

ACCOUNTABILITY OF TAX RECEIVABLE MANAGEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF THE DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TAXES

Asqolani¹, Nina Andriana², Miftahul Hadi³, Nur Fathoni⁴

Politeknik Keuangan Negara STAN¹²³; Directorate General of Taxes⁴

¹Corresponding author: asqolani@pknstan.ac.id

INFORMASI ARTIKEL

ABSTRAK

Article history:

Dikirim tanggal: 24/10/2023

Revisi pertama tanggal: 19/11/2023

Diterima tanggal: 13/12/2023

Tersedia online tanggal: 28/12/2023

Hasil audit Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan (BPK) terhadap pengelolaan piutang pajak oleh Direktorat Jenderal Pajak (DJP) menemukan ketidakcukupan administrasi piutang pajak dengan nilai lebih dari Rp 20 triliun dan berulang dari tahun-tahun sebelumnya. *Novelty* dari penelitian ini adalah penggunaan pendekatan Global Accountability Project (GAP) dan OECD Principles of Corporate Governance untuk melihat sejauh mana akuntabilitas sektor publik dalam pengelolaan piutang pajak oleh DJP. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif yaitu data primer melalui wawancara dengan DJP, BPK, dan Inspektorat Jenderal Kementerian Keuangan (ITJEN) serta data sekunder, terkait kinerja capaian selama 2019-2022. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan secara umum akuntabilitas pengelolaan piutang pajak oleh DJP sudah sesuai prinsip-prinsip akuntabilitas dalam GAP maupun OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, namun ada beberapa hal yang perlu ditingkatkan, seperti perbaikan administrasi piutang jatuh tempo, penambahan juru sita, pengaturan denda pajak yang belum diterbitkan, kerja sama dengan pihak ketiga, dan meningkatkan anggaran penagihan pajak.

Kata Kunci: Akuntabilitas, piutang pajak, Global Accountability Report, OECD Principles of corporate governance, laporan hasil audit

ABSTRACT

The audit results of the Audit Board (BPK) on the management of tax receivables by the Directorate General of Taxes (DGT) found inadequacy in the administration of tax receivables with a value of more than Rp 20 trillion and repeated from previous years. The novelty of this study is the use of the Global Accountability Project (GAP) approach and OECD Principles of Corporate Governance to see the extent of public sector accountability in the management of tax receivables by DGT. This research uses qualitative methods using primary data, interviews with DGT, the Audit Board, and the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Finance (ITJEN), and secondary data related to performance achievements during 2019-2022. The results show that, generally, accountability for tax receivables management by DGT has accountability principles in GAP and OECD Principles of Corporate Governance. Still, several things need to be improved, such as improving the administration of overdue receivables, adding bailiffs, regulating tax penalties that have yet to be issued, cooperating with third parties, and increasing tax collection budgets.

Keywords: Accountability, tax receivables, Global Accountability Report, OECD Principles of corporate governance, audit report

1. Introduction

Taxes levied by the Central Government, including Import Duties and Excise, and taxes charged by Local Governments, are subject to local laws and regulations. This tax revenue takes the most significant portion, more than 77.19% of the realization of state revenues and grants in the FY 2022 State Budget (APBN) (Kementerian Keuangan, 2023). Tax receivables arise from tax payables that are not paid at maturity. The tax debt can come from tax research, audit, or investigation with a legal product in the form of a Tax Bill (STP) and a tax assessment letter in the format of an Underpaid Tax Assessment Letter and an Additional Underpaid Tax Assessment Letter. It can be a tax principle, sanctions, interest, fines, hikes, and tax collecting charges in legal items.

Research related to tax receivables is fundamental. Not only does it impact the potential for substantial state revenues, but it also has the potential to lose the state if not appropriately managed. Although tax receivables are not a component of the state budget, they are a component of government assets on the balance sheet. Receivables are indeed a potential for state revenue receipts. In addition to the potential as tax revenue, tax receivables are audit findings always disputed by audit agencies such as the Audit Board and Inspectorate General.

Moreover, the development of tax receivables is increasing every year. Indonesia is one country concerned about debt and fiscal sustainability (Bui, 2020). According to the audit report from the Audit Board, tax receivable is needed to improve both the system and governance (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan (BPK), 2023). According to data from DGT, the number of tax bailiffs is 762 to support and maintain 1,726,988 tax receivable documentation, including Warning Letters, Notice of Distress Warrant, Confiscation Letters (SPMP), freezing of financial instruments, Sale of confiscated goods, Overseas Travel Ban, and Gijzeling.

Table 1: Tax Receivable on State Budget (in a million Rp)

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Tax Receivable	72,630	72,602	69,891	68,886	67,687
Allowance	44,894	44,914	37,439	39,736	39,387
Netto	27,736	27,688	32,452	29,150	28,300

Source: Audit Report 2018-2022

In 2020, DGT launched the Tax Administration Core System Update (PSIAP) or core tax administration system, to account for financial statements and provide management information through Information System Development in the context of the Tax Administration System. Tax collection is one of the services that will be implemented.

Recently, researchers used a multivariate accountability index based on the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) to assess accountability (del Vasto et al., 2019) and Bayesian methods (Lührmann et al., 2020). In Indonesia, accountability research on the public sector based on a multivariate index is still limited. Previous research on accountability uses the Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies (SAKIP) as the basis for regulations for implementing the performance accountability system. It compares with the application of local governments such as the Bandung Regency (Christy et al., 2017), the

Civil Registry Service Office on Purworejo Regency (Puspasari, 2016), Tasikmalaya Regency (Rosliyati, 2018), and Manado regency (Sinaepon et al., 2022). Previous research used accountability as a variable in quantitative research on taxpayer compliance at the Padang Tax Office (Putri et al., 2019), East Denpasar Tax Office (Dartini & Jati, 2016), and the performance of the tax inspectors at the Riau Tax Office (Safitri, 2016). Instead of using a local point of view, this research will fill the gap in the current view on accountability from an international perspective. This study aims to identify the level of accountability of DJP using The Global Accountability Project (GAP) Framework and OECD principles as a methodology for assessing accountability of tax receivable management in Indonesia. This research will contribute to the existing literature by identifying a novel method for assessing accountability using the GAP framework and OECD principles, combined with existing regulations in the public sector. We believe that accountability at the global level will increase trust not only in the domestic community but also internationally. Various things can be attributed to international confidence in the country's financial management. In controlling the State Budget deficit level, the international community's role is very significant, and it cannot be separated from trust.

2. Theoretical Framework

Accountability and Public Sector Accountability

Accountability is an ancient concept derived from the Anglo-Norman language, close to the term accounting, in the literal sense of bookkeeping around the year 1085 (Bovens, 2007). In its development, the concept of 'accountability' does not refer to rulers holding their people accountable, but rather, the authorities held responsible by their citizens. Accountability has become an icon for good governance. Furthermore, according to Bovens, accountability is a connection between an actor and a forum in which the actor must explain and justify their actions. The panel can submit questions and pass judgment, and the actor may face repercussions.

Accountability is one component of the principle of "Good Governance," which is required for every government work unit to realize the vision and mission of the organization (Badan Pengawasan Keuangan dan Pembangunan, 2019). Good Government Governance is known as good governance or government management. Of the 8 elements of Good Governance, according to the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), being accountable is essential for good governance, not just for public institutions but also for businesses and non-governmental organizations (UNESCAP, 2009). Traditional accounting and accountability models in the public sector operate in a stable and non-competitive environment (Pärl et al., 2020). The fundamental goal of public sector organizations (PSOs) is to implement public policy and advance social welfare (Kaur & Lodhia, 2019).

In Presidential Regulation Number 29 of 2014 concerning the Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies, it is necessary to report accountability for the performance of government agencies to assess their ability to meet the organization's vision, mission, and goals to improve the execution of a more efficient, successful, clean, and responsible government. In that regulation, performance accountability is mentioned as a way of showing how a government agency is responsible for the results of the programs

and activities that stakeholders have entrusted to it to fulfil its mission with clear performance goals through regular reports on its performance.

Previous research on accountability uses the Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies as the basis for regulations for the implementation of the performance accountability system and compares with the application (Christy et al., 2017; Puspasari, 2016; Rosliyati, 2018; Sinaepon et al., 2022). This research will combine the existing regulation based on the Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies, the application of tax receivable management, and international practice.

The Global Accountability Project (GAP) Framework

According to the Global Accountability Project (GAP) Framework, accountability pertains to the procedures and deeds by which an institution affirms its dedication to considering and harmonizing stakeholders' interests in its endeavours and decision-making processes and, after that, fulfils that commitment. It is a procedure whereby an entity affirms its dedication to considering and reconciling stakeholders' interests concerning its activities and decision-making and executes these pledges after that. (Blagescu et al., 2005; Hammer, 2018).

The GAP framework was created in 2001 to improve how inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), transnational corporations (TNCs), and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) answer the people and groups they affect with their decisions. The framework's practical aspects can also help integrated health systems be more accountable (Mallinson & Suter, 2017). The GAP framework has four accountability components: transparency, participation, evaluation, and feedback and reaction systems. Organizations should include these considerations in their policies, procedures, and actions at all levels and stages of decision-making and implementation for internal and external stakeholders. The higher the quality and consistency of these elements in the organization's rules, processes, and activities, the more accountable the organization will be.

Table 2: Dimensions of GAP Framework

GAP Framework	Descriptions
Transparency	We give stakeholders easy and timely information and let them evaluate the organization's procedures, structures, and operations.
Participation	The procedure via which a company grants active involvement of pivotal stakeholders in operations and decision-making that impact them.
Evaluation	The procedure by which an organization assesses and evaluates its progress and outcomes about its goals and objectives applies the knowledge gained to enhance the organization continuously and provides reports on the process's outcomes.
Complaint response	The procedures via which an organization facilitates the submission of grievances by stakeholders over its decisions and operations while ensuring that these issues are suitably examined and resolved.

Source: Pathways to accountability (Blagescu et al., 2005; Hammer, 2018)

The OECD Principles of Corporate Governance

The OECD Corporate Governance Principles were first published in 1999, and they provide support to market participants, policymakers, and regulators in strengthening the

institutional, legal, and regulatory structures that uphold good corporate governance, with a specific emphasis on public companies. Additionally, they offer pragmatic advice to stock exchanges, investors, corporations, and other stakeholders engaged in establishing efficient corporate governance.

These principles cover six critical areas of corporate governance: ensuring the foundation for a practical corporate governance framework, fulfilling shareholder rights, treating shareholders fairly, the role of stakeholders in corporate governance, disclosure and transparency, and management accountability (OECD, 2004). OECD principles have established international standards for corporate governance, serving as the foundation for several reform projects undertaken by governments and the private sector alike. Good corporate governance bridges the gap between the interests of those who administer the firm, huge shareholders, and those of all shareholders, enhancing investor confidence and lowering the company's cost of capital (Jesover & Kirkpatrick, 2005).

This research uses The GAP framework and OECD principles to determine the level of accountability of tax receivable management on the DGT. This institution is responsible for collecting local and international tax revenue. So, the measurement of accountability at the global level is relevant to OECD principles and an international perspective.

Institutional theory

Institutional theory seeks to comprehend the processes and reasons for how organizations function and how their activities impact the larger framework of inter-organizational relations. In addition to assisting public relations professionals in comprehending the legitimacy and reputation of corporations, the study of organizational institutions is performed in various academic fields, including sociology, business, and communication. Institutions are the normative standards and behaviour patterns within and between organizations; they give social exchange and order purpose. Incorporating industry and organizational norms, practices, and standards characterizes this conduct.

According to the institutional theory, organizational conduct is copied and repeated, resulting in accepted and expected norms as regular practice. Knowing how to follow an institution's relatively stable and formal labour rules lends credibility to the organization. It allows researchers to separate the institution from its reputation or how it is seen. This item discusses the evolution of institutional theory, current research on the subject, and how the approach affects corporate reputation. Between 1977 and 1983, the foundation of institutional theory, as it is now understood, began as part of a more significant effort to understand the variables that lead to successful and long-term organizational performance. During this period, the overall focus of organizational research switched from elements within administrative borders, known as closed systems, to systems that acknowledge the interplay between an organization and its environment, known as open systems. Additional theories, including resource dependence theory, population ecology theory, and structural contingency theory, endeavour to elucidate the mechanisms by which an organization adapts to its surroundings, enhancing its suitability and the overall performance of its industry or market. (Carroll, 2016).

Principal-Agent Theory

Schillemans posits that principal-agent theory has become the dominant theory in accountability research in the public sector. Agents, such as independent public

institutions, have become a paradigm in empirical accountability research (Schillemans & Busuioc, 2015). Jensen and Meckling provide an understanding of agency relations as a contract between the principal (owner) and agent (management) to carry out several tasks that provide delegation of authority in decision-making to the agent (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). It also reveals an assumption in agency theory that everyone has their interest, which allows for conflicts of interest between principals and agents. As an illustration, the owner, as a principal, has the motivation to maximize the entity's profitability. In contrast, management as an agent is incentivized to maximize its economic and psychological needs.

This misalignment of behaviour between principal and agent is called dysfunctional behaviour (Scott, 2009). Some dysfunctional behaviours that commonly occur according to agency theory include moral hazard, adverse selection, and free rider. Moral hazard indicates the mis-provision of information by agents motivated to provide false personal information. Adverse selection is the reporting of management information about engineered profits. At the same time, free riders are agents who do not contribute to responsibility but still list themselves as one part of it. This agency theory can explain the contractual relationship between principal and agent (in this study, it can be associated with central government and local government), asymmetry information, and agency costs that occur.

Regulation and Governance of Tax Receivables

The Law on Harmonization of Tax Regulations (UU HPP) has been implemented to promote accountable response and improve the taxation system in Indonesia (Office of Assistant to Deputy Cabinet Secretary for State Documents & Translation, 2021). As an implementation of Government Regulation No. 71/2010 concerning Government Accounting Standards (SAP), DGT issued a regulation that guidelines for accounting for tax receivables (PER-20/PJ/2020). This regulation describes how to record the addition or reduction of tax receivable balances, incoming transfers, outgoing transfers, allowance for tax receivables, re-receipt of tax receivables written off, and write-off tax receivable bills. To support transparency and participation, DGT issued PER-07/PO/2019 concerning Procedures for Submitting Tax Service Complaints and PMK No. 118/PMK.01/2021 is about the Organization and Work Procedures of the Ministry of Finance.

Accountability is one of the five perspectives of effective governance because administrators and administrative bodies must carry out the tasks and obligations of their posts (Keping, 2018). One accountability is manifested in the Government Agency Performance Accountability System. While the Government Agency Performance Accountability Report (LAKIP) is the outcome of the Government Agency Performance Accountability System, it describes a government agency's performance in implementing programs and activities funded by the state budget/local government budget. The preparation of the Government Agency Performance Accountability Report is based on a one-year budget cycle. In making the Government Agency Performance Accountability Report, a government agency must be able to determine the amount of performance produced quantitatively, namely the amount in units of number or percentage. The benefits of the Government Agency Performance Accountability Report can be used as evaluation material for the relevant government agencies for 1 budget year. The reporting term has

been changed from the Government Agency Performance Accountability Report to Government Agency Performance Report (LAPKIN) since the enactment of Presidential Regulation Number 29 of 2014 concerning SAKIP and PermenPAN RB Number 53 of 2014 concerning Operational Procedure of Performance Agreement, Performance Appraisal, and Review Procedures for Government Agency Performance Reports (Badan Pengawasan Keuangan dan Pembangunan, 2019).

3. Research Method

This research uses qualitative methods. Field studies are seen as a broad approach to qualitative research or a qualitative data collection method with researchers heading into the 'field' in an 'in situ natural state (Moleong, 2007). Three qualitative research methods will be conducted in this study. Method 1 is a thematic examination of taxation history. Method 2 is an Interactive Qualitative Analysis research design. Method 3 involves submitting one written query to a tax specialist. The results of the three research methods are triangulated to conduct research and answer questions in the study (Du Preez, 2018).

Data is collected by triangulation from DGT, the Audit Board, and the Inspectorate General. Triangulation is used to verify the data or information that researchers get from different perspectives in a way that minimizes what can happen during data collection and analysis as much as possible. Data confirmed as valid through triangulation will give researchers confidence about the data's validity so that they do not have doubts about making conclusions about the research (Bachri, 2010). The secondary data used are the Central Government Financial Statements (LKPP) and the Audit Report.

Data collection methods are techniques or ways that researchers can use to collect data. The data sources used are secondary data and primary data. Primary data results from interviews and forums from parties related to tax receivables management. The selection of respondents uses purposive sampling because it uses qualitative methods with case study analysts. This study only uses parties directly related to the problems analyzed in this research, state receivables managers, including stakeholders, DGT, the Audit Board, and the Inspectorate General.

The techniques carried out by the author in obtaining the data are from literature studies and interviews. The literature method collects data and information by reading and studying several kinds of literature, such as books, statutory provisions, and tax regulations. In this method, the author will collect, process, and analyze data from literature such as books, laws and regulations, journals, and regulations related to audit findings, previous research, The GAP framework, and OECD principles. The interview method is a means of gathering information directly from respondents by posing questions to them. Interviews are face-to-face between the interviewer and respondents, and their activities are carried out orally (Subagyo, 2020). Interviews were conducted with tax receivables management at the DGT, auditors from The Audit Board, and auditors from the Inspectorate General.

The data analysis method in this study used a technique developed by Miles and Huberman (Imam, 2013), which consists of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusions. In addition, to ensure the validity of the data in this study through triangulation. Triangulation refers to the collection of as much information (data) as

possible from various sources (humans, settings, and events) through multiple methods (Rukajat, 2018).

4. Result and Discussion

The level of accountability of DGT will later be evaluated using the Global Accountability Project (GAP) Framework and OECD Principles of Corporate Governance. Both methods were chosen because they can assess the application of accountability in the public sector, especially by looking at a global perspective. DGT and the Ministry of Finance are institutions that have significant external party involvement, namely in terms of tax revenue and audit opinions, that are usually used by external parties in providing loans, grants, and funding. The GAP Framework uses 4 dimensions: transparency, participation, evaluation, and complaint and response mechanisms.

Transparency focuses on being transparent about DGT's actions, releasing information about what it does, where it does it, how it does it, and how well it does it. This information is fundamental for stakeholders to monitor DGT's activities. Stakeholders can determine if DGT is carrying out its obligations by the provisions/regulations, whether it is adhering to applicable standards, and how its performance relates to the target. As a result, stakeholders can make informed decisions and choices about DGT. The assessment of the transparency dimension has two components: organizational policy and capacity and specific information requirements.

Table 3: The Results of The Gap Framework Directorate General of Taxes: Transparency

Global Accountability Index	Responses	Results		Recommendations		
		Exist	Not			
<i>GAP guidelines: Transparency</i>						
<i>Organizational policy and capacity</i>						
<i>T1</i> <i>Policy development</i>	Q1.1 The organization's policy on transparency in accounts receivable management is developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders and experts and reflects stakeholder needs.	V	Discussion of The Law on Harmonization of Tax Regulations involving stakeholders. PP 71-year 2010 Government Accounting Standards, PER-20/PJ/2020 Accounting for Tax Receivables,	The policy development in accounts receivable management is already developed on existing regulations.		
<i>T2</i> <i>Policy content</i>	Q2.1 DGT has a receivables management disclosure policy outlining rules related to information access.	V	DGT Performance Report 2019 to 2021, Annual Report	The policy content in accounts receivable is disclosed on performance and annual reports.		
<i>T3</i> <i>Governance</i>	Q3.1 Responsibility for supervising and implementing the accounts receivable management transparency policy is assigned to the leadership, and Responsibility falls to	V	PMK 118/PMK.01/2021 about Organization and Work Procedures of the Ministry of Finance	The accounts receivable management transparency policy is assigned to existing regulations.		

Global Accountability Index		Responses		Results	Recommendations
		Exist	Not		
the entire organization.					
<i>T4 Resources</i>	Q4.1 Resources are assigned to implementing an organization-wide transparency policy, which includes staff costs and accounts receivable management operations.	V		There is no information on the budget for managing tax receivable. The number of bailiffs is limited.	The budget for managing tax receivable should be disseminated. The tax bailiffs need to be increased.
<i>T5 Accessibility information availability</i>	Q5.1 Information on the organization's transparency policy is actively disseminated clearly and understandably to critical stakeholders in an appropriate form and through proper media.	V		www.pajak.go.id/ Performance Report 2016-2021 What's Up, social media. It is necessary to expand the delivery media, including those with limitations.	The taxpayer's information is confidential and may be classified as a state or office secret.
<i>T6 Accessibility: user-friendliness</i>	Q6.1 The process of submitting a request for information on accounts receivable management is easy for stakeholders to understand.	V		Through e-research, data is limited; there are data confidentiality regulations. Stakeholders are granted access rights. Data governance from regulations, House Representatives, and systems.	The duration of approval time needs to be standardized.
GAP guidelines: Transparency					
Specific information requirements					
<i>T7 General institutional information</i>	Q7.1 Details of accounts receivable management operations. For each activity, include a description of the action, where it occurred, when it happened, what its purpose was, what the budget was assigned to, and who was responsible for it.	V*)		IKU, Billing Budget, but not in detail.	The billing budget should be disseminated.
<i>T8 Governance structures & decision-making</i>	Q8.1 There is a clear identification of the executive leaders and a method for contacting them. Concerning conflict-of-interest rules that explain how the organization manages actual and prospective conflicts of interest, their interest in other organizations is disclosed.	V		According to the main tasks and functions	Governance structures decision-making in the management of receivables has been implemented.

Of 6 organizational policy and capacity components, DGT has fulfilled almost all features. From Policy development, DGT's policy on transparency in accounts receivable management is developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders and experts. It reflects stakeholder needs such as the Law on Harmonization of Tax Regulations stakeholders. On Policy content, DGT has a receivables management disclosure policy outlining rules related to information access. The stakeholders can access DGT Performance Report 2019 to 2021 and the Annual Report. According to Institutional Theory, organizational conduct is copied and repeated, resulting in accepted and expected norms as regular practice.

We find little information on the budget amount for managing tax receivables. From the data, 762 tax bailiffs should process 1,726,988 documents regarding tax collection to achieve the target Rp 19 trillion tax revenue. However, to achieve that target, the number of bailiffs must be increased to manage tax receivable. Responsibility for the supervision and implementation of the accounts receivable management transparency policy is assigned to the leadership, and responsibility falls to the entire organization as appropriate to ensure the policy's objectives are reflected in the goals and activities at all levels of the organization. All components of specific information requirements have been implemented but with limited information, especially regarding the budget assigned. By tax legislation, DGT could withhold some information. Certain information may represent a security risk to taxpayers in certain circumstances.

To be held accountable, an organization must understand the requirements and interests of its stakeholders. Participation is best accomplished if the organization collaborates with its stakeholders and uses a participatory decision-making process. Furthermore, the organization must create systems that allow stakeholders to provide input or express their opinions. This system may necessitate operational, policy, and strategic involvement. Organizations that value accountability should incorporate stakeholder feedback into broader organizational policies and plans rather than focusing solely on operational difficulties.

Table 4: The Results of The Gap Framework Directorate General of Taxes: Participation

Global Accountability Index	Responses		Information Source	Recommendations		
	Exist	Not				
<i>GAP guidelines: Participation</i>						
<i>Organizational policy and capacity</i>						
<i>P1</i> <i>Policy development</i>	Q1.1 The organization's policy on accounts receivable management participation is developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders and experts and reflects stakeholder needs.	V	Discussion of The Law on Harmonization of Tax Regulations and Non-Exchange Accounting Indonesian Governmental Accounting Standards Committee (KSAP).	The DGT has developed other participants in Income accounts with The receivable management.		
<i>P2</i> <i>Policy content</i>	Q2.1 The institution guarantees that essential stakeholders	V	PER-07 /PJ/2019 concerning Procedures for Submitting Tax Service	The policy content of DGT has already been		

Global Accountability Index	Responses		Information Source	Recommendations
	Exist	Not		
	will be represented and that their interests will be considered through a clear statement or policy on the importance of stakeholder engagement and participatory methods in accounts receivable management decision-making.		Complaints	implemented.
P3 <i>Governance</i>	Q3.1 Leadership is tasked with overseeing and implementing the participation policy, and accountability is distributed throughout the organization as needed to guarantee that the goals and activities at every level of the organization align with the policy's objectives, particularly accounts receivable management.	V	PMK No. 118/PMK.01/2021 regarding the Organization and Work Procedures of the Ministry of Finance	The governance of DGT is already implemented.
P4 <i>Resources</i>	Q4.1 Resources are assigned to implementing the organization-wide accounts receivable management participation policy, which includes staff time and operational costs.	V	The number of staff, especially bailiffs, is limited compared to the number of taxes overdue. The tax collection budget is limited; not all include such coordination funds.	The bailiffs need to be adjusted to the workload. Special operational costs of tax collection must be increased and included in the budget.
P5 <i>Accessibility: information availability</i>	Q5.1 Critical stakeholders are provided with clear and understandable information about the organization's participation policy and the process of individual stakeholder involvement in an acceptable format and through an appropriate channel, especially	V	Stakeholders involved and disseminated are limited to The Audit Board audits and Inspectorate General reviews.	The information availability access of DGT has already been implemented.

Global Accountability Index	Responses		Information Source	Recommendations
	Exist	Not		
	regarding receivables management.			
	Appropriate accommodations for people with different languages, vision problems, and hearing loss; Public meetings, print media, the Internet, audio, and video are examples of appropriate media.			
<i>Participation practice</i>				
<i>P6 Accessibility: user-friendliness</i>	Q6.1 Budgetary limits, language or expert terms hurdles, or physical access issues do not restrict key stakeholders' Participation in accounts receivable management.	V	Access to tax receivables data following applicable regulations is limited to The Audit Board, Inspectorate General, and Tax Supervisory Committee.	Due to secrecy regulations, access to tax receivables data is limited to specific institutions.
<i>P7 Setting the context.</i>	Q7.1 DGT will clearly state the objectives and reasons for involving stakeholders in each decision-making process.	V	The objectives and reasons involved are limited to The Audit Board, Inspectorate General, and Tax Supervisory Committee, which are regulated.	DGT need to involve more stakeholders, such as researchers.
<i>P8 Timing</i>	Q8.1 Participation occurs before and during the receivables management decision-making process.	V	Auditing, reviewing, or supervising DGT by The Audit Board, Inspectorate General, and Tax Supervisory Committee is done as needed.	Participation occurs before and during the receivables management decision-making process.
<i>P9 Reporting</i>	Q9.1 Accounts receivable management information is publicly available.	V	Only The Audit Board reports the results of receivables management to the public through audit reports.	Accounts receivable management information should be shared publicly according to existing regulations.

From 9 indicators of participation, DGT has passed 6 of them. Resources assigned to implementing the DGT receivable management participation policy, which includes staff time and operational costs, need to be improved. The performance of staff, especially

bailiffs, needs to be adjusted to the workload. Special operational costs of tax collection must be increased and included in the budget.

DGT does not fully share information on its participation policy and how it works with individual stakeholders clearly and efficiently to critical stakeholders in a suitable form and through appropriate media, especially in managing receivables. Stakeholders involved and disseminated are limited to The Audit Board audits and Inspectorate General reviews. As mentioned above, there are regulations for DGT to keep taxpayers' detailed information confidential. Accounts receivable management information is not fully publicly available. Only The Audit Board audit reports are available for the public; part of them are the results of receivables management by DGT. Based on the audit report, accountability of tax receivable management is still an important finding.

Evaluation is the process by which an organization monitors and assesses its progress and results about its goals and objectives, provides continuing learning input to the organization, and reports results by including key stakeholders. Evaluation provides monitoring and evaluation. It involves evaluating the effect (output, outcome, or impact), continuously monitoring progress, and providing feedback for adjustment to improve results.

Table 5: The Results of The Gap Framework Directorate General of Taxes: Evaluation

Global Accountability Index	Responses		Information Source	Recommendations		
	Exist	Not				
GAP guidelines: Evaluation						
Organizational policy and capacity						
E1 <i>Policy development</i>	E1.1 DGT's policy on evaluating receivables management is developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders and experts and reflects stakeholder needs.	V	Annual Report 2019 to 2021 DGT Performance Report 2019 to 2021, DGT vertical reorganization	Policy development on evaluating tax receivables management is already developed.		
E2 <i>Policy content</i>	E2.1 DGT has a policy on evaluating activities and its role in improving accountability of receivables management to stakeholders.	V	The procedure follows up on the Audit Board findings and Inspectorate General review.	However, some follow-ups have not been carried out.		
E3 <i>Governance</i>	E3.1 Responsibility for the supervision and implementation of the accounts receivable management evaluation policy is assigned to the members of the Board, and Responsibility is assigned to the entire organization as appropriate to ensure the objectives of the policy are reflected in the objectives and activities of accounts receivable management at all levels of the organization.	V	The evaluation is carried out in stages, from the tax office level, regional office, and head office.	Governance on evaluating tax receivables management is already developed.		

Global Accountability Index		Responses		Information Source	Recommendations
		Exist	Not		
<i>E4 Resources</i>	E4.1 Receivables management resources are assigned to implement organization-wide evaluation policies, covering staff and operational costs.	V		Most of the recommendations have been implemented. System improvement is needed so that corrections can be followed up immediately.	Resources for tax receivables management are already developed.
<i>E5 Accessibility: information availability</i>	E5.1 Key stakeholders are actively informed about DGT's receivables management policies and evaluations, which interact with the evaluation and access evaluation results clearly and understandably using the relevant formats and medium. The corresponding form could involve different languages, blindness, or deafness. A suitable medium could involve print publications, the Internet, audio and video, and public gatherings.	V		Follow-up information is reported in annual reports and performance reports.	Accounts receivable management information should be shared publicly according to existing regulations.
<i>E6 Accessibility: user-friendliness</i>	E6.1 Participation in the review of accounts receivable management by key stakeholders is not restricted due to physical access issues or communication limitations.	V		Specific stakeholders are granted access rights. Data governance from regulations, The House of Representatives, and systems.	Access to taxpayer databases is limited to specific institutions.
<i>Evaluation practice</i>					
<i>E7 Stakeholder involvement</i>	E7.1 Assessment of accounts receivable management for a project satisfying important stakeholders' information needs: - An analysis is done for every scheduled evaluation to determine the critical parties and what information they require. - The assessment aims to guarantee that every indicated information demand is satisfied.	V		Used by stakeholders for various purposes, such as The House of Representatives, Tax Supervisory Committee, and internal and external survey results.	Specific stakeholders are involved in evaluation practice.
<i>E8</i>	E8.1 The objectives of	V		The communication	The objectives of

Global Accountability Index		Responses		Information Source	Recommendations
		Exist	Not		
<i>Evaluation set-up & planning</i>	evaluating accounts receivable management are communicated.			process is carried out during meetings, monitoring and evaluation from the regional office and head office levels, bailiff forums, and billing offices.	evaluating accounts receivable management are communicated.
<i>E9 Data collection & analysis</i>	E9.1 Appropriate data collection methods are used in the management of receivables.	V		Landfill system update RAS module, SIDJP.	Data collection analysis are used appropriately.
<i>E10 Monitoring & learning</i>	E10.1 Results are processed and released regularly to inform ongoing developments and decision-making in accounts receivable management activities.	V		RAS Module TPA system update	The new tax management system is being developed.
<i>E11 Reporting</i>	E11.1 A detailed report outlining the goals, participants, methodology, strategy, findings, conclusions, and next steps is given for the receivables management evaluation process. When required, confidentiality is preserved, and justifications are given.	V		Annual Report 2019 to 2021 DGT Performance Report 2019 to 2021	The tax receivables management process is reported annually.
<i>E12 Specific evaluation</i>	E12.1 DGT will assess accounts receivable management activities in addition to the organization's performance concerning its goals and mission, financial performance, social and environmental impact, compliance with legal requirements, employee rights and conditions, human rights compliance, and compliance with pertinent internal and external voluntary codes of conduct.	V		Internal and external survey results	Specific evaluation is done from internal and external surveys.

DGT has maintained all evaluation components of GAP guidelines. DGT's policy on evaluating receivables management is developed with relevant stakeholders and experts. It reflects stakeholder needs such as follow-up audits from The Audit Board and Inspectorate General, The House of Representatives, and the tax supervisory commissioner. The evaluation is carried out in stages, starting at the lowest level, the tax offices (KPP), the regional tax offices, and the DGT head

office. Results are processed and released regularly to inform ongoing developments and decision-making in accounts receivable management activities. DGT has developed PSIAP to minimize errors in tax collection management.

The complaints and response mechanism is an internal and institutionalized mechanism that provides a process by which stakeholders can file complaints with the organization, and the organization responds to them. Response to complaints and alleged losses is an essential aspect of accountability. In addition, in the internal complaints and response system, access to justice is given to those who may be denied.

**Table 6: The Results of The Gap Framework Directorate General of Taxes:
Complaints and Response Mechanisms**

Global Accountability Index	Responses		Information Source	Recommendations		
	Exist	Not				
GAP guidelines: Complaints & response mechanisms						
<i>Organizational policy and capacity</i>						
<i>C1 Policy development</i>	C1.1 The organization's policy on grievances and receivables management responses is developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders and experts and reflects stakeholder needs.	V	PER- 07 /PJ/2019 concerning Procedures for Submitting Tax Service Complaints	The development of complaints and response mechanisms has already been implemented.		
<i>C2 Policy content</i>	C2.1 According to DGT policy, it will accept complaints from stakeholder groups, look into them, and respond. When applicable, the answer should include corrective measures for receivables management.	V	PER- 07 /PJ/2019 concerning Procedures for Submitting Tax Service Complaints	The policy content of complaints and response mechanisms are already implemented.		
<i>C3 Governance</i>	C3.1 The leadership is tasked with overseeing and implementing the complaints policy and receivables management response. As needed, the entire organization is also given the Responsibility to guarantee that the goals of the policy are mirrored in the goals and activities of DGT at all levels.	V	PER- 07 /PJ/2019 concerning Procedures for Submitting Tax Service Complaints	The governance of complaints and response mechanisms are already implemented.		
<i>C4 Resources</i>	C4.1 Resources are assigned to executing grievance and response policies throughout DGT functions, encompassing staff and operational expenditures.	V	PER- 07 /PJ/2019 concerning Procedures for Submitting Tax Service Complaints	The resources of complaints and response mechanisms are already implemented.		

Global Accountability Index	Responses	Information Source		Recommendations	
		Exist	Not	PER- 07 /PJ/2019	Submitting Tax Service Complaints
C5 <i>Accessibility: information availability</i>	C5.1 Information regarding the grievance procedure utilized for receivables management is proactively distributed to relevant stakeholders in a format and via media suitable for comprehension, ensuring clarity and comprehensibility. The relevant form may encompass a range of disabilities, such as visual impairment, deafness, and multiple languages. Applicable media may include print materials, online platforms, audio and video, public forums, and more.	V		PER- 07 /PJ/2019	The accessibility of concerning complaints and Procedures for response mechanisms Submitting Tax are already Service Complaints implemented.
C6 <i>Accessibility: user-friendliness</i>	C6.1 Design of access mechanisms for receivables management and consideration of the requirements of the intended stakeholders. This system fulfils the requirements of the most vulnerable individuals in particular.	V		PER- 07 /PJ/2019	The accessibility of concerning complaints and Procedures for response mechanisms Submitting Tax are already Service Complaints implemented.
<i>Complaint investigation</i>					
C7 <i>Assessment of complaint validity</i>	C7.1 The validity of receivables management complaints is assessed based on a clear, published definition and criteria for complaints.	V		PER- 07 /PJ/2019	The assessment of concerning complaint validity Procedures for has already been Submitting Tax implemented. Service Complaints
C8 <i>Process of investigation</i>	C8.1 The investigative team possesses the requisite expertise and capabilities to scrutinize grievances about accounts receivable management.	V		PER- 07 /PJ/2019	The process of concerning investigation of Procedures for complaint validity Submitting Tax has already been Service Complaints implemented.
<i>Outcomes</i>					
C9 <i>Redress for the complainant</i>	C9.1 Determining proper actions requires contact with the whistleblower, reference to established rules, and consideration of local circumstances and conditions.	V		PER- 07 /PJ/2019	The Remedy for the concerning complainant of Procedures for complaint validity Submitting Tax has already been Service Complaints implemented.

Global Accountability Index		Responses		Information Source	Recommendations
		Exist	Not		
<i>C10</i> <i>Organisational corrective action</i>	C10.1 The output of this mechanism includes recommendations for corrective and preventive actions within the organization.	V		PER-07 /PJ/2019	The Organizational corrective action of Procedures for complaint validity Submitting Tax has already been Service Complaints implemented.
<i>C11</i> <i>Post-resolution follow-up</i>	C11.1 A grievance system oversees the execution of strategies, including corrective and reactive actions (may also be monitored by an independent external third party).	V		PER-07 /PJ/2019	The Post-resolution follow-up of Procedures for complaint validity Submitting Complaints for Tax has already been Services, Tax Commission, Inspectorate General, National Complaint Services, KPK.

DGT has managed all the complaints and response mechanisms. There are a lot of means of complaints channels: interactive voice response (IVR) Kring Pajak 1500200, Facsimile: (021) 5251245, Email: pengaduan.itjeri@kemenkeu.go.id; pengaduan@pajak.go.id, Twitter: @kring_pajak, Website: www.lapor.go.id; www.wise.kemenkeu.go.id; www.pengaduan.pajak.go.id, tax chat: www.pajak.go.id, letter or come directly to the Directorate of Counseling, Services, and Public Relations or other work units, or Reporters who come directly to submit a complaint using the form in Appendix PER-07/PO/2019 (Vallen, 2021).

The accountability of DGT is essential to increase taxpayer compliance (Christy et al., 2017; Puspasari, 2016; Rosliyati, 2018; Sinaepon et al., 2022) and the performance of the tax office (Safitri, 2016). This research contributes to the existing literature on public sector research by addressing problem identification for accountability with a new method using the Global Accountability Project (GAP) Framework and OECD Principles of Corporate Governance. As such, a significant contribution of this study has been to analyze Responsibility in the public sector from an international perspective.

5. Conclusions, Implications, and Limitations

This research objective is to identify the level of accountability of tax receivable management by DGT combined with existing regulation (The Performance Accountability System of Government Agencies) and global perspective (The Global Accountability Project (GAP) Framework and OECD principles). DGT is an Organizational Unit Performance Accountability Entity that must provide accountability reports and will be supervised by the Inspectorate General and audited by The Audit Board.

DGT's accountability level is good enough using the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance and the Global Accountability Project (GAP) Framework. This level can be seen from almost all assessment indicators that have been met. In addition, this finding is consistent with the evaluation results of implementing the Performance Accountability

System of Government Agencies of the DGT from 2019 to 2021, which showed an increase with the predicate "AA" or "Very satisfactory."

When viewed from DGT's efforts in managing tax receivables, there is a significant development in tax reform by developing the Core Tax Administration System, which is expected to provide accurate, valid, sustainable, and integrated information on tax transactions. Furthermore, this research finds several weaknesses that need to be resolved due to the potential loss of tax revenue in the future. The DGT should pay attention to the increasing of bad debts that have not been collected and have not carried out active collection actions by the provisions and establish a control mechanism that provides notification of all tax provisions that will be billed. The number of staff, bailiffs, and the budget need to be adjusted to the workload. Also, DGT has regulations about stakeholder participation, research, and data collection. The duration of approval time needs to be standardized. Several features from the GPA Framework cannot be fulfilled regarding the taxpayer's information due to confidential and state secrets.

The limitation of this study is that it does not include all data from the tax offices. To further explore and describe the accountability of receivables, the following study can use data on each KPP that becomes a sample of the Audit Board audit. In addition, this research is only limited to central tax receivables, especially those administered by DGT. Further research may include tax receivables issued by the Directorate of Customs and Excise.

Acknowledgements

We would also like to thank our colleagues at the Director General of Taxes (DGT), The Audit Board of The Republic of Indonesia (BPK), and the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Finance (ITJEN) for their feedback and support throughout the research process.

References

Bachri, B. S. (2010). Meyakinkan validitas data melalui triangulasi pada penelitian kualitatif. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, 10(1), 46–62.

Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan (BPK). (2023). *Laporan Hasil Pemeriksaan atas Sistem Pengendalian Intern Laporan Keuangan Pemerintah Pusat tahun 2022*.

Badan Pengawasan Keuangan dan Pembangunan. (2019). *Laporan Akuntabilitas Kinerja (LAKIP/LAPKIN)*. <https://www.bpkp.go.id/puslitbangwas/konten/2019/LAKIP> (accessed 3 November 2023)

Blagescu, M., de Las Casas, L., & Lloyd, R. (2005). *Pathways to accountability* (Vol. 19). London: One World Trust.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework 1. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447–468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x>

Carroll, C. E. (2016). *The SAGE encyclopedia of corporate reputation*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483376493.n145>

Christy, Y., Setiana, S., & Cintia, P. (2017). Efektivitas penerapan Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah (SAKIP) pada pemerintahan daerah Kota Bandung (Studi kasus pada Badan Kepegawaian, Pendidikan dan Pelatihan; Bagian Umum dan Perlengkapan dan Badan Kesatuan Bangsa dan Politik). *Jurnal Akuntansi*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.28932/jam.v9i2.469>

Dartini, G., & Jati, I. K. (2016). Pemahaman akuntansi, transparasi, dan akuntabilitas pada kepatuhan wajib pajak badan. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana*, 17(3), 2447–2473.

del Vasto, P. H., Del Campo, C., Urquía-Grande, E., & Jorge, S. (2019). Designing an accountability index: A case study of South America Central Governments. *Central European Journal of Public Policy*, 13(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.2478/cejpp-2019-0009>

Du Preez, H. (2018). Constructing the fundamental principles of taxation through triangulation. *The ATA Journal of Legal Tax Research*, 16(2), 25–45. <https://doi.org/10.2308/jltr-52190>

Hammer, M. (2018). *Pathways to accountability II, the revised global accountability framework*. London: One World Trust.

Imam, G. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the Firm : Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(North Holland Publishing Company), 305–360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718812602>

Jesover, F., & Kirkpatrick, G. (2005). The revised OECD principles of corporate governance and their relevance to non-OECD countries. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 13(2), 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2005.00412.x>

Kaur, A., & Lodhia, S. K. (2019). Sustainability accounting, accountability and reporting in the public sector: An overview and suggestions for future research. *Meditari Accountancy Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-08-2019-510>

Kementerian Keuangan. (2023). *Laporan Keuangan Pemerintah Pusat 2022*.

Keping, Y. (2018). Governance and good governance: A new framework for political analysis. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40647-017-0197-4>

Lührmann, A., Marquardt, K. L., & Mechkova, V. (2020). Constraining Governments: New Indices of Vertical, Horizontal, and Diagonal Accountability. *American Political Science Review*, 114(3), 811–820. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055420000222>

Mallinson, S., & Suter, E. (2017). Governance and accountability. *Handbook Integrated Care*, 149–163. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56103-5_10

Moleong, L. J. (2007). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

OECD. (2004). The OECD principles of corporate governance. *Contaduría y Administración*, 216. <https://doi.org/10.22201/fca.24488410e.2005.562>

Office of Assistant to Deputy Cabinet Secretary for State Documents & Translation. (2021). *Law on Harmonization of Tax Regulations Used to Address COVID-19 Disruptions, Minister Says*. <https://setkab.go.id/en/law-on-harmonization-of-tax-regulations-used-to-address-covid-19-disruptions-minister-says/> (accessed 2 November 2023).

Päril, Ü., Paemurru, E., Paemurru, K., & Kivisoo, H. (2020). Dialogical turn of accounting and accountability integrated reporting in non-profit and public-sector organisations. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBAM-11-2019-0178>

Puspasari, E. (2016). Efektivitas Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah (SAKIP) Dinas Kependudukan Dan Pencatatan Sipil Kabupaten Purworejo. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration Research*, 1(3), 501–513.

Putri, N. P., Tanno, A., & Kurniawan, R. (2019). Pengaruh sistem administrasi perpajakan modern, akuntabilitas dan sanksi perpajakan terhadap kepatuhan wajib pajak. *Jurnal Benefita*, 4(2), 386–398.

Rosliyati, A. (2018). Pengaruh implementasi Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah (SAKIP) terhadap penerapan good governance. *Jurnal Wawasan Dan Riset Akuntansi*, 1(2), 66–79. <https://doi.org/10.25157/jwr.v1i2.1257>

Rukajat, A. (2018). *Pendekatan penelitian kualitatif (Qualitative research approach)*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.

Safitri, D. (2016). Pengaruh pelatihan teknis perpajakan, profesionalisme, akuntabilitas, perencanaan pemeriksaan pajak, batasan waktu dan konflik peran terhadap kinerja pemeriksa pajak (Studi empiris pada pemeriksa pajak yang terdaftar di KPP se-Kota Pekanbaru). *Jurnal Akuntansi (Media Riset Akuntansi & Keuangan)*, 5(1), 83–98.

Schillemans, T., & Busuioc, M. (2015). Predicting public sector accountability: From agency drift to forum drift. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(1), 191–215. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483376493.n145>

Scott, W. R. (2009). *Financial Accounting Theory*. Fouth Edition. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2012.02.007>

Sinaepon, D., Sabijono, H., & Kalalo, M. Y. B. (2022). Evaluasi penerapan Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah berdasarkan PP RI Nomor 29 Tahun 2014 pada Pengadilan Militer III-17 Manado. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi*,

Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi, 10(4), 50–61.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v10i4.43655>

Subagyo, A. (2020). *Applikasi Metode Riset: Praktik Penelitian Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mix Methods*. Malang: Inteligensia Media.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). (2009). *What is Good Governance?* <https://www.unescap.org/resources/what-good-governance> (accessed 3 November 2023).