The Oscar Publishing Services
International Journal of Law And Criminology

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue02 2026
PAGE NO. 32-41
DOI 10.37547/ijlc/Volume06Issue02-09

International Legal Standards for Protecting Taxpayer Rights in The Context of Digital Tax Administration

Javokhir Tilaganboev
Tashkent State University of Law, Lecturer, Department of English Law and European Union Law, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 December 2025; **Accepted:** 21 January 2026; **Published:** 27 February 2026

Abstract: The rapid transition towards "Tax Administration 3.0" marks a profound paradigm shift in global revenue mobilization, characterized by the integration of artificial intelligence, machine learning, robotic process automation, and machine-to-machine data sharing. While these unprecedented technological advancements promise enhanced efficiency, drastically reduced compliance burdens, and the near-real-time mitigation of tax evasion, they simultaneously introduce severe risks to fundamental taxpayer rights. This exhaustive research report provides a granular analysis of the international legal standards governing taxpayer protections in the contemporary digital era. By synthesizing recent jurisprudential developments—including landmark rulings from the European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the European Union — the analysis delineates the highly precarious balance between expanding administrative enforcement powers and the preservation of privacy, data protection, and due process. The report rigorously examines the regulatory frictions surrounding automated decision-making and algorithmic profiling, critically scrutinizing the systemic implications of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act. Furthermore, the analysis traces the historical evolution of taxpayer charters, culminating in the contemporary international push for a "Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights," which strictly advocates for human-in-the-loop oversight, algorithmic explainability, and protection against digital disenfranchisement. Finally, the report highlights the critical dimension of international tax cooperation, emphasizing the distinct capacity challenges faced by jurisdictions in the Global South, the privacy implications of the Automatic Exchange of Information (AEOI), and the socio-economic ramifications of the digital divide. Ultimately, the synthesis establishes that sustainable and equitable digital tax governance requires an architecture fundamentally anchored in human rights, absolute transparency, and algorithmic accountability.

Keywords: Digital Tax Administration, Tax Administration 3.0, Taxpayer Rights, Artificial Intelligence, Automated Decision-Making, General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), Algorithmic Accountability, International Tax Law, Global South.

Introduction: The Intersection of Digitalization and Revenue Governance

The foundational architecture of global tax administration is currently undergoing a structural and functional metamorphosis, transitioning away from traditional, reactive audit models towards seamless, integrated, and highly automated technological ecosystems. Often conceptualized by international bodies as "Tax Administration 3.0," this evolutionary phase seeks to embed taxation directly into the digital systems used by taxpayers for their daily economic, commercial, and social activities (OECD, 2024). By leveraging advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning (ML), distributed ledger technology, robotic process automation (RPA), and real-time application programming interfaces (APIs), national tax authorities are uniquely positioned to ingest, process, and analyze vast quantities of structured and unstructured data at unparalleled speeds (Grau, 2021). The fundamental objective driving this transformation is twofold: to drastically reduce the administrative burden on individual and corporate taxpayers by facilitating compliance by design, and to systematically close the tax gap by utilizing predictive analytics to detect evasion, fraud, and aggressive tax planning long before they fully materialize (OECD,

2023).

However, the aggressive modernization of state revenue mobilization introduces an acute and persistent tension between administrative efficiency and the safeguarding of fundamental human rights. Tax administrations inherently possess a formidable array of highly intrusive statutory powers — ranging from the compulsory extraction of sensitive financial data and real-time transaction monitoring to the execution of enforced asset recovery and wage garnishment — which directly and substantially impact the civil liberties, privacy, and property rights of individuals and corporate entities (IMF, 2025). Historically, democratic legal systems have counterbalanced these asymmetrical state powers through rigorous procedural safeguards, comprehensive judicial oversight, and the codification of standardized taxpayer charters (IBFD, 2022).

The contemporary digital transformation rapidly destabilizes this historical equilibrium. The widespread deployment of automated decision-making (ADM) systems and predictive risk-scoring algorithms obscures the administrative assessment process behind a dense veil of computational complexity, rendering traditional mechanisms of transparency, reason-giving, and public accountability increasingly obsolete (Hatfield, 2024). The international legal community is presently grappling with the profound socio-legal implications of this technological shift. Organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the United Nations (UN), and various regional tax bodies are increasingly recognizing that digital transformation cannot, and must not, exist in a legal vacuum (IMF, 2025; UN, 2023). The massive expansion of data collection capabilities, facilitated by domestic technological modernization and international frameworks like the Common Reporting Standard (CRS) and the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA), necessitates a commensurate strengthening of privacy and data protection frameworks across all participating jurisdictions (Article 29 Working Party, 2015).

Furthermore, the escalating reliance on algorithmic profiling to assess audit risks, substitute taxpayer obligations, or dictate punitive enforcement actions raises urgent and unresolved legal questions concerning algorithmic bias, the presumption of innocence, and the fundamental right to a fair and impartial hearing (Grau, 2021; IMF, 2025). This comprehensive report exhaustively evaluates the international legal standards requisite for the protection of taxpayer rights in the context of digital tax administration. It systematically dissects the intersection of advanced computational technologies with established international human rights frameworks, particularly focusing on European jurisprudence, which consistently serves as the vanguard for global data protection and privacy standards. The analysis subsequently extends to the normative, multilateral efforts to construct a universally applicable “Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights,” reflecting a growing academic and institutional consensus that novel technological threats demand bespoke, modernized legal remedies (Hatfield, 2024; Center for Taxpayer Rights, 2024). By interrogating the disparate impacts of digitalization—from the automated denial of essential public benefits to the marginalization of low-income taxpayers caught on the wrong side of the digital divide — the report delineates the theoretical and practical legal contours of a human-centric, rights-oriented digital tax ecosystem.

The Mechanics and Institutional Implications of Tax Administration 3.0

The transition to a highly digitalized, algorithmically driven tax ecosystem fundamentally reengineers the traditional social contract and the operational relationship between the sovereign state and the taxpayer. To adequately evaluate the legal standards required to govern this new paradigm, it is analytically necessary to first understand the technological architecture underpinning Tax Administration 3.0 and the specific administrative powers it amplifies.

The Technological Architecture of Modern Revenue Authorities

Modern tax authorities are progressively, and in some jurisdictions rapidly, evolving into sophisticated data agencies, transcending their historical role as mere revenue collection entities (CIAT, 2024). The traditional administrative paradigm, wherein the tax administration passively received self-assessed, retrospective tax returns and subsequently subjected a statistically minor fraction of them to manual, human-led auditing, is being irrevocably supplanted by continuous, real-time data ingestion protocols. Tax administrations now routinely access operational data directly from taxpayer natural business systems, circumventing human involvement entirely through seamless machine-to-machine data transmission (OECD, 2024).

Furthermore, the global expansion of electronic invoicing (e-invoicing) mechanisms and electronic fiscal devices—now strictly mandatory for all or certain classes of taxpayers in a significant percentage of OECD and emerging economies—ensures that granular transactional data is captured, authenticated, and verified directly at the point of sale, instantly streaming

to government servers (OECD, 2023). This deluge of big data forms the indispensable operational foundation for the application of artificial intelligence and machine learning within modern tax administration. AI systems are predominantly and aggressively deployed in high-yield areas such as the detection of sophisticated tax evasion networks, the optimization of mass debt collection, and the automation of frontline taxpayer services via natural language processing chatbots and virtual assistants (OECD, 2024; IMF, 2024). Robotic Process Automation (RPA) further accelerates these administrative processes by handling high-volume, repetitive tasks across multiple fragmented, legacy IT systems, effectively mimicking human computational interactions but at an incomparable scale, duration, and speed (University of Chile, 2021).

While these technologies demonstrably support increased national productivity, economic growth, and greater tax certainty for fully compliant businesses, they fundamentally alter the nature of state surveillance and administrative discretion (OECD, 2023; Emerald, 2024). When a sophisticated machine learning algorithm autonomously identifies a complex pattern indicative of Value Added Tax (VAT) carousel fraud across thousands of cross-border transactions, the ensuing administrative action is often swift, automated, and legally binding, deliberately bypassing the nuanced, context-dependent, and inherently slower evaluation traditionally provided by human tax auditors.

The Amplification of Administrative Power and Algorithmic Governance Risks

The comprehensive digitalization of tax tools naturally and inevitably facilitates an unprecedented expansion of tax administration powers, particularly regarding mass information gathering, data synthesis, and automated enforcement mechanisms (IMF, 2025). Consequently, governance arrangements and statutory mandates in tax procedure must be strictly calibrated to strike a fair, legally defensible balance between state administration powers and adequate, robust taxpayer protections. The International Monetary Fund has explicitly emphasized that well-functioning tax systems must be firmly anchored in legal design that transparently dictates exactly how these expanded powers are exercised, monitored, and legally contested (IMF, 2025).

The deep integration of advanced technologies exacerbates these intrinsic administrative risks by introducing the novel legal and operational concept of "algorithmic governance" (IMF, 2025). When legally binding decisions are entirely or substantially delegated to complex mathematical models, the traditional administrative law principles of transparency, reason-giving, and human accountability are severely tested, and often completely ruptured.

The Dutch childcare allowance scandal stands as a harrowing, internationally recognized testament to the catastrophic dangers of unmitigated algorithmic governance. In that instance, the deployment of a self-learning algorithm (SyRI) to detect social welfare and tax fraud resulted in the unlawful penalization and financial ruin of thousands of innocent families, driven largely by opaque algorithmic biases regarding dual nationality and a systemic, structural failure of human administrative oversight (IMF, 2025; Rachovista and Johann, 2022). This scandal underscores the critical reality that digitalization, absent robust legal guardrails and human rights integrations, can effortlessly transform the tax administration from a neutral arbiter of public finance into an instrument of systemic oppression and structural discrimination.

Human Rights Frameworks in the Tax Context: Jurisprudential Developments

The protection of taxpayer rights is intrinsically and irrevocably linked to broader international human rights frameworks. Historically, tax matters were often viewed by jurists and legislators as a highly specialized, exceptional domain, somewhat insulated from the intense constitutional and human rights scrutiny routinely applied to criminal law or civil liberties. However, the aggressive convergence of data-intensive tax administration and human rights law has precipitated a monumental shift in judicial reasoning across multiple jurisdictions. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union presently provide the most highly developed, rigorous jurisprudential architecture for evaluating the legality of digital tax administration practices globally.

The Right to Privacy, Data Protection, and Digital Search

Article 8 of the ECHR guarantees the fundamental right to respect for private and family life, a provision that has steadily become the primary legal bulwark against unwarranted state surveillance and overbroad data collection by tax authorities (ECHR, 1950; Rachovista and Johann, 2022). In the digital era, the mere collection and retention of data—even if that data is not immediately utilized for a specific tax audit—constitutes an actionable interference with this right (ECJ, 2014). Under ECHR jurisprudence, such interference is only legally permissible if it is strictly prescribed by law, pursues a legitimate aim (such as the economic well-being of the country via tax collection), and is fundamentally necessary and proportionate in a

democratic society (ECJ, 2014; Hatfield, 2024).

The boundary of proportionality is frequently and aggressively tested by modern tax technologies. In the landmark, paradigm-shifting case of Digital Rights Ireland, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) struck down the Data Retention Directive, which had broadly mandated telecommunications service providers to retain metadata from all citizens' communications for investigatory purposes (ECJ, 2014). The CJEU ruled definitively that such blanket, undifferentiated retention of metadata violated the fundamental rights to privacy and data protection, setting a profound legal precedent that directly impacts how tax authorities can legally harvest mass metadata to track taxpayer behavior and economic footprints (ECJ, 2014).

Similarly, the European Court of Human Rights has established strict, unyielding parameters for digital seizures and algorithmic searches conducted by state authorities. In the case of Kırdök and Others v. Turkey, the seizure of massive quantities of electronic data from lawyers' offices by judicial authorities, without adequate, technically sound procedures for filtering data covered by strict professional secrecy, was ruled a severe breach of Article 8 (ECHR Guide, 2023). Furthermore, in Kruglov and Others v. Russia, the broad, untargeted seizure of computers and hard drives containing highly personal information without sufficient procedural and judicial safeguards was similarly condemned by the Court (ECHR Guide, 2023). These rulings unequivocally affirm that tax administrations cannot lawfully utilize broad digital sweeps of electronic devices, cloud servers, or third-party platforms without highly specific, legally constrained warrants that rigorously protect professional privilege and filter irrelevant personal data.

The direct intersection of tax administration and Article 8 was most explicitly examined in the Dutch SyRI (System Risk Indicator) case (Rachovista and Johann, 2022). The District Court of The Hague ruled that the legislation authorizing SyRI — a sophisticated technological instrument utilized to profile citizens for social welfare and tax fraud risk by pooling massive, disparate datasets from various government agencies — violated Article 8 of the ECHR (Rachovista and Johann, 2022). The court conclusively determined that the algorithmic system lacked fundamental transparency, as citizens were neither informed of how their risk profiles were mathematically constructed, nor what specific data points contributed to a high-risk designation (Rachovista and Johann, 2022). The SyRI judgment establishes a vital, globally relevant legal standard: the state's legitimate interest in detecting tax evasion does not, under any circumstances, override the imperative of transparency and the absolute right of the citizen to understand the computational data processing to which they are continuously subjected.

The Right to a Fair Trial and Due Process in Automated Assessments

Article 6 of the ECHR, which explicitly guarantees the right to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, plays a highly critical role in complex tax disputes, particularly concerning the automated imposition of tax penalties and financial surcharges (University of Bologna, 2021). The Strasbourg court has consistently held over decades of jurisprudence that while standard, baseline tax assessments generally fall outside the scope of Article 6 (as they are traditionally considered a core civic obligation rather than a civil right or criminal charge), tax surcharges and administrative penalties possessing a demonstrably punitive and deterrent character are legally classified as "criminal charges" under the autonomous, substantive meaning of the Convention (University of Bologna, 2021; ECHR, 2002).

This legal distinction is profoundly important in the specific context of automated tax administration. If an algorithmic system autonomously generates a punitive tax assessment or a severe financial surcharge based strictly on a predictive risk model, the taxpayer must be afforded the full panoply of Article 6 protections, most notably including the presumption of innocence (IMF, 2025; ECHR, 2002). The enforcement of tax authority claims prior to a final judicial determination—a process greatly accelerated and often fully automated by digital garnishment systems and API integrations with financial institutions—can unlawfully deprive the taxpayer of these fundamental rights if irreversible economic or reputational damage occurs before an independent court can effectively intervene (ECHR, 2002).

Furthermore, the right to a fair hearing fundamentally requires equality of arms between the disputing parties. In a digital, algorithmically driven context, this strictly dictates that the taxpayer must have unhindered access to the evidence and the computational logic relied upon by the tax authority. However, when an administration relies on a proprietary, third-party "black-box" machine learning algorithm to assess liability or impose a severe penalty, the taxpayer is fundamentally and structurally disadvantaged. As notably determined by the Slovak Constitutional Court in the eKasa case, the automatic processing of vast amounts of transactional data to risk-assess taxpayers for VAT fraud raises profound, systemic legality and human rights issues if the

targeted taxpayer cannot effectively comprehend, audit, or challenge the specific algorithmic logic dictating the adverse administrative action (Rachovista and Johann, 2022).

Algorithmic Accountability, the GDPR Framework, and Artificial Intelligence Regulation

The absolute crux of the contemporary legal debate surrounding digital tax administration centers on Automated Decision-Making (ADM) and digital profiling. As tax authorities globally deploy increasingly sophisticated risk-scoring algorithms to categorize taxpayers as "compliant," "anomalous," or "high-risk," the specific legal mechanisms governing these mathematical algorithms dictate the ultimate survival of administrative justice.

The GDPR Framework and Article 22 Restrictions

Within the European Union, and influencing data protection regimes globally, the digitalization of tax administration inextricably implicates the stringent requirements of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (Hatfield, 2024). While taxation is explicitly recognized as an important objective of general public interest — allowing member states to implement specific legislative measures restricting certain data subject rights to ensure the efficient collection of taxes — such legislative restrictions must fiercely respect the core essence of fundamental rights and freedoms, and remain strictly necessary and proportionate in a democratic society (Hatfield, 2024; GDPR, 2016).

The most critical GDPR provision concerning tax algorithms and administrative automation is Article 22, which strictly governs automated individual decision-making, including computational profiling (Ropes & Gray, 2024). Article 22(1) establishes a fundamental, actionable right for the data subject "not to be subject to a decision based solely on automated processing, including profiling, which produces legal effects concerning him or her or similarly significantly affects him or her" (GDPR, 2016).

If a tax administration relies on Article 22(2)(b) to utilize solely automated processing for audits or assessments, the authorizing domestic legislation must mandate robust, verifiable safeguards, minimally including the absolute right to human intervention (GDPR, 2016). However, a persistent, deeply complex legal challenge lies in strictly defining what constitutes a decision based solely on automated processing. Tax administrations frequently argue in judicial proceedings that their advanced risk-scoring algorithms merely provide "decision-making assistance" to human tax auditors, thereby theoretically exempting the entire IT system from Article 22 restrictions (OECD, 2024). Yet, if the human auditor systematically rubber-stamps the algorithmic output without independent, meaningful, and documented evaluation, the processing remains de facto solely automated, representing a dangerous legal fiction designed to circumvent accountability (International Journal for Public Policy, Law and Development, 2025).

The CJEU SCHUFA Ruling: A Watershed Precedent for Algorithmic Scoring

The precise legal boundaries of Article 22 were radically clarified and significantly expanded by the CJEU in the highly consequential landmark SCHUFA judgment (Matheson, 2024; Hunton Andrews Kurth, 2024). SCHUFA, a prominent German credit reference agency, utilized complex automated algorithms to generate credit scores based on mathematical probability regarding a consumer's likelihood to repay a loan. SCHUFA argued vigorously that it merely provided the mathematical score (profiling) and that the actual legal "decision" to deny a loan was independently made by the third-party bank, thus ostensibly placing SCHUFA's algorithmic operations outside the strict scope of Article 22 (Matheson, 2024).

The CJEU comprehensively dismantled this legal argument, ruling that the automated generation of a probability value itself constitutes "automated individual decision-making" under Article 22(1) if a third party (in this case, the bank) "strongly relies" on that score to make a decision that significantly affects the individual (Matheson, 2024). The court acutely noted that a poor automated score leads "in almost all cases" to a loan refusal, effectively making the algorithmic score the determinative, deciding factor, stripping away the illusion of independent human decision-making (Matheson, 2024).

The transposition of the SCHUFA ruling into the realm of digital tax administration is profound and highly disruptive. If a third-party technology vendor, or an internal, specialized data science unit within a tax authority, generates an automated fraud risk score, and the frontline tax auditor relies heavily on that specific score to initiate a restrictive audit, freeze business assets, or deny a massive VAT refund, the generation of that score strictly constitutes automated decision-making. Consequently, the taxpayer legally triggers the right to a full explanation of the algorithm's internal logic, and the tax authority must possess a clear, unambiguous legislative mandate under Article 22(2)(b) with corresponding, actionable safeguards (Matheson, 2024; Hunton Andrews Kurth, 2024). The SCHUFA decision significantly curtails the ability of tax authorities to hide behind the legally flimsy facade of

"human-in-the-loop" oversight if that human intervention is merely illusory or bureaucratic theater.

The EU AI Act and the Classification Controversy

Running parallel to data protection law, the regulatory landscape for algorithms is being aggressively shaped by the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act. The AI Act formally adopts a risk-based approach, imposing highly stringent compliance, transparency, and data governance obligations on "high-risk" AI systems before they can be deployed in the European market (Legal Nodes, 2024; Bipartisan Policy Center, 2024). Annex III of the AI Act explicitly lists specific, sensitive areas where AI systems are deemed high-risk by default, including biometrics, critical infrastructure management, law enforcement, and access to essential public services and welfare benefits (EU AI Act, 2024).

The specific classification of AI systems used by tax administrations was a subject of intense, highly polarized legislative negotiation in Brussels. Given that tax algorithms can precipitate devastating audits, freeze corporate assets, and impose punitive, quasi-criminal sanctions, human rights legal scholars vehemently argue they inherently pose exceptionally high risks to fundamental rights (International Journal for Public Policy, Law and Development, 2025; Stanford TTLF, 2024). However, Recital 59 of the finally enacted AI Act (which crystallized the earlier draft Recital 38) explicitly states that AI systems specifically intended to be used for administrative proceedings by tax and customs authorities should not automatically be classified as high-risk AI systems used by law enforcement authorities (Hadwick, 2024).

This specific statutory carve-out for tax administration is highly controversial and widely criticized by civil rights advocates. Critics accurately contend that it creates a massive, dangerous regulatory lacuna. By statutorily exempting predictive tax auditing tools from the high-risk classification, tax authorities and their software vendors are legally relieved of the mandatory, burdensome requirements to conduct rigorous external conformity assessments, maintain comprehensive technical documentation, and ensure rigorous, audited human oversight mechanisms under the AI Act framework (MDPI, 2025; Hadwick, 2024). This legislative imbalance heavily favors state administrative efficiency at the direct, unmitigated expense of taxpayer rights, leaving the GDPR as the primary, yet arguably insufficient and overstretched, mechanism for algorithmic accountability in modern taxation (Hatfield, 2024).

The Evolution of Taxpayer Charters and the Push for a "Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights"

In direct response to the intrinsic, structural asymmetries in power and information between the sovereign state and the individual taxpayer, global legal systems have historically relied on Taxpayer Charters or Bills of Rights to formally codify the principles of good administration and procedural fairness (IMF, 2025). The IBFD Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers' Rights (OPTR) systematically and rigorously monitors these minimum standards globally, meticulously tracking legislative shifts, administrative circulars, and supreme court case law across over 50 diverse jurisdictions annually (IBFD, 2024; IBFD, 2025).

While traditional, analog taxpayer charters effectively outline core, foundational rights —such as the right to information, legal representation, and judicial appeal — they were fundamentally drafted in an analog era and severely fail to address the unique, highly scalable vectors of harm introduced by digital transformation (CFE Tax Advisers Europe, 2018; IBFD, 2022). For example, the right to confidentiality was traditionally conceived by legislators to prevent corrupt or careless tax officials from leaking physical paper files; today, that right must encompass rigorous, technologically advanced protection against catastrophic state data breaches, unauthorized inter-agency data pooling, and the invasive algorithmic reconstruction of a taxpayer's entire private life through the aggregation of disparate digital metadata (IBFD, 2024; IBFD, 2022).

Recognizing this critical, expanding legal gap, international legal scholars, tax practitioners, and civil society advocates have initiated a massive, concerted global effort to draft and promote a legally binding "Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights." This ambitious initiative gained significant international momentum during the 9th International Conference on Taxpayer Rights held in Antwerp in June 2024, convened by the Center for Taxpayer Rights and hosted by the DigiTax Centre (Hatfield, 2024; Center for Taxpayer Rights, 2024). The proceedings at Antwerp focused explicitly on framing new fundamental rights necessitated by the digitalization of tax authorities, robustly debating whether existing constitutional rights merely require judicial reframing, or if entirely novel, technologically specific rights must be formally recognized by international treaties (DigiTax, 2024; Univ-Droit, 2024).

Cross-Border Dynamics, the Automatic Exchange of Information, and the Global South

The intense digitalization of tax administration is not an isolated domestic phenomenon confined to individual nation-states; it is deeply, inextricably intertwined with the architecture of international tax cooperation and the massive volume of cross-border data flows. The prevailing global architecture designed for countering tax evasion and illicit financial flows relies heavily on

the Automatic Exchange of Information (AEOI), orchestrated primarily through multilateral frameworks like the OECD's Common Reporting Standard (CRS) and bilateral treaties stemming from the US Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA) (Article 29 Working Party, 2015).

Privacy Implications of the Automatic Exchange of Information

The global implementation of CRS and FATCA necessitates the mass, systematic, and continuous transfer of highly sensitive personal and financial data across sovereign borders, often occurring entirely without the targeted taxpayer's prior knowledge, consent, or ability to intervene (Article 29 Working Party, 2015; Revista Tecnica Tributaria, 2020). Data protection authorities, including the influential European Data Protection Board, have continuously and critically scrutinized these international frameworks for their severe, largely unchecked impact on global privacy (Article 29 Working Party, 2015).

A critical legal friction point is that AEOI mechanisms routinely force the exchange of sensitive financial data with jurisdictions that may not possess adequate data security infrastructure, robust cyber-defense capabilities, or independent legal safeguards protecting taxpayer confidentiality. Consequently, a taxpayer's fundamental right to privacy can be severely compromised once their data enters the global exchange network, highlighting the urgent, unmet need for international tax treaties to explicitly embed rigorous data protection standards as a mandatory prerequisite for participation in AEOI networks. Indeed, as highlighted by Philip Baker KC, the general international rule of exchanging information without prior notification to the taxpayer severely limits the individual's possibility of preparing a legal defense or correcting fatal data inaccuracies before harsh administrative action is taken, a legally questionable practice currently observed in over 80% of surveyed countries globally (Revista Tecnica Tributaria, 2020).

Capacity Building, the UN Framework, and the Global South

The complex conversation surrounding digital tax administration and the protection of taxpayer rights must also necessarily encompass the disparate economic and technological realities of the Global South. While advanced OECD economies debate the philosophical nuances of algorithmic explainability and GDPR compliance, many developing countries are still struggling to establish the foundational IT infrastructure required for digital revenue mobilization. Organizations such as the African Tax Administration Forum (ATAF) and the Inter-American Center of Tax Administrations (CIAT) explicitly recognize that digitalization presents a robust, generational opportunity for structural transformation in these regions, but they note unique, severe institutional hurdles accompany it.

Developing countries face the immense dual challenge of modernizing archaic tax systems to capture elusive revenue from the hyper-globalized digital economy while simultaneously rushing to establish the domestic legal frameworks necessary to protect their citizens from state overreach (IJECM, 2023). ATAF research clearly indicates that countries pairing digital IT reforms with absolute legal clarity—including comprehensive statutory guidance on electronic records, digital signatures, and codified taxpayer rights—experience significantly greater voluntary compliance and vital public trust (IJECM, 2023). Without a proper, robust legal basis clearly establishing administrative responsibility, audit reporting, and data transparency, the rapid introduction of digital tools is highly susceptible to severe political abuse, potentially eroding already fragile public trust in government institutions entirely (UN DESA, 2024).

Furthermore, the integration of fundamental human rights into international tax cooperation is gaining unprecedented, historic traction within the United Nations (UN DESA, 2024; UN Tax Committee, 2023). The UN Human Rights Council has repeatedly and forcefully emphasized the direct nexus between fair taxation, the curbing of illicit financial flows, crushing sovereign debt burdens, and the realization of economic, social, and cultural rights globally (Scottish Human Rights Commission, 2024; Glasgow University, 2025). As the United Nations actively negotiates the historic Framework Convention on International Tax Cooperation, global human rights mechanisms heavily expect that state parties will strictly align their new tax norms with their existing, binding human rights obligations (CESR, 2025; Lund University, 2024).

For developing nations, vigorously represented by coalitions such as the G-24, the primary goal is to utilize digital transformation to implement fairer, more easily administered profit allocation methods — such as Fractional Apportionment for digital services and the recognition of Significant Economic Presence (SEP) — while entirely avoiding the immense, often unworkable administrative complexities of the OECD Pillar One transfer pricing rules (IBFD Tax News, 2025; Kluwer International Tax Blog, 2025). In this specific macroeconomic context, “taxpayer rights” conceptually expands to encompass not only the individual citizen's right to privacy but also the collective, sovereign right of developing nations to exercise their taxing rights equitably and effectively in

the highly digitalized global economy without being undermined by systemic international tax avoidance (IBFD Tax News, 2025).

Strategic Recommendations for Global Policymakers

To successfully harmonize the inevitable, highly beneficial progression of Tax Administration 3.0 with the fundamental, non-negotiable imperatives of international human rights, international policymakers, tax treaty negotiators, and domestic legislators must rapidly adopt a proactive, rights-based governance architecture. The following strategic actions are urgently requisite:

Codify the Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights: National legislatures should formally and urgently enact comprehensive digital taxpayer charters, embedding the explicit rights to algorithmic explainability, meaningful human intervention, and absolute protection from solely automated punitive profiling directly into primary, binding tax procedure laws.

Harmonize Tax AI with High-Risk AI Frameworks: Jurisdictions actively implementing AI regulations (such as the European Union) should urgently reconsider the controversial statutory exemption of tax administration systems from “high-risk” classifications. Tax enforcement algorithms possess the immense power to severely restrict property and privacy rights, deeply necessitating the highest tiers of external conformity assessments and regulatory scrutiny.

Mandate Algorithmic Transparency and Bias Auditing: Tax authorities globally must be legally required to publish comprehensive impact assessments for all predictive and generative AI models utilized in revenue administration. Continuous, independent bias auditing must be a strict statutory precondition for the continued legal operation of any automated risk-scoring system.

Bridge the Digital Divide to Ensure Equity: Tax administrations must be legally mandated to maintain comprehensive, non-digital avenues for tax compliance and dispute resolution. Digitalization funding strategies must explicitly include vast resources for digital literacy programs and continuous financial support for Low Income Taxpayer Clinics to ensure that vulnerable demographics are not structurally disenfranchised by the shift to digital platforms.

CONCLUSION

The comprehensive digital transformation of global tax administration represents one of the most profound and highly consequential shifts in the mechanics of state governance and public finance in the twenty-first century. The rapid integration of artificial intelligence, real-time data streaming, and predictive algorithmic profiling offers extraordinary, unprecedented tools for closing the massive global tax gap, optimizing domestic resource mobilization, and heavily streamlining taxpayer services. However, this monumental technological leap fundamentally and dangerously alters the historical balance of power between the sovereign state and the individual citizen. The expansive, highly intrusive capabilities of Tax Administration 3.0 routinely and violently collide with the fundamental human rights to privacy, data protection, and a fair, transparent administrative process.

As heavily evidenced by the recent jurisprudential interventions of the European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the European Union, the aggressive deployment of opaque, automated systems without rigorous, embedded legal safeguards routinely results in the severe violation of civil liberties. The catastrophic human toll of algorithmic miscalculations and state automation bias, starkly highlighted by the Dutch childcare allowance scandal, clearly demonstrates to the global community that administrative efficiency can never, under any circumstances, be pursued at the direct expense of administrative justice, due process, and human dignity.

To prevent the technological modernization of the state from slowly devolving into a form of algorithmic authoritarianism, international legal standards must evolve rapidly and decisively. The growing global academic and institutional consensus pointing toward the urgent necessity of a “Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights” provides a vital, highly actionable normative blueprint. This blueprint correctly insists on the irreplaceable value of human oversight, the absolute right to algorithmic explainability, and the strict imperative of technological non-discrimination. Ultimately, the political and legal legitimacy of the modern digital tax system relies not on the mathematical sophistication of its machine learning models or the processing speed of its servers, but on its unwavering, demonstrable adherence to the rule of law and the resolute, uncompromising protection of fundamental human rights. Global policymakers must act decisively to ensure that as tax administrations become increasingly driven by artificial intelligence, the overarching legal framework remains uncompromisingly tethered to human justice.

REFERENCES

1. Article 29 Working Party (2015) Statement on automatic inter-state exchanges of personal data for tax purposes. European Commission.
2. ATAF (2023) The Digital Transformation of Tax Administrations. African Tax Administration

Forum.

3. Bipartisan Policy Center (2024) High-Risk, High-Reward AI: The EU AI Act approach.
4. Center for Taxpayer Rights (2024) Toward a Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights. 9th International Conference on Taxpayer Rights, Antwerp.
5. CESR (2025) Aligning tax cooperation with human rights in the UN Tax Convention. Center for Economic and Social Rights.
6. CFE Tax Advisers Europe (2018) Opinion Statement CFE 1/2018 on the Importance of Taxpayer Rights Codes and Charters on Tax Good Governance.
7. CIAT (2024) Systems Integration in Tax Administration 3.0. Inter-American Center of Tax Administrations.
8. DigiTax Centre (2024) Conference “Toward a Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights” 2024. University of Antwerp.
9. ECHR (1950) European Convention on Human Rights. Council of Europe.
10. ECHR (2002) Janosevic v. Sweden. European Court of Human Rights..
11. ECHR Guide (2023) Guide on Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights: Right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence. Council of Europe.
12. ECJ (2014) Digital Rights Ireland Ltd v Minister for Communications, Marine and Natural Resources and Others. Court of Justice of the European Union.
13. Emerald (2024) ‘Digital taxation, artificial intelligence and Tax Administration 3.0’, Asian Review of Accounting, 32(2).
14. EU AI Act (2024) Artificial Intelligence Act, Annex III. European Union.
15. GDPR (2016) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation). European Parliament and Council..
16. Glasgow University (2025) Towards Fiscal Justice: International Human Rights Law. PhD Thesis..
17. Grau, A. (2021) ‘Automated decision-making in tax administration’, Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property..
18. Hadwick, D. (2024) ‘EU AI Act and Tax Administration’, European Papers, 2024(3).
19. Hatfield, M. (2024) ‘Digital technologies, tax administration, and taxpayer rights’, Tax Research Network Blog.
20. Hunton Andrews Kurth (2024) CJEU Rules that GDPR Prohibition on Automated Decision-Making Applies to Credit Scoring.
21. IADB (2024) The Future of Tax Administrations Lies in the Intelligence Generated by Big Data. Inter-American Development Bank.
22. IBFD (2024) 2023 Yearbook on Taxpayers’ Rights. IBFD Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers’ Rights.
23. IBFD (2025) 2024 Yearbook on Taxpayers’ Rights. IBFD Observatory on the Protection of Taxpayers’ Rights.
24. IBFD Tax News (2025) G-24 supports net income taxation for digital services. IBFD Knowledge Hub.
25. IJCA (2024) ‘From Audit to Algorithm: Ethical Challenges of AI Inclusion in Public Tax Administration’, International Journal of Computer Applications, 187(69).
26. IJECM (2023) Digital Transformation in Tax Administrations: Evidence from Africa. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management.
27. IMF (2024) Understanding artificial intelligence in tax and customs administration. IMF Technical Note 2024/006.
28. IMF (2025) Strengthening Tax Governance through Tax Legal Design. IMF Working Paper WP/25/017.
29. International Journal for Public Policy, Law and Development (2025) ‘Artificial Intelligence and Algorithms in Tax Auditing by the Tax Administration Service in Mexico: Analysis of Potential Biases’, 2(3).
30. Kluwer International Tax Blog (2025) UN Tax Committee Confronts New Challenges.
31. Legal Nodes (2024) EU AI Act 2026 updates: compliance requirements.
32. Matheson (2024) CJEU delivers important decision on automated decision-making under the GDPR.
33. OECD (2023) Tax Administration 2023: Comparative Information on OECD and other Advanced and Emerging Economies. OECD Publishing, Paris.
34. OECD (2024) Governing with Artificial Intelligence: AI in Tax Administration. OECD Publishing.
35. OECD (2024) Tax Administration 3.0: The Digital Transformation of Tax Administration. OECD Publishing.
36. OECD (2024) Tax Administration Digitalisation and Digital Transformation Initiatives. OECD Publishing.
37. Rachovista, A. and Johann, N. (2022) ‘The human rights implications of the use of AI in the digital welfare state: lessons learned from the Dutch SyRI

Case', Human Rights Law Review.

38. Revista Tecnica Tributaria (2020) Philip Baker Model Taxpayer Charter digital tax administration.

39. Ropes & Gray (2024) Computer says no: CJEU rules on automated decision making.

40. SCIRP (2024) Proposed Digital Taxpayer Bill of Rights. Scientific Research Publishing.

41. Stanford TTLF (2024) Tax Administration 3.0: AI and Taxpayer Rights. TTLF Working Paper 124.

42. Tax Ombud SA (2023) Fair Play: Digital capacity-building. Office of the Tax Ombud, South Africa.

43. Thomson Reuters (2024) Academics: AI tech can help close tax admin digital divide.

44. UN DESA (2024) Digitalization of Revenue Authorities and Annexes. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

45. UN Tax Committee (2023) Co-Coordinators' Report on Taxation Issues Related to the Digitalized and Globalized Economy. United Nations.