Lithuania: 2014–2016 End-of-Term Report

Lithuania made progress towards implementing the majority of its commitments. However, implementation has not translated into changes in government practice. Going forward, the government could continue its efforts to intensify collaboration with civil society to develop more measurable and ambitious commitments.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary international initiative that aims to secure commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) carries out a review of the activities of each OGP participating country. This report summarises the results of the period January–September 2016.

The Office of the Government is the leading coordinating authority responsible for Lithuania's OGP commitments. The Office of the Government assists the prime minister in implementing policies and coordinates activities for the ministries and other subordinate institutions in Lithuania. The office is accountable to the Parliament of Lithuania.

The office has limited legal powers (primarily of a coordinative type) to enforce policy changes on other agencies within the government. Upon completion of the development of the action plan, the office was appointed by a government decree as the institution to coordinate the implementation of the OGP action plan.

At the time of writing this report, Lithuania has prepared a third action plan. A few of the unfinished commitments were included in this new plan. For instance, further development of the public consultation model and also implementation of the open data initiative in Lithuania. While there are overlapping areas of action between the second and third action plan, most of commitments in the third action plan are new.

Table 1: At a Glance		Mid term	End-of-term
Number of commitments			8
Level of completion			
Completed		0	2
Substantial		2	5
Limited		6	1
Not started		0	0
Number of commitments with:			
Clear relevance to OGP values		5	
Transformative potential impact		0	
Substantial or complete implementation		2	7
All three (✪)		0	0
Did it open government?	Major	N/A	0
	Outstanding	N/A	0
Moving forward			
Number of commitments carried over to next action plan		4	

Consultation with civil society during implementation

Countries participating in OGP follow a process for consultation during development and implementation of their OGP action plan.

The Office of the Government took steps to gather input from multiple stakeholders and to inform them about the state of implementation of the OGP action plan. For instance, it organised a multi-stakeholder meeting (attended by around 40–50 individuals) to account for the progress of the action plan and gather feedback (see midterm report for more information). There is, however, no evidence suggesting that the Office of the Government established a regular multi-stakeholder forum to review implementation of the action plan.

Table 2: Action Plan Consultation Process

Phase of Action Plan	OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section)	Did the Government Meet this Requirement?
During implementation	Regular forum for consultation during implementation?	No
	Consultations: Open or invitation only?	N/A
	Consultations on IAP2 spectrum[1]	N/A

---

[1] IAP2 Spectrum information available here:
http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/imported/IAP2%20Spectrum_vertical.pdf.

Progress in commitment implementation

All of the indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual, available at http://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/about-irm. One measure deserves further explanation due to its particular interest for readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top between OGP participating countries: the "starred commitment" (✪). Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

1. It must be specific enough that a judgement can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have "medium" or "high" specificity.
2. The commitment's language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of access to information, civic participation, or public accountability.
3. The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented.
4. Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving a ranking of "substantial" or "complete" implementation.

Based on these criteria, the Lithuania action plan contained no starred commitments at the midterm. At the end-of-term, based on the changes in the level of completion, Lithuania's action plan contained no starred commitments.

Commitments assessed as starred commitments in the midterm report can lose their starred status if their completion falls short of substantial or full completion at the end of the action plan implementation cycle, which would mean they have an overall limited completion at the end of term, per commitment language. Finally, the graphs in this section present an excerpt of the wealth of data the IRM collects during its progress reporting process. For the full dataset for Lithuania, see the OGP Explorer at www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer.

About "did it open government?"

Often, OGP commitments are vaguely worded or not clearly related to opening government, but they actually achieve significant political reforms. Other times, commitments with significant progress may appear relevant and ambitious, but fail to open government. In an attempt to capture these subtleties and, more importantly, actual changes in government practice, the IRM introduced a new variable "did it open government?" in end-of-term reports. This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice has changed as a result of the commitment's implementation. This can be contrasted to the IRM's "starred commitments" which describe *potential* impact.

IRM researchers assess the "did it open government?" question with regard to each of the OGP values relevant to this commitment. It asks, did it stretch the government practice beyond business as usual? The scale for assessment is as follows:

- Worsened: Worsens government openness as a result of the measures taken by the commitment.
- Did not change: Did not change status quo of government practice.
- Marginal: Some change, but minor in terms of its impact over level of openness.
- Major: A step forward for government openness in the relevant policy area, but remains limited in scope or scale.
- Outstanding: A reform that has transformed "business as usual" in the relevant policy area by opening government.

To assess this variable, researchers establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan. They then assess outcomes *as implemented* for changes in government openness.

Readers should keep in mind limitations. IRM end-of-term reports are prepared only a few months after the implementation cycle is completed. The variable focuses on outcomes that can be observed on government openness practices at the end of the two-year implementation period. The report and the variable do not intend to assess impact because of the complex methodological implications and the time frame of the report.

General overview of commitments

As part of OGP, countries are required to make commitments in a two-year action plan. End-of-term reports assess an additional metric, "did it open government?" The tables below summarise the completion level at the end of term and progress on this metric. For commitments that were complete already at the midterm, the report will provide a summary of the progress report findings but focus on analysis of the "did it open government?" variable. For further details on completed commitments at the midterm, please see Lithuania's IRM midterm progress report.

The action plan focuses on the following four umbrella initiatives:

- Improvement of public and administrative service provisions (both online and offline);
- Increasing public participation in public governance;
- Release of open data; and
- Reducing levels of corruption in Lithuania.

While some commitments within these umbrella initiatives contain tangible outputs and indicators, the majority of the commitments lack specificity in terms of time frames, measurable outputs, and outcome indicators.

The Lithuanian action plan contains 14 "actions" in six broad areas. The IRM researcher combined some of these actions, resulting in eight commitments assessed.

Table 3: Overview: Assessment of Progress by Commitment

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Term	Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
1. Public Services Quality Improvements		✔			Unclear					✔			Midterm		✔				✔			
													End-of-Term				✔					
2. Developing and Promoting E-Services		✔			Unclear					✔			Midterm		✔				✔			
													End-of-Term		✔							
3. Public Participation			✔		✔	✔		✔		✔			Midterm			✔				✔		
													End-of-Term			✔						
4. Raising Civic Awareness		✔			Unclear					✔			Midterm		✔				✔			
													End-of-Term			✔						
5. National Civil Society Fund Model		✔				✔				✔			Midterm		✔				✔			
													End-of-Term			✔						
6. Accessibility of Public Information			✔		✔					✔			Midterm		✔					✔		
													End-of-Term				✔					
7. Public Decision-Making Transparency		✔			✔		✔			✔			Midterm		✔					✔		
													End-of-Term			✔						
8. Promoting Anti-Corruption Education		✔			✔		✔			✔			Midterm			✔				✔		
													End-of-Term			✔						

Commitment 1. Public Services Quality Improvements

Commitment Text:

Initiative 1: customer-focused public services
Area: to improve the quality of services
Actions:
1. *To make an inventory and* **catalogue of public and administrative services**.
   a. *An inventory of the public and administrative services administered and provided by public administration authorities has been made, a list/catalogue of these services has been compiled and a methodology and indicators for measuring their provision have been created.*

Start date: not specified...............   End date: 2014

2. *To ensure the* **monitoring** *and assessment of* **the quality of services**.
   a. *Studies have been carried out by ministries on the assessment of the appropriateness of the public and administrative services provided and/or administered by them and on the conformity of these services with public needs.*
   b. *Quality performance criteria for service providing institutions have been laid down, serving the basis for the assessment of these institutions; publication of the results of the assessment.*
   c. *Methodological recommendations for measuring user satisfaction with public services (service quality) have been developed for public administration authorities.*
   d. *Studies aimed at determining the activity of public administration authorities as regards assessment of indicators for user satisfaction with services have been carried out.*

Start date: 2014............................   End date: 2016

3. *To* **develop service quality standards**.
   a. *Minimum quality standards for services regulated by ministries have been developed and posted on the ministries' websites.*
   b. *Recommendations for drawing up citizens' charters have been prepared.*
   c. *A standard for the provision of public services at public administration authorities has been developed*

Start date: 2014............................   End date: 2015

[emphasis added]
Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior
Supporting institution(s): Not specified

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Midterm / End-of-Term	Did It Open Government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed		Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
Overall		✔			Unclear					✔				✔			Midterm		✔			
																✔	End-of-Term					
1.1. Public and administrative services catalogue			✔		Unclear					✔					✔		Midterm					
																✔	End-of-Term					

1.2. Quality of service monitoring	✔		Unclear		✔		✔		
								✔	
1.3. Develop service quality standards	✔		Unclear		✔		✔		
								✔	

Commitment aim:

This commitment aims to improve public service delivery by (1) creating an inventory of all administrative e-services and (2) creating a set of standards for service-providing institutions to help them evaluate the quality of service delivery. These milestones were created to address the fact that service provision and user satisfaction evaluation practices are not usually integral in Lithuanian institutions activities yet. By contrast, the European Commission (EC) eGovernment report[1] together with the Digital Economy and Society Index[2] indicate that in terms of internet penetration rates (82.1 percent in 2014)[3] and e-infrastructure, Lithuania has the potential to become a role model in providing public and administrative services online.

Status
Midterm: Limited

None of the activities were fully completed during the midterm report. While the online service catalogue www.lietuva.gov.lt was successfully developed, the government was still developing methodologies for measuring user satisfaction of public services and posting them online. See the midterm report for a more detailed overview.[4]

End of term: Complete

The government completed all activities under this commitment. The key development in this policy area is the fact that the Ministry of the Interior issued methodological recommendations[5] for measuring user satisfaction and drawing minimum service quality requirements. The goal behind these recommendations, as presented in the document itself, is to (1) encourage institutions (both administering and providing services) to improve their service quality, (2) introduce benefits behind service standards, (3) prescribe procedures for developing service standards and (4) overall to initiate standard development practices for the whole of the public sector. This output, in effect, completes the few remaining tasks that were foreseen in the action plan, namely "developing methodology and indicators for measuring their service provision" and "developing methodological recommendations for measuring user satisfaction with public services."

Did it open government?

As implemented, the commitment did not have any influence on governmental openness practices. Activities were largely aimed at better service provision through steps that are, at this point, internal to government. Experts interviewed[6] for this report welcome the fact that the ministry is leading the conversation about unified service standards of the public sector in Lithuania. The commitment's further effect is largely dependent on whether institutions do in fact use developed recommendations and approaches in monitoring service standards strategically.

Carried forward?

There is no commitment in the third national action plan that directly targets the service-provision policy area.

---

[1] EU E-Government report 2015, http://bit.ly/1RtqNfT.

[2] EU Digital Agenda document, http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/desi.

[3] Internet usage statistics can be found at http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats9.htm#eu.

[4] The midterm report can be accessed here: http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Lithuania14-15_final_Eng.pdf.

[5] The document can be downloaded here: http://bit.ly/2e1KUVV.

[6] Interview with a representative of Transparency International Lithuania, 15 August 2016.

Commitment 2. Developing and Promoting E-Services

Commitment Text:

Initiative 1: customer-focused public services
Area: to develop and promote e-services
Responsible authority: Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications
Actions:

1. *To carry out projects for **online service dissemination** at public library.*
   a. *The capacities of the people to use electronic services have been enhanced, together with their awareness of new technologies and e-services.*
   b. *Digital exclusion across Lithuania has been reduced – people are encouraged to learn more and develop their skills towards a successful application of the ICT. The share of individuals using electronic public and administrative services in 2014 has accounted for 46 per cent, in 2015 – 50 per cent, in 2016 – 52 per cent.*

2. *By employing new technologies, to develop solutions for improving public and administrative services geared to promote the use of e-services and the provision of services through a centralized portal, **e-Government Gateway** (www.epaslaugos.lt).*
   a. *Public and administrative services have been brought online to the maximum extent possible. In 2014, the share of major public and administrative services brought online (at the highest level of electronic maturity) has accounted for 83 per cent, 2015 – 90 per cent, 2016 – 93 per cent.*
   b. *A high level of bringing services of public relevance online has been ensured, electronic solutions are being developed and implemented making it possible to receive services at one contact point. The number of e-service users has been growing, while ensuring the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination. A year-on-year growth in the number of visitors at eGovernment Gateway (www.epaslaugos.lt): in 2014 – 737.4 thousand, 2015 – 759.5 thousand, 2016 – 782.3.*
   c. *The quality of life of Lithuania's population and the productivity of enterprises have grown up by using opportunities offered by the ICT. The goal is to make sure that by 2020 at least 85 per cent of the Lithuanian population use the Internet (75 per cent in 2015) and 100 per cent of enterprises use high-speed internet (50 per cent in 2015) .*

[emphasis added]

Responsible institution: Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications

Supporting institutions: Not specified

Start date: 2014 ………………………   End date: 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
Overall		✔			Unclear					✔				✔ (Midterm) / ✔ (End-of-Term)				✔			
2.1. Online service dissemination		✔			Unclear					✔				✔ (Midterm) / ✔ (End-of-Term)							
2.2. Increase services on e-Government Gateway		✔			Unclear					✔					✔ (Midterm) / ✔ (End-of-Term)						

Commitment aim:

This commitment aims to increase the online provision of public and administrative services and to promote their wider public usage. Lithuania has achieved significant progress in e-governance. The country ranks eleventh out of all EU states in the annual Digital Economy and Society Index, which summarises relevant indicators on Europe's digital performance and tracks the evolution of EU member states in digital competitiveness.[1] In terms of actual use of e-services, Lithuania ranks eighth in the same index, with 43 percent of citizens requesting information from public institutions online. This commitment aims at further growth of e-services usage in Lithuania.

Status
Midterm: Limited

The commitment had demonstrated limited progress. The government put significant effort in creating outreach tools (www.prisijungusi.lt, for instance) and campaigns, as well as further developing central e-service provision platform www.epaslaugos.lt. While the percentage of citizens using e-services has been increasing (from 40 percent in 2014 to 44 percent in 2015), this milestone had not yet reached the target outlined in the action plan (the target was 46 percent in 2014 and 50 percent in 2015), falling short by six percentage points both years.

For a detailed analysis, please refer to the midterm report.[2]

End of term: Limited

The government made no further progress towards completion of this commitment. Since the milestones are worded in a way to measure impact of the actions of the government and since 2016 surveys to quantify that impact are not yet available, the achievements are evaluated against the available data of 2015. In 2015, 88.3 percent of public and administrative services were provided online (the target was 90 percent in 2015 and 93 percent in 2016). The e-service portal www.epaslaugos.lt was visited by 1.8 million unique visitors (the target was 759,000 in 2015 and 782,000 in 2016), and the internet penetration rate was 71 percent (the target was 75 percent in 2015).

Did it open government?

The majority of the commitment's outputs are linked to better service provision through digitisation, but it is unclear how this would open government. The relevance of the commitment on access to information, civic participation, and public accountability is unclear, and implementation of the commitment did not change government practice in any of these areas. However, growth in internet penetration rates and an increase in IT literacy have created a better environment for the government to employ internet technologies in its openness efforts.

Carried forward?

The commitment to develop and further promote e-service usage in Lithuania was not carried forward to the third national action plan.

---

[1] EU Digital Agenda document can be found here: http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/desi.

[2] The midterm report can be accessed here: http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Lithuania14-15_final_Eng.pdf.

Commitment 3. Public Participation

Commitment Text:

Initiative 2: Public participation in public governance
Area: to encourage public administration authorities to have consultations with people
Actions:

1. *To ensure public consultations and* **facilitate public involvement** *in public governance processes.*
   a. *Legal regulation of public consultations has been improved –main consultation principles, terms and standards have been established.*
   b. *Proposals received and implemented through public consultations are made public, new technologies are employed for consultations.*
   c. *With a view to enhancing public involvement in public administration, information is provided, already at the school level and extending to other levels of the education system, about opportunities for accessing information held by the State, and public involvement in the processes of public governance (Ministry of Education and Science).*
   d. *To enable the public to express its opinion on the quality of provided services, efforts are made to ensure the greatest possible public involvement in the administration of institutions providing education, health, social security and public security services, thus enhancing the role of the councils in these institutions (Ministry of Education and Science).*
   e. *The Council of Non-governmental Organisations (and advisory institution) has been set up to ensure the participation of NGOs in establishing, shaping and implementing NGO development policy (Ministry of Social security and Labour).*

Responsible institution: Ministry of Education and Science, Ministry of Social Security and Labour
Supporting institutions: Not specified
Start date: 2014......................   End date: 2016

2. *To implement a* **measure promoting active involvement** *by local communities and individuals* **in decision-making** *as regards responding to public needs in the fields of local community relevance.*
   a. *In 2014 at least 90 per cent of the total activities approved by the decisions of the Local Community Council, involving all municipalities, have been implemented.*
   b. *Capacities of the people, community organisation managers and the most active community members to represent community interests in finding best solutions to the problems have been enhanced. Community self-governance increased. In order to evaluate the efficiency of communal participation in public administration processes, developments in their involvement in these processes have been observed, best practices of cooperation between public administration authorities and communities have been shared, and the effectiveness of decisions adopted together with the public has been analysed.*

Responsible institution: Ministry of Social Security and Labour
Supporting institutions: Not specified
Start date: not specified...............   End date: 2015

3. *To develop and implement measures encouraging people and local communities to* **participate in local decision-making**
   An informational-methodological publication has been developed for the representatives of local communities (seniūnaičiai), which provides information about the rights of the people and the possibilities of participating in local decision making, other information of local relevance (e.g. safe neighbourhood, emergency telephone number 112 etc); relevant legal information is provided in a simple, reader-friendly form. All the representatives of local communities (seniūnaičiai) will receive necessary information in the manner acceptable to them. The results of the monitoring of popular surveys will be made public.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior
Supporting institutions: Not specified

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion / Midterm / End-of-Term				Did It Open Government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
Overall			✔		✔	✔		✔		✔					✔				✔		
															✔						
3.1. Facilitate public involvement			✔		✔	✔		✔			✔			✔							
														✔							
3.2. Measure promoting involvement		✔			✔	✔				✔					✔						
																✔					
3.3. Encourage participation in local decision making			✔		✔	✔				✔					✔						
																✔					

Commitment aim:

The commitment contains three deliverables that all contribute to the engagement of community members in public governance and decision making. Each milestone addresses key stakeholders: public institutions; local community representatives, including community managers and leaders; and communities themselves.

Levels of civic participation and empowerment remain low. The IRM researcher identified a number of indicators attesting to the level of public participation in consultations in the beginning of the action plan period: (1) only five percent of Lithuanians participated in any type of municipal public consultation in 2014[1] and almost 80 percent of respondents reported an unwillingness to participate in public consultations at all;[2] (2) levels of public trust in public institutions remain low (only 41 percent of Lithuanians trusted public institutions in 2013[3]); and (3) 64 percent of residents did not receive any type of information concerning public issues in their municipalities and *Seniūnijos* (smallest administrative unit in Lithuania).[4]

Status
Midterm: Substantial

According to the midterm report, all three milestones were ongoing and in varying stages of completion, although two of them were substantially completed. While the government took steps to reform the legal environment and initiated internet tools for holding public consultations, only eight of fourteen ministries had integrated www.lrt.lt as a platform for consultations. For this reason, the IRM researcher did not grant full completion status to this milestone.

Regarding the milestone to promote active involvement by local communities, no public records indicated an increased level of self-governance, and the commitment language did not provide any information on how these changes were going to be observed and monitored. However, 90 percent of the total activities approved by the decisions of the local community councils (see [midterm report](#)) were implemented, which shows that the newly established councils functioned. The action to enhance capacity of stakeholders to represent community interest remained unfulfilled.

The government published booklets for local community representatives, which supported the milestone encouraging participation in local decision making. However, the government fell short in making public the results of popular surveys.

For a detailed analysis of the commitment, refer to midterm report.

End of term: Substantial

Although the government made progress in implementing some of the commitment's milestones, some milestones remained unfulfilled. Therefore, the overall completion level remains substantial.

Since the midterm report, research did not reveal any visible outputs that would advance public consultations, youth engagement into public policy formation, or citizen engagement in the administration of public institutions. It is worth noting that in July the government announced the public procurement tender notice[5] for improving the public consultation mechanism in Lithuania, indicating that it needed external expert help in identifying key challenges and developing mechanisms that would involve more citizens in public governance. This step was welcomed by a representative of Transparency International Lithuania as a notable development in the field, which, according to the representative, generally did not see much improvement throughout 2016.[6] An additional activity took place that completes the milestone to promote active involvement by local communities. Notably, the Ministry of Social Security and Labour posted the analysis of its local community council programme online, and it had an overall positive evaluation.[7]

The IRM researcher found the milestone on local community participation in decision making to be complete. The Ministry of the Interior published results of three popular surveys.[8] Although the contact point within the ministry did not provide information about the total number of surveys conducted, the IRM researcher found the action fulfilled the milestone that surveys "will be made public."

Did it open government?
Access to information: Marginal
Civic participation: Marginal

The fact that the government published the analysis of its local community council programme does marginally contribute to an increased amount of information made available to the public. However, none of the initiatives under this commitment resulted in substantial improvement to access to information.

This commitment did not result in substantial change over the number of consultations held online. For example, the number of public consultations held at the newly developed www.lrv.lt platform increased only slightly since mid-2015, with seven public consultations held and with 10 reactions received from the public (compared to five consultations and one contribution reported in the midterm report).[9] An interviewed representative[10] of one of the leading public policy NGOs in Lithuania remarked that the public consultation model in Lithuania is largely nonfunctional. Efforts of both national and municipal institutions to involve local communities in decision making remain fragmented and scarce. Additionally, institutions are not mandated to

conduct public consultations, and when they do there are no rules governing the format of those consultations. In addition, levels of civic empowerment in Lithuania remain low (according to the Civil Society Institute, the index amounts to 33.4 points out of possible 100[11]).[12]

While the number of public consultations held remains low, the government is investing time and resources to develop the new consultation platform and is undertaking legal reforms, which indicates that the issue of public involvement is on the government's agenda.

Carried forward?

The third national action plan (2016–2018) contains a broad commitment to increase civic participation and engagement in public governance with four milestones, including developing a public consultation mechanism, introducing OGP values, fostering an open public governance culture in the public sector, and creating an NGO database and an NGO fund.

---

[1] Transparency International Lithuania survey can be found here: http://bit.ly/1PPIZFu.

[2] Transparency International Lithuania survey can be found here: http://bit.ly/1SOtVYT.

[3] The document can be downloaded here: http://bit.ly/2f1veEG.

[4] The document can be downloaded here: http://bit.ly/2eXgw3t.

[5] The tender notice can be found here: https://lrvk.lrv.lt/uploads/lrvk/documents/files/advertisement-119369.pdf.
[6] Interview with Rugilė Trumpytė, Transparency International Lithuania, 30 November 2016.
[7] The evaluation can be found here: http://www.socmin.lt/lt/nevyriausybiniu-organizaciju-sektorius/igyvendintos-programos.html.
[8] Surveys can be found here: https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/konsultacijos-su-visuomene/apklausos.
[9] Public consultations conducted can be found at https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/konsultacijos/.
[10] Rūta Mrazauskaitė, Transparency International Lithuanian Chapter.

[11] The survey can be downloaded here: http://www.civitas.lt/time-line/pilietines-galios-indeksas-2015-m/.
[12] Ibid.

Commitment 4. Raising Civic Awareness

Commitment Text:

Initiative 2: Public participation in public governance
Area: raising civic awareness
Action: To update civic and historical education at school
Expected outcome:

1. *Enhancing the quality and competitive capacity of general and higher education systems: **civic and historical education has been updated** at schools. **Civic and national identity education projects have been implemented**. Arrangements have been made for educational civic activities and personal development across the country, various organisational forms thereof are being developed, thus encouraging the strengthening of local and national organisations of pupils and students.*
2. *The growth of the Civic Empowerment Index in 2012 was 35.0, in 2017 – 40.0.*
3. *Growth of the Civic Empowerment Index for pupils and students in 2013 was 46.0, and in 2014 – 46.7.*

[Emphasis added]

Responsible institution: Ministry of Education and Science
Supporting institutions: Not specified
Start date: 2014............................ End date: 2020

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
														Midterm / End-of-Term							
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
Overall		✔			Unclear					✔				✔				✔			
															✔						
4.1a. Civic education update		✔			Unclear					✔					✔						
															✔						
4.1b. Implement civic education project		✔			Unclear					✔				✔							
															✔						

Commitment aim:

This commitment aims to update the civil education curriculum in schools. However, the commitment is unclear about what projects and initiatives should be conducted, and it does not include sufficient information about performance and outcome indicators.

Status
Midterm: Limited

According to the midterm report, both milestones were ongoing and in different stages of completion. While teachers interviewed by the IRM researcher viewed the steps in reforming civic education as positive, CSO experts interviewed had a considerably more critical take. Some of these criticisms had to do with the lack for resources allocated to implement the reforms and the lack of CSO involvement in developing the civic education curriculum.

See midterm report for a detailed analysis.

End of term: Substantial

The key development in the civic education policy area is that the Ministry of Education and Science developed and issued a 2016–2020 interinstitutional strategic activity plan on civic education.[1] It aims to strengthen youth civil and national perception skills (taking into account geopolitical realities in the region, kids will be taught how to recognise signals of information warfare, for instance).[2] The plan also includes education on democratic skills, such as critical thinking and political skills. It also aims to involve a wider range of actors in civic education, including NGOs in Lithuania, recognising their importance in youth civic education. However, the plan does not specify concrete action to complete these goals and only sets down interinstitutional coordination procedures and overall goals. An interinstitutional working group is to gather on an annual basis and report on progress in pursuing the goals set out in the plan.

Did it open government?
As implemented, this commitment has not contributed to opening government practice. The main activities have targeted national identity teaching rather than focusing on educating the public about their rights and responsibilities, an application that could strengthen overall citizen empowerment in the country. However, the forthcoming interinstitutional activity plan now includes youth democratic skills building; thus, it can be expected that citizen empowerment will in fact be addressed in the period of 2016–2020.

Carried forward?
There is no commitment in the third national action plan that targets the civic education policy area.

---

[1] The legal act can be found here: https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/3326bca0f26a11e5989ee743dd0efbb0.
[2] A press release can be found here: https://www.smm.lt/web/lt/pranesimai_spaudai/naujienos_1/sutelkiamas-demesys-i-pilietini-ir-tautini-ugdymajis-tampa-kryptingas-nuoseklus-itraukiamos-skirtingos-organizacijos.

Commitment 5. National Civil Society Fund Model Development

Commitment Text:

Initiative 2: public participation in public governance
Area: raising civic awareness
Action: To develop a model for the National Civil Society Fund.
Expected outcome:
Several versions of the model for the National Civil Society Fund have been designed. They have been discussed with social partners and the selected version has been presented at the Government Strategic Committee.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Social Security and Labour
Supporting institutions: Not specified
Start date: not specified...............   End date: 2014

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion	Midterm			Did It Open Government?				
														End of Term							
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
		✔				✔				✔				✔	✔			✔			

Commitment aim:

This commitment aims to develop a model for the National Civil Society Fund to distribute government funding to Lithuanian NGOs.

Lithuania does not have a centralised fund to distribute government funding to NGOs. As revealed by experts interviewed,[1] officials have been debating the usefulness of such a mechanism for many years. However, the government has not taken any specific action on the matter since 1990. Currently, NGO financial sustainability largely depends on smaller-scale, project-based funding for organisations, and that funding comes mainly from international foundations, the European Commission, foreign embassies, and corporate donors. This commitment aims to supplement NGO financing with established public-funding mechanisms.

Status
Midterm: Limited

Prior to the development of the OGP action plan in 2014, the Ministry of Social Security and Labour conducted an exploratory study on relevant experiences from a number of countries and developed an initial concept for the funding mechanism for NGOs.[2]

During the first year of action plan implementation, the ministry conducted a thorough analysis of best practices from Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland and developed

two alternatives of the fund model: centralised and specialised. Because the government did not discuss the alternative models with social partners or present them to the Government Strategic Committee, the IRM researcher noted the commitment had limited completion.

Refer to midterm report for the full analysis.

End of term: Substantial

The interview with the representative of the NGO Council[3] (a body, representing NGO interests in the government, see midterm report) revealed that during 2016, the government presented two fund alternatives to the NGO Council. The NGO Council rejected both alternatives as not feasible and suggested a third model option for further considerations. Implementing the NGO fund will not happen before 2018 (see below). The government developed several models and discussed them with social partners. However, because the government did not present the final model to the Strategic Committee, the commitment was substantially implemented.

Did it open government?
Civic participation: Did not change
This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of civic participation as it is intended to strengthen the enabling environment for civil society through NGO and public-sector support by establishing a sustainable funding mechanism. However, the potential impact of the commitment lies with further implementation of the funding model. The development of the fund model itself is only a prerequisite to achieving its objectives. In particular, substantial work needs to be done to ensure transparency of the funding mechanism and objectivity and impartiality in its further functioning.

Carried forward?

The third national action plan takes this commitment further and promises to establish the NGO fund before the end of 2018. As worded in the action plan, the purpose of the fund is to:
1. Finance the strengthening of institutional capacities of NGOs required for participation in the public decision-making process;
2. Draft proposals by NGOs on decisions of public governance and presentation to the interested institutions and the public; and
3. Strengthen capacities of NGO representatives required for the drafting and presentation of such proposals.

---

[1] Interview with Martinas Zaltauskas, 1 September 2016.
[2] The document can be downloaded here: http://bit.ly/1Sp4Bax.

[3] Interview with Martinas Zaltauskas, 1 September 2016.

Commitment 6. Accessibility of Public Information

Commitment Text:

Initiative 3: Openness to the public of the activities of public administration authorities (Open Data)
Area: to make information held by public authorities accessible to the public
Actions:

1. *To develop an **Open Data supply model**.*
   a. *An Open Data supply model has been developed:*
   b. *Guidelines for public administration authorities have been developed defining the Open Data concept, terms and conditions and methods for data opening;*
   c. *Alternative ways for opening data have been presented.*

2. *To encourage data supply in **open formats**.*
   a. *Recommendations have been developed for public institutions and agencies as regards the preparation of investment projects aimed at creation or modification of information systems; provisions have been made for the adjustment of information systems to provide data in open formats (.csm. xml, and others).*
   b. *adjustment of information systems to provide data in open formats has been listed among investment priorities for 2015*
   [Emphasis added]

Responsible institution: Ministry of Transport and Communications
Supporting institutions: Not specified
Start date: Not specified ………….   End date: 2014

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion	Midterm / End of Term			Did It Open Government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
Overall			✔		✔					✔				✔					✔		
																✔					
6.1. Develop open data supply model			✔		✔					✔					✔						
																✔					
6.2. Open formats			✔		✔					✔				✔							
																✔					

Commitment aim:

This commitment aims to provide public information in an open data format by developing an open data supply mechanism and developing recommendations for public institutions in the field of public data management and release.

Currently, there is no functional open data portal in Lithuania. According to an interviewed anti-corruption NGO representative,[1] key stakeholders have been discussing the need for open data

since 2010. However, the government has taken limited actions to develop and implement an open data supply model, and few public institutions in Lithuania release some open data.

Status
Midterm: Limited

The milestone regarding the development of an open data supply model was substantially completed. The Information Society Development Committee (ISDC) under the Ministry of Transport and Communications reported a number of outputs and commissioned a feasibility study in the beginning of 2015 that presented two open data supply model alternatives.[2] However, there were a few missing milestones: specifically, open data guidelines for other institutions were not prepared at the time of developing the midterm report.

The milestone regarding data supply in open formats showed limited progress. While the Ministry of Communications and Transport did not start the commitment according to its strict wording, it did complete steps which have the same or even greater impact in the open data arena. The ministry included an open data provision in the selection of investment projects in the area of information systems development or modification. This provision encourages institutions to ensure that newly developed or updated information systems have the functionality required to gather and release data in open formats. Refer to the midterm report for a detailed overview.

End of term: Complete

In July 2016, the minister of transport and communication issued an order concerning recommendations on data opening in the public sector (No. 3-245 (1.5E)).[3] The order provides good practice recommendation for all national and municipal institutions, including state-owned enterprises. They include definitions of open data, objectives behind opening data, and methods to identify data release priorities. These outputs in effect complete the commitment in full.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Marginal

The commitment is a positive step towards improved open data release practices in the future and has resulted in marginal changes in access to information. An interview with an Information Society Development Committee representative revealed that there were instances when the Ministry of Communications and Transport applied the criteria of open data to new ICT investment projects, indicating that the newly introduced criteria took effect and were used in determining financial investments. Further improvements are expected as the commitment does not specifically outline the provision of open data but instead creates preconditions for the further provision of open data.

Carried forward?

The commitment related to open data was included in the third national action plan with an aim to build an open data portal and integrate it into the European single digital market. As worded in the action plan, the government plans to create centrally managed technical tools enabling people and business to have, without preconditions, convenient access to public-sector data for business development and nongovernmental initiatives. The commitment involves the creation of centralised access to open data, including metadata and datasets, in the public sector.

---

[1] Interview with Ruta Mrazauskaite, 15 September 2015.

[2] The Open Data Feasibility study can be found here:
http://ivpk.lrv.lt/uploads/ivpk/documents/files/IVPK_leidiniai/Galimybi%C5%B3%20tyrimo%20ataskaita_atviri%20duomenys%202015.pdf.

[3] The recommendations can be accessed here: https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/3a0d20c04e8311e6b72ff16034f7f796.

Commitment 7. Public Decision-Making Transparency

Commitment Text:

Initiative 4: corruption prevention, transparency promotion
Area: To reduce the scale of corruption

Responsible authority: Ministry of Interior, Special Investigation Service

Action: to ensure publicity and transparency in public decision-making, enhance public access to draft legislation.

Expected outcome:
1. *All **draft legislation** is **made public** (www.lrs.lt).*
2. *Reorganisation of the system of the authorities overseeing economic operators has reduced preconditions for corruption as a result of **lower administrative and supervisory burden**.*
3. ***Reduced motivation for illegal payments** in the field of healthcare.*
4. ***Improved procedures for the provision of administrative and public services** and for their administration by increasing the transparency and effectiveness of public services; improved system for civil servant selection, career, service, training and evaluation.*
5. ***Training of legislative drafters** on evaluation of draft legislation considering the aspect of anti-corruption, consultations given to legislation drafters on anti-corruption aspect in the evaluation of draft legislation.*

[Emphasis added]

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior, Special Investigation Service
Supporting institutions: Not specified
Start date: 2014............................   End date: 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion / Midterm / End-of-Term				Did It Open Government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
Overall		✔			✔		✔			✔				✔					✔		
															✔						
7.1. Publicise draft legislation			✔		✔						✔				✔						
																✔					
7.2. Lower administrative burden	✔						✔			✔					✔						
															✔						
7.3. Reduce illegal payments in health care	✔						✔			✔				✔							
														✔							

7.4. Improve service provision procedures		✔		✔				✔			✔		
											✔		
7.5. Training of legislative drafters			✔		✔			✔	✔				
											✔		

Commitment aim:

This commitment aims to increase transparency in public decision-making processes and lists a range of outputs with widely varying degrees of specificity and unclear links between various milestones. The IRM researcher believes that the commitment was developed in response to low levels of trust in government institutions and high corruption perception levels (with a score of 61/100, Lithuania ranks 32nd in the Corruption Perception Index 2015). It addresses a number of transparency and anti-corruption issues in various fields, such as health care, business administration, legislative transparency, and capacity of legislative drafters. While experts interviewed recognise these issues as very important, the milestones in the commitment are a set of fragmented actions, rather than a strategic reform package.

Status
Midterm: Limited

The commitment had limited completion status at the midterm report. It included a number of vaguely connected milestones with varying levels of specificity and lacked information regarding target audiences of specific actions (not defining "legislative drafters," for instance).

The government had taken substantive steps to reduce administrative burdens by developing a plan to reduce the number of business monitoring institutions, among other things. However, the lack of specificity and indicators in the language of the milestone makes it difficult to determine whether the milestone has been fully completed.

Similarly, the milestone to reduce motivation for illegal payments in health care did not specify concrete actions or indicators; thus, it was not possible to evaluate accurately. But based on reported actions, it was evaluated as having limited completion level. These actions included the standardisation of information provided to patients at health care institutions.

Regarding the milestone to improve procedures for the provision of public services, the language of the commitment does not provide measurable indicators to assess completion. However, the IRM researcher identified a number of steps taken by the government towards fulfilment of this commitment. For example, the government moved eight citizen-oriented services online, created municipal anti-corruption commissions, and amended freedom of information legislation to oblige institutions to publish information about professional misconduct. Desk research by the IRM researcher identified no information regarding their perceived effectiveness.

The milestone to train legislative drafters, as worded, does not contain measurable indicators to allow the IRM researcher to determine the level of completion of this commitment. At the end of the first year of implementation, the IRM researcher could find no evidence that this milestone had started.

See the midterm report for a detailed analysis.

End of term: Substantial

The milestone to make draft legislation public was completed even before the commitment was developed, because all legislation, including official drafts, was already published at www.lrs.lt. In addition, the government developed the new database www.e-tar.lt which stores all public legislation since 1990.

The IRM researcher could find no additional output towards fulfilment of the milestone to reduce administrative burdens. Similarly, the government took no new actions in the field of illegal payments.

While there were no additional actions taken by government towards completion of the milestone to improve the provision of administrative services, web searches of various commissions show that authorities tend to comply with the requirement to post online information about internal official legal breaches.

Regarding training of legislative drafters, the milestone has been granted a substantial completion status. In 2015, the Special Investigation Service conducted 143 anti-corruption seminars with more than 5,000 officials attending.[1] In addition, 1,861 participants attended ethics and anti-corruption training, conducted by the Civil Service Department.[2]

Did it open government?
Access to information: Marginal
Public accountability: Marginal

The commitment's language is vague, and it lists a range of outputs without outlining a clear path to achieving them, making it hard to assess the potential or actual outcomes. The fully functioning legislative database was active well before the action plan implementation. The newly created legislative database with additional functionality may be considered as improving ways to access legislative information in Lithuania. In addition, a standardised information package to patients at hospitals may also have contributed to marginally improved levels of access to information. The fact that institutions largely obey the requirement to publish online information about public officials' administrative breaches does contribute to marginally increased levels of public accountability. Finally, while the effectiveness of the newly created municipal anti-corruption commissions remains an object of criticism from the leading anti-corruption NGO in Lithuania,[3] the desk research indicates that these commissions tend to publish information about their activities, mainly meeting minutes, which does contribute to a marginal increase of information in Lithuania.

Carried forward?

Some issues related to this commitment are carried over in the third national action plan. These issues include:
- Corruption in health care (action: to create and broadcast social advertisements that target corruption in the health care system);
- Public involvement in state governance (action: to develop and implement measures for publicising information about government activities and civic participation in governance); and
- Public input into state governance (action: to create a public consultation mechanism).

---

[1] The Special Investigation Service Activity report can be found here:
http://www.stt.lt/documents/ataskaitos/stt_ataskaita_2016_web.pdf.
[2] The Civil Service Department Activity report can be found here:
http://vtd.lrv.lt/uploads/vtd/documents/files/VEIKLA/ATASKAITOS/Ataskaita_2015.pdf.

---

[3] Interview with Ruta Mrazauskaite, 18 November 2016.

Commitment 8. Promoting Anti-Corruption Education

Commitment Text:

Initiative 4: corruption prevention, transparency promotion
Area: To reduce the scale of corruption
Action (milestone): to promote anti-corruption education by employing mass media and other means.
Expected outcome:
1. *Increased public intolerance to corruption, and public involvement in anti-corruption has been encouraged; **anticorruption education programmes have been developed and implemented**.*
2. *Delining share of population thinking corruption is widespread according to Special Eurobarometer (in 2014 – 95 %, in 2015 – 94%, 2016 – 93%).*
3. *Growing Transparency International Corruption Perception Index (in 2013 – 57, in 2014 – 58, in 2015 – 59, in 2016 - 60).*
4. *Anti-corruption **initiative "Clean hands" has been carried across health institutions** in Lithuania (Ministry of Health, Q2/2014).*

[emphasis added]

Responsible institution: Ministries
Supporting institutions: Not specified
Start date: 2014............................   End date: 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
															Midterm End-of-Term							
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
Overall		✔			✔		✔			✔					✔			✔			
															✔						
8.1. Develop anti-corruption education programmes			✔		✔		✔			✔					✔						
															✔						
8.2. "Clean Hands" initiative		✔					✔			✔						✔					
																✔					

Commitment aim:

This commitment aims to promote anti-corruption education through the use of media and the creation of anti-corruption education programmes. This commitment comes in a context where 95 percent of Lithuanians believe that corruption is widespread.[1]

Midterm: Substantial

Throughout the first year of the action plan, numerous anti-corruption education campaign outputs were visible in the mass media. The Special Investigation Service and the Ministry of Education and Science had been developing anti-corruption education programmes well before this action plan came into effect. Anti-corruption NGOs interviewed by the IRM researcher confirmed the existence of these programmes.

The milestone to carry out the Clean Hands initiative was completed. Since the Ministry of Health did not specify the number of public health institutions that should carry the Clean Hands initiative, the IRM researcher has presumed that the initiative concerns the 21 health care institutions that are under the ministry's jurisdiction. This one time initiative aimed to rank 21 health care institutions according to their anti-corruption index. The index includes information about the amount of information available to patients and an anonymous survey of staff and patients, among others. The Ministry of Health did not make the results of the survey publically available.

End of term: Substantial

The IRM researcher could not identify any further activities conducted towards completion of the anti-corruption programme.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Did not change
Public accountability: Did not change

A representative of Transparency International[2] remarked that while anti-corruption education is necessary it can only be truly effective in reducing corruption levels if combined with other methods on other levels of state and municipal governance (for instance, by promoting practical participation of pupils at schools and developing democratic skills early in life).

In the action plan, the government measures the success of this commitment with an increase of the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) score. While Lithuania's CPI score has increased, such change can hardly be attributed to isolated anti-corruption efforts, such as those in this commitment.

In conclusion, there is no evidence suggesting, that substantial completion of this commitment has resulted in more open government practices, such as increased access to information or public accountability.

Carried forward?

The third national action plan does not include any type of commitment that would aim to further reduce corruption levels in Lithuania.

---

[1] EC Eurobarometer survey report 2014: https://www.stt.lt/documents/es_ataskaita_2014/Lietuva_2014.pdf.
[2] Interview held on 12 October 2015.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Commitments are clustered based on the original OGP action plan. This report is based on a desk review of governmental programmes, draft laws and regulations, governmental decrees, and analysis of the commitments, as well as on monitoring the process of elaboration of the second action plan. In preparing this report, the IRM researcher conducted four additional interviews with CSO representatives and five public officials as well as numerous email/telephone queries to public institutions in Lithuania.

Karolis Granickas is a senior programme manager at the Open Contracting Partnership. Together with Epsi platform and others, he contributed to global open data advocacy efforts. Karolis holds a bachelor's degree in international law from Westminster University, London, and a master's degree in EU law from Maastricht University in the Netherlands.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, to empower citizens, to fight corruption, and to harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and to improve accountability.

Open
Government
Partnership