Evaluation of the Performance of the Board of Directors

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
Internal selfevaluation: An internal evaluation of the performance of the Board of Directors and Functional Committees is conducted once every year (Where an external performance evaluation has been arranged for the current year, the internal performance evaluation may be exempted)	January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025	The performance evaluation of individual Director members.	The performance evaluation of individual Director was conducted through internal self-evaluation. For the scoring criteria, each review item is scored using the weight method, and performance evaluation results are divided into five levels, namely excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor.	The performance evaluation of individual Directors included the following: (1) Understanding of the goals and missions of the Company; (2) recognition of duties as directors; (3) degree of participation in the Company's operations; (4) management of internal relationship and communication; (5) professionalism and continuing education; and (6) internal control.	The self-evaluation results for all “Director Members” were rated as “Excellent.”
External evaluation: The performance of the Board of Directors shall be evaluated by	January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025	The respective performance evaluations of the Board of Directors, Audit Committee,	The Company appointed EY to conduct the 2025 performance evaluation of the Board of Directors, the Audit	EY conducted the evaluation of the Board of Directors and its Functional Committees across three primary	With respect to qualitative assessment indicators, EY further applied a three-tier evaluation approach, comprising Basic, Advanced, and

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
external independent institutions or external experts/ scholars at least once every three years.		Remuneration Committee, Ethical Corporate Management Committee, and Sustainable Development Committee are included.	Committee, the Remuneration Committee, the Ethical Corporate Management Committee, and the Sustainable Development Committee. EY is a member firm of one of the Big Four accounting firm networks and enjoys an excellent professional reputation. The external evaluators possess advisory or practical experience in the areas of corporate governance, internal control, and risk management, and have extensive experience in conducting external board performance evaluations for	dimensions: Structure, People, and Process and Information. The evaluation methods included document review, directors' self-evaluation questionnaires, and on-site interviews. The evaluation covered eight aspects: board structure and processes; board composition; legal entity and organizational structure; roles and responsibilities; behavior and culture; director training and development; oversight of risk control; and oversight of reporting, disclosure, and performance.	Benchmark levels. Based on the overall evaluation, the Company's comprehensive performance in the areas of Board of Directors and Functional Committee Structure, People, and Process and Information was rated at the Benchmark level. [Summary of Overall Evaluation] 1."Structure" dimension: (1) Appropriate Functional Committees have been established, including the Audit Committee, Remuneration Committee, Ethical Corporate Management Committee, and the Sustainable Development Committee. (2) Independent directors account for three out of seven board seats,

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
			peer financial holding companies. Furthermore, the firm is not affiliated with the accounting firm engaged as the Company's attesting CPA and does not belong to the same network, thereby ensuring its professionalism and independence. The external evaluators were responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the Company's Board of Directors and its Functional Committees, maintaining an impartial and objective stance, and there were no circumstances that could compromise their		exceeding the competent authority's recommendation of having at least two independent directors and at least one-third of the total board seats. (3) Upon review of the Board's composition, the Company currently has seven directors, including three female directors, surpassing the requirement that the Board include at least one female director. (4) The Board of Directors demonstrates a diverse composition, with members possessing the professional knowledge, experience, and backgrounds necessary to fulfill their

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
			independence.		functions, including expertise in finance, business, law, accounting, financial management, cybersecurity/ information technology, and risk management. The Board of Directors is therefore able to provide concrete oversight and guidance to the management team. 2. “People” dimension: (1) The Company has established relevant corporate governance regulations, including the Board Performance Evaluation Guidelines and the Corporate Governance Principles. (2) The interviewed directors possess

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					experience in the financial industry and are well acquainted with SinoPac Holdings' core business focus, competitive advantages, and potential risks. They are able to provide specific insights regarding SinoPac Holdings' operational strategies. (3) The Board members have diverse backgrounds and are all seasoned professionals. They actively participate in meetings, engage in objective, fair, and impartial discussions, and leverage their respective expertise, professional knowledge, and diverse perspectives to

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					provide concrete recommendations to the management team during meetings, thereby duly fulfilling their duties and responsibilities. 3.“Process and Information” dimension: (1) The Audit Committee conducts regular communications with the Chief Auditor and the CPA regarding material issues, thereby effectively performing its oversight function. (2) The meeting affairs unit provides agenda materials prior to meetings. Directors or committee members may request supplementary information from

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					the meeting administration unit or the proposing unit, thereby assisting directors or committee members in fully understanding the substance of the proposals and facilitating thorough deliberation. [Recommendations for Enhancement] 1. Under the current practice, a Risk Management Committee is established under the Chairman, with the Chairman serving as the convener. The Committee reviews the Company's risk management policies, organization, systems, and overall limits, and examines the overall exposure and risk profile. It

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					is recommended that the Company continue to review and further optimize the governance design of the Risk Management Committee. The Board of Directors may, based on practical needs, designate an appropriate number of directors to serve as members, with priority consideration given to the participation of independent directors. 2. The Company has established a Personnel Review Committee and a talent pool for senior managerial officers, and director candidates are nominated through a nomination system. In

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					addition to maintaining its benchmark practices, it is recommended that the Company further institutionalize succession planning and talent pool planning for directors, clearly define the core competencies required of directors and succession considerations, and appropriately disclose the relevant mechanisms in the annual report or corporate governance report. This would enhance the long-term planning of the Board's composition and increase transparency regarding its operation.

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					3. The Company has continuously arranged continuing education programs for directors on topics including anti-money laundering, sustainable finance, and climaterelated issues, demonstrating the Board's emphasis on corporate governance matters. In addition to ensuring that directors' continuing education complies with regulatory requirements, it is recommended that the Company further align the training topics with the core responsibilities of the Board of Directors and its Functional

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					Committees. Moreover, based on the Board's overall competency structure, the Company may systematically plan advanced courses covering areas such as risk management, information security governance, and regulatory trends, so that directors' continuing education remains more closely aligned with the Company's strategies, risk profile, and governance priorities. [the Company's Response Measures] 1. The Company will continue to assist the Board of Directors through the Functional Committee and will consider, as practical needs

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					require, subordinating the Risk Management Committee to the Board of Directors. 2. In coordination with the competent authorities' schedule for establishing a Nomination Committee, the Company will further define directors' core competencies and succession considerations. 3. The Company has established clear requirements for directors' continuing education in accordance with the "Directions for the Implementation of Continuing Education for Directors and Supervisors of TWSE Listed and TPEx Listed

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					Companies" and other relevant regulations. These requirements include a minimum of six hours of training per year (newly appointed directors must complete at least 12 hours in their first year) and must include at least three hours of courses related to Environmental (E), Social (S), and Governance (G) topics in corporate sustainability, as well as three hours of climaterelated training in line with the TCFD work plan. To assist directors in effectively completing their training, the Company has established a comprehensive support

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					mechanism: course updates from various training providers are consolidated monthly, directors are proactively notified via email, and enrollment assistance is provided, enabling directors to select courses suited to their individual needs and continuously enhance their professional competencies. In 2025, all directors met the required training hours, with an average of 18.78 hours per director—well above the statutory minimum—of which climaterelated courses averaged 5.42 hours. The training courses covered diverse topics, including elder protection

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					and trust management, antimoney laundering, sustainable development and the lowcarbon economy, information security and digital finance, and ESG and financial management, demonstrating the Company's strong commitment to directors' professional development and corporate governance. Going forward, the Company will, based on practical needs, consider expanding the scope of directors' required training to include advanced courses on risk management, information

Evaluation Cycle	Evaluation Period	Scope of Evaluation	Evaluation Method	Evaluation Content	Evaluation Results
					security governance, and regulatory trends.