4.91
6. Internal control	4.96

- ⊙ Functional committees: 22 of which were applicable to the Audit Committee, 21 of which were applicable to the Remuneration and Nomination Committee, whereas 19 of which were applicable to the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee. Average performance scores of functional committees as below.

Committee Area of assessment	Audit Committee 2023	Remuneration and Nomination Committee 2023	Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee 2023
1. Engagement in the Company's operations	4.96	4.96	4.97
2. Awareness toward the functional committees' responsibilities and duties	4.97	4.90	5.00
3. Improvement of the functional committees' decision quality	5.00	5.00	5.00
4. Formation and election of functional committee members	5.00	5.00	5.00
5. Internal control	5.00	-	-

Note: Scores are assigned using a 5-scale system: "Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Good (3), Fair (2), Improvement Required (1)." A perfect score is 5 for all assessments.

- ⊙ Improvement measures:

- ① With regard to Board of Directors performance evaluation and director self-evaluation, the board scored lower compared to the previous year, whereas directors' individual self-assessed scores were better than the previous year. Below is an explanation to aspects that scored less than 4.85:

- The Board of Directors' performance valuation

Indicator	Improvement measures
A. Level of participation in the Company's operations 3. Are directors given relevant information prior to a board meeting? (Average score: 4.80)	● Agenda of a board meeting and all related information is mailed to each director, along with the meeting advice, 7 days in advance so that they may read and comprehend beforehand.
A. Level of participation in the Company's operations 10. Do directors engage financial statement auditors in adequate communication and interaction? (Average score: 4.80)	● The Company invites financial statement auditors to discuss during board meetings when presenting financial statements for the previous year or previous half. Furthermore, the Company hosts two meetings a year where financial statement auditors may discuss with independent directors on key

	<p>audit issues. Overall, adequate time is given for directors and financial statement auditors to communicate face-to-face regarding the audit plans proposed by the Company and subsidiaries.</p>
<p>A. Level of participation in the Company’s operations</p> <p>11. Does the board regularly and thoroughly examine performance of the management team, and make reward and disciplinary decisions in a timely manner? (Average score: 4.73)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Yearly/quarterly reports on business operations or significant motions are made to provide directors with a better understanding of the Company’s operations and performance of the management team. Yearly performance evaluation is conducted in accordance with Paragraph 1, Article 26 of the Articles of Incorporation, Article 5 of “Director Remuneration Policy,” and Paragraph 1, Article 4 of “Remuneration and Nomination Committee Articles of Incorporation.” Performance evaluation, salary, and compensation for the Company’s Chairman and managers, as well as subsidiaries’ chairmen, vice chairmen, and presidents, are presented for review by the Remuneration and Nomination Committee and for resolution by the Board of Directors.
<p>C. Composition of the Board of Directors</p> <p>30. Does the Company have no more than two directors on the board who are related to each other as a spouse or 2nd-degree relative or closer, so as to ensure objective and independent decision-making? (Average score: 4.67)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Board of Directors will propose the establishment of the “Election Standards for the 9th Board of Directors” when electing members of the 9th board. This standard will serve as reference for nomination and re-election. The Company has implemented a key role system. All chairmen and presidents of the financial holding company and the main subsidiaries and their subordinates are considered key roles whose annual performance and compensation are determined differently from other managerial positions. Each key role holder shall have their annual performance evaluated based on aspects including strategic direction, key indicators, corporate social responsibilities, and leadership quality. Performance goal-setting and performance review are subject to approval by the Chairman. By monitoring performance and gaining insight into leadership style, the Company hopes to identify suitable director candidates from within the organization.
<p>D. Election and ongoing education of directors</p> <p>32. Does the Company have robust and transparent director election procedures and succession plans in place? (Average score: 4.73)</p>	

➤ The Board and director (individual) performance assessment

Indicator	Improvement measures
<p>C. Level of participation in the Company's operations</p> <p>7. Directors' personal attendance (excluding proxy attendance) at board meetings (Average score: 4.67)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prior to setting a time for board meetings, the Company will first determine directors' availability and schedules in line with city council meetings so that all directors are able to attend. In the case of extraordinary meeting, best efforts will be made to schedule meetings at times when all directors are able to attend. Board meetings between March and June each year are scheduled depending on the types of motions to be resolved for the upcoming shareholders' meeting, so as to meet the time requirements imposed by laws.
<p>C. Level of participation in the Company's operations</p> <p>14. Are directors free of concurrent director/supervisor duties in other companies? (Average score: 4.60)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The concurrent duty arrangement conforms with the "Regulations Governing Qualification Requirements for the Founder or Responsible Persons of Financial Holding Companies and Concurrent Serving Restrictions and Matters for Compliance by the Responsible Persons of a Financial Holding Company," the "Regulations Governing Appointment of Independent Directors and Compliance Matters for Public Companies," and related laws.

- ② With regard to the evaluation of functional committee performance, the Audit Committee was the only one that scored lower compared to the previous year, whereas the Remuneration and Nomination Committee and the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee both scored higher compared to the previous year. The indicators that scored 4.8 and below are shown with explanations and suggestions:

Indicator	Improvement measures
<p>Remuneration Committee</p> <p>B. Awareness towards duties of the functional committee</p> <p>11. The Remuneration and Nomination Committee communicates regularly with senior managers on performance evaluation and development plans. (Average score: 4.67)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To enable more adequate explanation of senior managers' annual performance evaluation and development plan (including training history), a decision was made during the Board of Directors meeting held in January 2024 to amend the "Senior Manager Performance Evaluation and Development Schedule" and add the assessment criteria – "Senior managers' participation in key internal meetings (such as Operational Committee and Risk Management Committee meetings) and internal/external training courses." The Company will continually review and improve other assessment aspects to further complete senior managers' performance evaluation.

2022 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees

2022 board of directors' regular performance evaluation and progress

1. Basis: "Performance Evaluation Policy for the Board of Directors and Its Functional Committees."

2. Evaluation cycle and frequency

The Company's Board of Directors and functional committees are subject to internal performance evaluation at the end of each year.

3. Evaluation indicators

- ⊙ Board of directors' performance is evaluated using 48 indicators across 6 different areas, including board engagement in the Company's operations, improving the quality of board decisions, the board's composition and structure, election and continuing education of board members, enforcement of internal control, and engagement in sustainable operation (ESG).
- ⊙ Directors' (individual) performance is assessed using 23 indicators across 6 different areas, including director awareness towards the Company's goals and missions, their respective duties, level of engagement in the Company's operations, maintenance of internal relations and communication, continuing education, and enforcement of internal control system.
- ⊙ Functional committees' performance is evaluated using 19–22 indicators across 5 different areas, including committee engagement in the Company's operations, improving the quality of committee decisions, the committee's composition and structure, election and continuing education of committee members, and enforcement of internal control.

4. Evaluation procedures

- ⊙ At the end of each year, the Company evaluates year's performance using various indicators. Results of internal and external performance assessments are presented for discussion by the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee and the Board of Directors within 3 months of the following financial year.
- ⊙ 2022 performance of the Board of Directors and functional committee was reported and discussed during the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee meetings dated March 15, 2023.

5. Assessment results

The board of directors and functional committees have performed in accordance with corporate governance principles. All committees have duly performed their duties and supported the board.

- ⊙ Out of the 48 board performance indicators, average performance scores ranged between 4.8 and 5.0 (out of 5) across all categories.

Area of assessment	Average score
	2022
1. Engagement in the Company's operations	4.93
2. Improvement of the Board's decision quality	4.99
3. Composition and structure of the Board of Directors	4.97
4. Election and continuing education of directors	4.94
5. Internal control	4.97
6. Engagement in sustainable operation (ESG)	4.94

- ⊙ Out of the 23 individual director performance indicators, average performance scores ranged between 4.8 and 5.0 (out of 5) across all categories.

Area of assessment	Average score
	2022
1. Comprehension of the Company's targets and missions	4.88
2. Directors' duty awareness	4.97
3. Participation in the Company's operations	4.85
4. Management and communication of internal relations	4.88
5. Professionalism and continuing education of directors	4.91
6. Internal control	4.94

- © Functional committees: 22 of which were applicable to the Audit Committee, 21 of which were applicable to the Remuneration and Nomination Committee, whereas 19 of which were applicable to the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee. Average performance scores of functional committees as below.

Area of assessment \ Committee	Audit Committee 2022	Remuneration and Nomination Committee 2022	Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee 2022
1. Engagement in the Company's operations	5.00	5.00	5.00
2. Awareness toward the functional committees' responsibilities and duties	5.00	4.91	4.97
3. Improvement of the functional committees' decision quality	5.00	5.00	4.95
4. Formation and election of functional committee members	5.00	4.93	5.00
5. Internal control	5.00	---	---

Note: Scores are assigned using a 5-scale system: "Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Good (3), Fair (2), Improvement Required (1)." A perfect score is 5 for all assessments.

◎ Improvement measures:

① Board of Directors performance evaluation and director self-evaluation both showed improved scores compared to the previous year. Below is an explanation to aspects that scored less than 4.90:

➤ The Board of directors' performance valuation

Indicator	Improvement measures
<p>A. Level of participation in the Company's operations 6. All directors of the Company have made noticeable contributions in board meetings. (Average score: 4.82)</p>	<p>● Diverse, humane, and flexible courses will be organized to help enforce core values, professional advantages, and capabilities. Each year, the Company provides tuition to directors and supervisors within the group on a variety of corporate governance-related topics such as finance, risk management, cybersecurity, business, and corporate social responsibilities. All of which have been considered essential courses for directors' education roadmap.</p>
<p>A. Level of participation in the Company's operations 11. The board had regularly and thoroughly examined the performance of the management team, and made reward and disciplinary decisions in a timely manner. (Average score: 4.82)</p>	<p>● Yearly/quarterly reports on business operations or significant motions are made to provide directors with a better understanding of the Company's operations and performance of the management team. Yearly performance evaluation is conducted in accordance with Paragraph 1, Article 26 of the Articles of Incorporation, Article 5 of "Director Remuneration Policy," and Paragraph 1, Article 4 of "Remuneration and Nomination Committee Articles of Association." Performance evaluation, salary, and compensation for the Company's Chairman and managers, as well as subsidiaries' chairpersons, vice chairpersons, and presidents, are presented for review by the Remuneration and Nomination Committee and for resolution by the board of directors.</p>
<p>D. Election and ongoing education of directors 32. The Company has robust and transparent director election procedures and succession plans in place. (Score: 4.73)</p>	<p>● The Board of Directors will propose the establishment of "Election Standards for the 9th Board of Directors" when electing members of the 9th board. This standard will serve as reference for nomination and re-election. The Company has implemented a key role system. All chairmen and presidents of the financial holding company and the main subsidiaries and their subordinates are considered key roles whose annual performance and compensation are determined differently from other managerial positions. Each key role holder shall have their annual performance evaluated based on aspects</p>
<p>D. Election and ongoing education of directors 33. Board members are elected according to the Company's board diversity policy and assessment standards. (Score: 4.82)</p>	

	including strategic direction, target accomplishment, corporate social responsibilities, and leadership quality, all of which are subject to approval by the Chairman of the financial holding company. Furthermore, year-end performance is evaluated individually and on a case-by-case basis by the Chairman of the respective subsidiaries. This system enables the organization to gain insight into the performance and leadership style of each individual, and uncover suitable talent for director succession. If there is a need to assign a new director to the board, the Company would first recommend one from the list of key role managers.
F. Involvement in ESG 46. Board members' understanding of ESG issues relevant to the Company's industry. (Average score: 4.82)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The ESG Task Force makes reports of half-yearly progress and execution plan for the next six months. Each year, the Company provides tuition to directors and supervisors within the group on a variety of corporate governance-related topics such as finance, risk management, cybersecurity, business, and corporate social responsibilities. All of which have been considered essential courses for the directors' education roadmap. The Company shares information about courses or conferences on topics such as ESG issues, compliance, financial reporting, and risk management that are being held outside the organization as a means to encourage continuing education among directors.

- Outcome of board of directors and board member performance (self) assessment and follow-up progress; only areas that averaged a score of 4.73 or lower and where two or more members had rated a score of 4 were listed:

Indicator	Improvement measures
C. Level of participation in the Company's operations 7. Directors' overall attendance (excluding proxy attendance) at board meetings (5 for full attendance, 4 for 1 missed session, 3 for 2 missed sessions and so on)? (Average score: 4.73)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prior to setting a time for board meetings, the Company will first determine directors' availability and schedules in line with city council meetings so that all directors are able to attend. In the case of an extraordinary meeting, best efforts will be made to schedule meetings at times when all directors are able to attend.
C. Level of participation in the Company's operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The concurrent duty arrangement conforms with

<p>14. Directors do not assume concurrent director/supervisor duties in multiple companies. (Score: 4.73)</p>	<p>“Regulations Governing Qualification Requirements for the Promoter or Responsible Persons of Financial Holding Companies and Concurrent Serving Restrictions and Matters for Compliance by the Responsible Persons of a Financial Holding Company,” “Regulations Governing Appointment of Independent Directors and Compliance Matters for Public Companies,” and related laws.</p>
---	--

② With regard to the evaluation of functional committee performance, only the indicators that scored 4.50 and below are shown with explanations and suggestions:

Indicator	Improvement measures
<p>Remuneration Committee A. Awareness toward duties of the functional committee 11. The Remuneration and Nomination Committee communicates regularly with senior managers on performance evaluation and development plans. (Average score: 4.40)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Senior managers are key persons of the financial holdings and subsidiaries, and given their critical role in making important decisions, it is essential that they possess adequate knowledge in the domestic and foreign financial environments as well as prevailing regulations. To facilitate more comprehensive description of senior managers’ accomplishments aside from annual performance, a proposal was raised to establish “Senior Manager Performance Evaluation and Development Schedule” to take into consideration senior managers’ participation in key internal meetings (such as Operational Committee and Risk Management Committee meetings) and training courses within and outside the organization.

● **External Assessment (Once Per 3 Years)**

2024 Performance evaluation of the Board of Directors and Functional committees by external professional institution

Taiwan Corporate Governance Association

Performance evaluation of the board of directors and functional committees of external professional independent institutions: Taiwan Corporate Governance Association is an independent non governmental/non-profit corporation that evaluates the governance system of professional companies in Taiwan and provides performance evaluation services for the board of directors.

The Company commissioned Taiwan Corporate Governance Association to evaluate the performance of its Board of Directors in December 2024. The external evaluation covered five aspects including: board composition and division of responsibilities, board guidance and supervision, board authorization and risk management, board communication and coordination, and self-discipline and improvement of the Board of Directors, and utilized a combination of questionnaires and field interviews to assess board performance. For this evaluation, Taiwan Corporate Governance Association assembled an assessment panel and designated Convener Sheng-Yuan Chen (Distinguished Professor at National Taipei University of Business School of Accounting and Finance), Committee Member Wen-Long Chang (General Secretary of Chinese National Association of Industry and Commerce), General Secretary Che-Sheng Wu (Vice Chairperson of Chinese Professional Management Association), Section Chief Yi-Fang Tsai, and Specialist I-Ching Sung to join the panel. By engaging a professional institution to review the performance of the current Board and Functional Committees, the Company was able to benefit from the guidance, the exchange of knowledge, as well as a professional and objective checkup of the Company's health. The performance evaluation concluded by Taiwan Corporate Governance Association on the Company's Board of Directors was reported to the Corporate Governance and Sustainability Committee and the Board of Directors on March 14, 2025. (Taiwan Corporate Governance Association is an independent non-government/non-profit organization that specializes in the evaluation of corporate governance system and assessment of Board of Directors performance.) Taiwan Corporate Governance Association made the following comments and suggestions in its Board of Directors performance assessment report:

1. Assessment outcome and suggestions:

The Association gave a highly favorable rating on directors' professional background, senior managers' compensation, and how the Company has associated long-term performance with sustainability. The Association recommended that the composition of the next Board of Directors should take into account gender equality for enhanced diversity.

2. Subsequent follow-up:

Outcomes of this assessment will be taken into consideration when electing or nominating directors for the next board.