

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): Lithuania Progress Report 2016 – 2017

Rugile Trumpyte, Independent Researcher

Table of Contents

Executive Summary: Lithuania	2
I. Introduction	10
II. Context	11
III. Leadership and Multistakeholder Process	14
IV. Commitments	23
1. To build Lithuania's open data portal, and integrate into the European single digital market	25
2. To develop and implement measures for publicizing information about government activities and civic participation in governance	28
3. To publish online information about revenues and spending of national and municipal institutions	30
4. To create and broadcast social advertisements that target corruption in the healthcare system	33
5. To create legal, organizational and technical tools to easily access detailed information about election and voting procedures, participation in the elections, donations to political campaign participants	35
6. To create public consultation mechanism	37
7. To foster open public governance culture in public sector by introducing values of Open Government Partnership	40
8. Creation of NGO database	42
9. Creation of NGO fund	45
V. General Recommendations	48
VI. Methodology and Sources	50
VII. Eligibility Requirements Annex	53



Executive Summary: Lithuania

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Progress Report 2016-2017

Lithuania's third action plan focused on the openness of public sector institutions, anticorruption, and improving civic participation. While the Office of the Government formed a new working group to oversee development and implementation the action plan, it met only once during the implementation period. Moving forward, the Office of the Government should consult a wider range civil society when developing future action plans, and include more ambitious commitments that are more clearly in line with OGP values and timelines.

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. Lithuania began participating in OGP in 2011. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) carries out an annual review of the activities of each country that participates in OGP.

The Office of the Government is the lead coordinating institution for Lithuania's third national action plan and responsible for the country's OGP commitments. The Office assists the Prime Minister in implementing policies and coordinates activities of the ministries and other subordinate institutions in Lithuania, though it does not have the power to compel public sector institutions to implement OGP commitments.

The Office formed a new OGP working group to oversee in the developing and implementation of this third action plan. Unlike the previous working group which included only public sector representatives, this group comprised of representatives from the public sector, civil society, and academia.

OGP Process

Countries participating in the OGP follow a process for consultation during development of

At a Glance:

Member since: 2011
Number of commitments: 9

Level of Completion:

Completed: 0
Substantial: 0
Limited: 8 of 9
Not started: 1 of 9

Commitment Emphasis:

Access to information: 5 of 9
Civic participation: 3 of 9
Public accountability: 0
Tech & innovation for transparency & accountability: 4 of 9

Commitments that are

Clearly relevant to an OGP value: 8 of 9
Of transformative potential impact: 1 of 9
Substantially or completely implemented: 0
All three (★): 0

their OGP action plan and during implementation.

Development of Lithuania's third action plan involved civil society and government, though the number of civil society stakeholders was limited to three. The Office of the Government did not provide advance notice of the action plan, nor did it carry out awareness-raising activities, and thus it is unclear if consultations with civil society groups impacted the final design of the action plan. Additionally, the consultation process was only held online and did not conform to standards set in OGP guidelines.

Outside of the OGP working group that met to draft the action plan and oversee its implementation, no regular multi-stakeholder forum was held. The working group met only once, in June 2017, since the action plan was drafted. The IRM researcher recommends forming a stronger mechanism to better inform the public about the developments of the commitments, explain any possible delays, and provide supportive documents as needed.

The Office of the Government published a self-assessment report on its website, together with an online consultation to provide feedback on the action plan. The consultation period was open for two weeks, from 11 September to 24 September 2017. The online public consultation received 12 proposals, however they are not available online and are currently being evaluated at the time of writing this report.

Commitment Implementation

As part of OGP participation, countries make commitments in a two-year action plan. Lithuania's action plan contains nine commitments. Table 1 summarizes each commitment's level of completion and potential impact. Table 2 provides a snapshot of progress for each commitment and recommends next steps. In some cases, similar commitments are grouped and reordered to make reading easier.

Note that the IRM updated the criteria for starred commitments in early 2015 in order to raise the standard for model OGP commitments. Under these criteria, commitments must be highly specific, relevant to OGP values, of transformative potential impact, and substantially completed or complete. Lithuania's third national action plan contained no starred commitments.

Table 1: Assessment of Progress by Commitment

COMMITMENT SHORT NAME	POTENTIAL IMPACT				LEVEL OF COMPLETION			
	NONE	MINOR	MODERATE	TRANSFORMATIVE	NOT STARTED	LIMITED	SUBSTANTIAL	COMPLETE
Theme 1: Openness to the public of the activities of government institutions								
1. To build Lithuania's open data portal, and integrate into the European single digital market								
2. To develop and implement measures for publicizing information about government activities and civic participation in governance								
Theme II: Preventing corruption and promoting transparency								
3. To publish online information about revenues and spending of national and municipal institutions								
4. To create and broadcast social advertisements that target corruption in the healthcare system								
5. To create legal, organizational and technical tools to easily access detailed information about election and voting procedures, participation in the elections, donations to political campaign participants								
Theme III: Increased civic participation and engagement in public governance								
6. To create public consultation mechanism								
7. To foster open public governance culture in public sector by introducing values of Open Government Partnership								
8. Creation of NGO database								

COMMITMENT SHORT NAME	POTENTIAL IMPACT				LEVEL OF COMPLETION			
	NONE	MINOR	MODERATE	TRANSFORMATIVE	NOT STARTED	LIMITED	SUBSTANTIAL	COMPLETE
9. Creation of NGO fund								

Table 2: Summary of Progress by Commitment

NAME OF COMMITMENT	RESULTS
<p>1. To build Lithuania's open data portal, and integrate into the European single digital market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Clear • Potential Impact: Transformative • Completion: Limited 	<p>Currently, most public sector institutions in Lithuania do not inventory their data, and the exact scope of data is unknown. This commitment seeks to create a centrally-managed open data portal for the public to access and use government-held data. It also calls for the training of public officials to manage data, and to integrate the new open data portal into the EU single digital portal. If fully created, the open data portal could have a potentially transformative impact on the way public data is stored and used in Lithuania. The open data portal could add an estimated 2 percent of Lithuania's GDP to the country's economy, and it would eliminate fees that are currently required when requesting data from the Central Registry.</p> <p>The Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications has launched two public procurements for the portal: one for drafting the methodological guidelines for the portal and one for developing the portal. The second procurement is still in the draft stage, and the portal will be developed once funding for the procurement is allocated. The procurement documents suggest that implementation of this commitment might be delayed. The IRM researcher recommends breaking down the milestones into smaller activities to better measure the level of the implementation, and to consult stakeholders to better address the needs of potential data users.</p>
<p>2. To develop and implement measures for publicizing information about government activities and civic participation in governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Clear • Potential Impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>The level of public consultation is low in Lithuania, and the public is often unaware of the possibilities to engage in decision-making processes. This commitment aims to increase the accessibility of information of government activities and civic engagement opportunities by standardizing the publication of information on government activities and training public officials in civic engagement during decision making. The Office of the Government has drafted a visual identity toolkit and scheduled trainings for public officials, namely for communication specialists from the government and from the House of President. The IRM researcher recommends joining this commitment with Commitment 6 on creating a public consultation mechanism.</p>
<p>3. To publish online information about revenues and spending of national and municipal institutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Clear • Potential Impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>Many Lithuanian citizens lack sufficient information on revenue and spending at the local level, as well as the responsibilities of municipal governments. This commitment seeks to establish a regularly updated online platform that would provide information on national and local revenues and expenses to the public. The Ministry of Finance contracted the European Social Fund Agency to fund the project to open revenues and spending on the municipal and national levels, contracted Ernst & Young Baltic to identify key information for the online platform, and held a public consultation to decide what data should be published in the portal. However, because there is no timeline for interim activities, the IRM researcher cannot track the schedule of implementation in more detail. The IRM researcher recommends narrowing the scope of the commitment and clearly identifying the types of data to be opened.</p>

<p>4. To create and broadcast social advertisements that target corruption in the healthcare system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Unclear • Potential Impact: Minor • Completion: Not Started 	<p>Lithuania's health care system is among the most corrupt public sectors institutions, and the Lithuanian government has set out to reduce corruption in the health care sector by more than one half in 2020 as part of its National Anti-Corruption Program. This commitment comes directly from the National Anti-Corruption Program and calls on the Ministry of Health to create and broadcast social advertisements through audio-visual measures that will provide citizens with anti-corruption information. Implementation of this commitment has not begun, and the Ministry of Health is still in the process of preparing a project proposal for funding from the European Social Fund Agency. As written, the commitment is not relevant to OGP values, and thus the IRM researcher does not recommend carrying it forward to the next action plan.</p>
<p>5. To create legal, organizational and technical tools to easily access detailed information about election and voting procedures, participation in the elections, donations to political campaign participants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Clear • Potential Impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>Although Lithuania's elections are described as transparent, information on political party and campaign financing on the Central Electoral Commission (CEC) is not easily accessible. This commitment is taken directly from the National Anti-Corruption Program and seeks to increase accessibility to information on elections and voting procedures through the creation of legal, organizational, and technical tools. The CEC used its previous experience with receiving information requests to determine what data was on demand without directly consulting the public. The CEC is currently preparing a project proposal to receive funding from EU Structural Funds to create a system that would gather personal data on participation in elections and donations to politicians. As the CEC coordinates activities with the National Anti-Corruption Program rather than the OGP action plan, the IRM researcher recommends not carrying the commitment forward to the next action plan.</p>
<p>6. To create public consultation mechanism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Clear • Potential Impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>The level of public participation in decision-making processes in Lithuania is low. This commitment seeks to create a public consultation methodology, including guidelines on its application and an awareness-raising video for the new methodology. It also calls for the methodology to be practically-tested and to regularly monitor and assess the effectiveness of the new methodology.</p> <p>The Office of the Government has contracted the company Cicitta to create the new methodology, test it in practice, and train public officials in its use. The Office of the Government assigned seven ministries to test a different consultation methodology, and will update the draft methodology once these are tested. The IRM researcher recommends following OGP principles when defining public consultation to allow all interested parties to participate. The IRM researcher also recommends combining this commitment with Commitment 2 to increase the accessibility of information on government activities and civic engagement opportunities.</p>
<p>7. To foster open public governance culture in public sector by introducing values of Open Government Partnership</p>	<p>This commitment addresses recommendations from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to foster the capacity of civil servants to engage in open government principles. Trainings for civil servants and public conferences and seminars with civil society groups have been organized for this purpose. A self-assessment report notes that</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Clear • Potential Impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>the Office of the Government has organized a roundtable discussion on the state of open government in Lithuania. The commitment's goal is to establish a process instead of tangible results, and therefore the level of implementation is difficult to measure. The IRM researcher recommends choosing a sample of institutions to test the effectiveness of the open government trainings and to choose more innovative tools for educating civil servants.</p>
<p>8. Creation of NGO database</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Clear • Potential Impact: Moderate • Completion: Limited 	<p>Data on the structure, contacts, activities, and financial performance of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Lithuania are required by law to be available to the public, but this data is not currently publicly available unless purchased. This commitment seeks to create a public NGO database, which would provide at least a portion of the information free of charge. Implementation of this commitment has been delayed due to confusion over the responsibility to create the NGO database. However, the professional development group Create Lithuania is in the process of gathering examples of NGO databases from other countries to draft a concept for Lithuania's database. The IRM researcher recommends amending the Law on NGOs to clarify the legal criteria for qualification as an NGO. The IRM researcher also recommends explicitly delegating responsibility for implementing this commitment to the Ministry for Social Security and Labor instead of the Ministry of Justice.</p>
<p>9. Creation of NGO fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP Value Relevance: Clear • Potential Impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>No data currently exists on how much Lithuania spends on financing NGOs. This commitment aims to establish a National Civil Society Fund (NGO Fund) that would finance Lithuanian NGOs' capacity to participate in public decision-making processes on an institutional level. The NGO Fund would finance different programs specifically for NGOs that want to develop their advocacy skills, ability to draft legal acts, and participation in policymaking. It would also focus on financing communication projects within NGO networks. The potential impact of this commitment is contingent on the budget of the Fund, as well as the flow of financing to the NGOs.</p> <p>During the first year of implementation, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour was in contact with a working group of NGOs to draft the concept for how the Fund might operate. Although NGOs claimed to be satisfied with the role of the Ministry, some added that all the work is being done by the NGOs. To become binding, the Fund concept must be confirmed by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour and then passed in Parliament. However, the commitment falls under the Program of the Government, and therefore its progress is not determined by the OGP action plan. The IRM researcher recommends carrying this commitment forward to the next action plan and reformulating the operational logistics of the Fund in closer consultation with NGOs and stakeholders.</p>

Recommendations

Many of the commitments saw only limited implementation during the first year of the action plan. One main recommendation is to more actively consult with a wider range of stakeholders (including public sector and civil society representatives) to develop commitments that are achievable within the OGP timeframe and that are more clearly in line with OGP values. Proposing more ambitious implementation activities that are independent of pre-existing government and third-party strategic documents would allow commitments to be more explicitly and directly focused on opening government. Identifying concrete milestones rather than processes would better facilitate verifiable commitment implementation.

Beginning in 2014, all OGP IRM reports include five key recommendations about the next OGP action planning cycle. Governments participating in OGP will be required to respond to these key recommendations in their annual self-assessments. These recommendations follow the SMART logic; they are Specific, Measurable, Answerable, Relevant, and Timebound. Given these findings, the IRM researcher presents the following key recommendations:

Table 3: Five Key Recommendations

Ensure the proposals for the next action plan are discussed among stakeholders from public sector and CSOs before confirming them as commitments
Ensure the commitments are in line with OGP values of access to information, civic participation, and public accountability
Show good leadership and inform the public about developments of the commitments, explain any possible delays, and provide supportive documents
Ensure the proposed commitments can be fully implemented in the two-year timeframe and that it alone may achieve the relevant goal
Identify the criteria which could indicate the achievement of the commitments and measure their implementation

Eligibility Requirements: To participate in OGP, governments must demonstrate commitment to open government by meeting minimum criteria on key dimensions of open government. Third-party indicators are used to determine country progress on each of the dimensions. For more information, see Section VII on eligibility requirements at the end of this report or visit bit.ly/1929F11.

Rugilė Trumpyt is a senior program manager at Transparency International Lithuania and a lecturer at ISM University of Management and Economics. In her work, she focuses on good governance in the public and private sectors, access to information and anti-corruption tools.

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



I. Introduction

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is an international multistakeholder initiative that aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP provides an international forum for dialogue and sharing among governments, civil society organizations, and the private sector, all of which contribute to a common pursuit of open government.

Lithuania began its formal participation in 2011, when Prime Minister Andrius Kubilius declared his country's intention to participate in the initiative.¹

In order to participate in OGP, governments must exhibit a demonstrated commitment to open government by meeting a set of (minimum) performance criteria. Objective, third-party indicators are used to determine the extent of country progress on each of the criteria: fiscal transparency, public official's asset disclosure, citizen engagement, and access to information. See Section VII: Eligibility Requirements for more details.

All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that elaborate concrete commitments with the aim of changing practice beyond the status quo over a two-year period. The commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area.

Lithuania developed its national action plan from March 2016 to May 2016. The official implementation period for the action plan was 31 May 2016 through 31 December 2018. This year one report covers the action plan development process and first year of implementation, from May 2016 to October 2017. Beginning in 2015, the IRM started publishing end-of-term reports on the final status of progress at the end of the action plan's two-year period. Any activities or progress occurring after the first year of implementation October 2017 will be assessed in the end-of-term report. The government published its self-assessment in September 2017. At the time of writing, September 2017, the implementation of the action plan is not on schedule.

In order to meet OGP requirements, the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) of OGP has partnered with Rugile Trumpyte, who carried out this evaluation of the development and implementation of Lithuania's third action plan. To gather the voices of multiple stakeholders, the IRM researcher(s) held meetings and interviews in Vilnius and Kaunas. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments. Methods and sources are dealt with in Section VI of this report (Methodology and Sources).

¹ For Lithuania's letter of intent to join OGP, see: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-letter-of-intent-join-ogp>.

II. Context

Lithuania's third action plan focused on themes in line with the country's Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) membership recommendations, such as open data, preventing corruption, and increasing civic participation. However, the commitments were largely taken from pre-existing strategic documents, and fell short of what stakeholders thought is needed to adequately address these issues.

2.1 Background

Lithuania's third action plan largely continues the themes of the previous two, namely increasing access to open data, increasing civic participation, and reducing corruption. While the previous action plan saw high levels of implementation, most commitments had only a minor potential impact and did not lead to any change in open government.¹

Lithuania is currently in the process of accession to OECD, and has initiated reforms to solidify legislation to regulate anti-corruption and lobbying activities, to better govern state-owned enterprises in line with OECD recommendations.² In March 2015, Lithuania launched a new National Anti-Corruption Program for 2015–25, which aims to reduce the percentage of the population that agrees a bribe helps solve problems to no more than 33 percent, and reduce the share of the population that admits to giving a bribe during the past five years to no more than 10 percent.³ Lithuania joined the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention in July 2017,⁴ and adopted a new Law on Lobbying in September 2017 to better regulate lobbying activities.⁵ While the law expands the scope of decision makers whom lobbyists may target, it does not specify which activities fall under the term “lobbying.” Progress has been made in reducing the level of bribery among traffic police officers from 35 percent in 2014 to 12 percent in 2016.⁶ In 2017, the Ministry of Health set an ambitious goal to decrease the level of bribery in health care by more than one half, from 24 percent in 2016 to 10 percent in 2020.⁷

However, recent research shows that political corruption remains an obstacle to transparent and effective decision making in Lithuania, with nepotism and conflicts of interests among the top challenges.⁸ Notably, there are still no official whistleblower protection laws in Lithuania and no official definition of whistleblowers in the legal system. As a result, according to Transparency International, only 7 percent of those who encountered corruption in 2016 reported it to the authorities.⁹ The issue of whistleblower protection received significant media coverage after the accountant Rasa Kazenienė exposed potential corruption in the Kaunas Remand Prison in early 2017.¹⁰ As the President of Lithuania, Dalia Grybauskaitė noted in her annual speech to the Lithuanian Parliament in 2017 that “fighting corruption requires a great deal of effort, but the idea of giving protection to those who report it has been kept at a standstill in Parliament for the third term running.”¹¹

Citizens of Lithuania are not fully aware of the possibilities to engage in decision-making process and public consultations are rare in Lithuania. According to a 2014 Transparency International Lithuania survey, only 5 percent of respondents said that they have participated in a consultation.¹²

Transparency in open data remains an open government issue in Lithuania. The Public Procurement Office and Vilnius municipality have championed voluntarily

opening data and releasing it in open data formats. Data on public procurements have been made available on the website Freedata,¹³ while Vilnius municipality has created a separate section for data on its website.¹⁴ However, according to the Global Open Data Index, Lithuania discloses only a small share its data.¹⁵ The state enterprise National Registry has key information about public sector, business, and NGO performance, but it is not available to the public unless purchased.

2.2 Scope of Action Plan in Relation to National Context

Lithuania's third OGP action plan focused on three areas: the openness of public sector institutions, anticorruption, and civic participation. Lithuania is on a positive anticorruption track, as it seeks to reduce corruption in line with OECD membership recommendations. To do this, it has set concrete outcomes, like reducing bribery in health care,¹⁶ in the current Government Program.¹⁷ The action plan includes three commitments that address the issue of corruption: (1) publishing budgetary information online for national and municipal institutions, (2) creating and broadcasting advertisements on corruption in health care, and (3) facilitating access to information on voting procedures, participating in elections, and donations to political campaigns. While these commitments are positive steps, they fall short of the structural reforms needed to overcome the public perceptions of corruption in Lithuania. For example, given the prevalence of bribery in the health care industry, reducing the public perception of the need to give bribes in health care requires a more systemic and holistic approach than broadcasting educational advertisements on this issue. Similarly, providing the public with information on the revenue and expenses of national and municipal institutions might not be enough to ensure that state funds are not being misused.

Notably, whistleblower protection is not addressed in the action plan. However, at the time of writing this report, there is a draft law on whistleblowing being discussed in the Parliament. Future action plans would have opportunities to support efforts to advance whistleblower regulations and implementation.

Lithuania has chosen to open data on NGOs (contact information, core activities, staff, etc.) and included this goal as one of its commitments in the third action plan. What remains unclear is whether this effort is part of a broader long-term policy to open data in the National Register or a one-off initiative by civil society organizations (CSOs). So far, there are no supporting documents that could prove the former. Also, the National Audit Office has already stated that Lithuania lacks a shared vision about the disclosure of data and should focus on more consistent policies in this field.¹⁸

¹ Independent Reporting Mechanism, Lithuania End-of-Term Report 2014 – 2016, Open Government Partnership, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Lithuania_EoT_2014-2016_ENG_0.pdf.

² Roadmap for the Accession of Lithuania to the OECD Convention, 2015, <https://goo.gl/GKdFmu>.

³ "Lithuania - Nations in Transit," Freedom House, 2016, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2016/lithuania>.

⁴ "Lithuania to join the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention," OECD, 19 May 2017,

<http://www.oecd.org/corruption/lithuania-to-join-the-oecd-anti-bribery-convention.htm>.

⁵ Law on Lobbying, No. VIII-1749, <https://goo.gl/Gqs1Vu>.

⁶ Lithuanian Map of Corruption, Special Investigative Service, 2016, <https://goo.gl/B4dqVn>.

⁷ The Program of the Government, No. 167, 2017, <https://goo.gl/bCr787>.

⁸ Special Eurobarometer 397 on Corruption, 2014, <https://goo.gl/bJ99ZF>.

⁹ Global Corruption Barometer, Transparency International, 2016, <https://goo.gl/9UwiEJ>.

¹⁰ Media articles on Rasa Kazeniene and Kaunas Remand prison, portal 15min.lt, <https://www.15min.lt/tema/rasa-kazeniene-63796>.

¹¹ Annual speech of the President of Lithuania, last updated 8 June 2017, <https://goo.gl/zvkVuH>.

¹² "Citizens' Survey on the Openness of municipalities", Transparency International Lithuania, 2014, <http://www.transparency.lt/tils-tyrimai-ir-analizes/>.

¹³ “Open data on public procurements,” Public Procurement Office, <http://www.freedata.lt/vpt/>.

¹⁴ “Open data of Vilnius Municipality,” Vilnius Municipality, http://www.vilnius.lt/lit/Atviri_duomenys_/4206.

¹⁵ “Global Open Data Index: Survey”, Lithuania profile, <http://global.census.okfn.org/place/lt>.

¹⁶ The Action plan of the program of Lithuanian Government, No. 167, 2017, <https://goo.gl/A8ACwM>.

¹⁷ The Action plan of the program of Lithuanian Government, No. 167, 2017, <https://goo.gl/A8ACwM>.

¹⁸ Is the disclose of public data ensured, National Audit Office, report No. VA-P-900-1-25, 2016, <https://goo.gl/RwUNdk>.

III. Leadership and Multistakeholder Process

Development of Lithuania’s third action plan involved civil society and government stakeholders, though the number of civil society stakeholders was limited to three. The Office of the Government did not provide advance notice or carry out awareness-raising activities, and it is unclear if consultations impacted the final action plan. The Office of the Government formed an OGP working group to oversee action plan development and implementation, but it only met once during the first year of implementation.

3.1 Leadership

This subsection describes the OGP leadership and institutional context for OGP in Lithuania. Table 3.1 summarizes this structure while the narrative section (below) provides additional detail.

Table 3.1: OGP Leadership

1. Structure	Yes	No
Is there a clearly designated Point of Contact for OGP (individual)?	✓	
	Shared	Single
Is there a single lead agency on OGP efforts?	✓	
	Yes	No
Is the head of government leading the OGP initiative?		✗
2. Legal Mandate	Yes	No
Is the government’s commitment to OGP established through an official, publicly released mandate?	✓	
Is the government’s commitment to OGP established through a legally binding mandate?		✗
3. Continuity and Instability	Yes	No
Was there a change in the organization(s) leading or involved with the OGP initiatives during the action plan implementation cycle?	✓	
Was there a change in the executive leader during the duration of the OGP action plan cycle?	✓	

Lithuania is a semi-presidential republic with a separation of power between the President and the Parliament.¹ The Office of the Government is the lead coordinating institution responsible for Lithuania’s OGP commitments. The Office assists the Prime Minister in implementing policies and coordinates activities of the ministries and other subordinate institutions in Lithuania, though it does not have the power to compel public sector institutions to implement OGP commitments. The OGP action plan is developed under the decree of the Chancellor and comes into effect after it is confirmed by the Prime Minister.

In March 2016, the Office of the Government formed a new OGP working group which was renewed in December 2016. The working group is an advisory body that participates in developing and monitoring the implementation of the action plan. While the previous working group (which oversaw Lithuania’s second action plan) consisted of only public sector representatives, the current group consists of representatives from the public sector, civil society, and academia.

There is no special funding allocated for OGP activities. However, there are three employees working on OGP matters in the Office of the Government, in addition to their other responsibilities.

3.2 Intragovernmental Participation

This subsection describes which government institutions were involved at various stages in OGP. The next section will describe which nongovernmental organizations were involved in OGP.

Table 3.2: Participation in OGP by Government Institutions

How did institutions participate?	Ministries, Departments, and Agencies	Legislative	Judiciary (including quasi-judicial agencies)	Other (including constitutional independent or autonomous bodies)	Subnational Governments
Consult: These institutions observed or were invited to observe the action plan but may not be responsible for commitments in the action plan.	7 ²	0	0	0	0
Propose: These institutions proposed commitments	1	0	0	0	0

for inclusion in the action plan.					
Implement: These institutions are responsible for implementing commitments in the action plan whether or not they proposed the commitments.	11	0	0	0	0

In Lithuania, participation in OGP was limited to a handful of executive agencies. Seven of them, namely the Association of Local Authorities in Lithuania, the Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Transport and Communications, the Ministry of Education and Science, and the Ministry of Social Security and Labour had representatives in the OGP working group and could provide their proposals before the action plan was confirmed. These public-sector representatives also have the power to implement individual commitments in the action plan. Table 3.2 above details which institutions were involved.

Although government agencies were formally included during the drafting of commitments, their participation did not ensure they knew their responsibilities. For example, while the Ministry of Justice has a representative in the OGP working group, there was miscommunication between the Office of the Government and the Ministry. On 2 August 2017, the vice-minister of the Ministry of Justice Justas Pankauskas sent an official letter to the Office of Government stating that its assigned commitment, to create an NGO database, went beyond the legal authority of the Ministry of Justice.³

Other examples show that a number of institutions responsible for implementing commitments in the action plan did not realize they were responsible until mid-evaluation. This situation occurred in cases when the Office of the Government transferred commitments from other strategic documents like the Program of the Government or National Anti-Corruption Program into the action plan and named the same institutions as responsible of their implementation. In such cases, the institutions carried out implementation based on the commitment's inclusion in these strategic documents and not as part of the OGP action plan.

3.3 Civil Society Engagement

While the Office of the Government did engage a few stakeholders before confirming the final action plan, the consultation process was only held online, and the process did not live up to the standards set in OGP guidelines.

Table 3.3: National OGP Process

Key Steps Followed: 3 of 7

Before	1. Timeline Process & Availability			2. Advance Notice		
	Timeline and process available online prior to consultation	Yes	No	Advance notice of consultation	Yes	No
			✗			✗
	3. Awareness Raising			4. Multiple Channels		
	Government carried out awareness-raising activities	Yes	No	4a. Online consultations:	Yes	No
			✗		✓	
				4b. In-person consultations:	Yes	No
✓						
5. Documentation & Feedback						
Summary of comments provided				Yes	No	
				✓		
During	6. Regular Multi-stakeholder Forum					
	6a. Did a forum exist?	Yes	No	6b. Did it meet regularly?	Yes	No
		✗			✗	
After	7. Government Self-Assessment Report					
	7a. Annual self-assessment report published?	Yes	No	7b. Report available in English and administrative language?	Yes	No
		✓			✓	
	7c. Two-week public comment period on report?	Yes	No	7d. Report responds to key IRM recommendations?	Yes	No
✓					✗	

Information on the participants and their proposals was made available online on the Office of the Government website,⁴ but there is no evidence suggesting that the Office of the Government published a timeline or any advance notice for the consultation process. Apart from the information on its website, the Office of the Government sent invitations to a number of CSOs and published an open call to take part in the consultation on its Facebook page. CSOs and academia that are members of the working group, namely Civil Society Institute (CSI), Transparency International Lithuania (TIL), the Non-Governmental Organization Information and Support Centre (NISC), and Mykolas Romeris University, received the same invitation.

In April 2016, the Office of the Government launched an online consultation to gather feedback for Lithuania's OGP priorities. As stated online, the purpose of the consultation was to understand A) how to make Lithuania's citizens more interested in the work of the government, and B) to determine priorities for the OGP action plan. The public was asked to comment on draft priorities and make their own suggestions for the action plan. Those eleven priorities were listed for the participants online, and included:

1. Building Lithuania's open data portal and integrating it into the European single digital market;

2. Publishing information about the incomes and expenses of national and municipal institutions online;
3. Broadcasting social advertisements that target corruption in the healthcare system;
4. Creating legal, organizational, and technical tools to easily access detailed information about elections, voting procedures, and donations to political campaigns;
5. Gathering information about the consultation process with Lithuanian society;
6. Publishing the proposals received and the feedback to them;
7. Publishing successful examples of cooperation with CSOs;
8. Publishing information about public consultations in a friendly manner;
9. Letting NGOs provide public services that are now in the hands of public sector institutions;
10. Creating an NGO database;
11. Establishing an NGO Fund.

The online call for proposals lasted for one month, and afterwards, a number of the above-mentioned priorities were incorporated into Lithuania's action plan as commitments. As stated on the website, the Office of the Government received comments and proposals from four different stakeholders, all of them available online in full scope. Three citizens and the association Knowledge Economy Forum participated. Two of them agreed on the priorities provided online and added some proposals, and the other two focused on separate topics and questioned the proposed activities. While the Office of the Government publicly stated on its website that the participants agreed on the priorities, it is not clear whether the consultation had any impact on the development of the action plan.

Countries participating in OGP follow a set of requirements for consultation during development, implementation, and review of their OGP action plan. Table 3.3 summarizes the performance of Lithuania during the 2016-2018 action plan.

Table 3.4: Level of Public Influence

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) "Spectrum of Participation" to apply to OGP.⁵ This spectrum shows the potential level of public influence on the contents of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for "collaborative."

Level of public input		During development of action plan	During implementation of action plan
Empower	The government handed decision-making power to members of the public.		
Collaborate	There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda.		
Involve	The public could give feedback on how commitments were considered.		
Consult	The public could give inputs.	✓	✓
Inform	The government provided the public with information on the action plan.		
No Consultation	No consultation		

3.4 Consultation During Implementation

As part of their participation in OGP, governments commit to identify a forum to enable regular multi-stakeholder consultation on OGP implementation. This can be an existing entity or a new one. This section summarizes that information.

In March 2016, the Office of the Government formed a working group that would participate in drafting Lithuania’s action plan and later oversee its implementation. This group was renewed in December 2016 and included representatives from the public-sector, Vilnius-based CSOs, and academia. The group consisted of 15 people, seven of whom were women. All of them were invited by an official invitation from the Office of the Government with no open call launched for other possibly interested parties.

Although the working group is tasked with monitoring the development and implementation of the OGP action plan, it has met only once in June 2017, in Vilnius, to discuss the ongoing activities of the national action plan. There are no publicly available minutes of this meeting posted online. Before the June 2017 meeting, participation was based only on email correspondence. All members of the working group received an email from the Office of the Government with a request to fill out the form on the national action plan and provide suggestions for possible goals and commitments for the action plan. The Office of the Government sent another email to the working group to “evaluate the progress of the action plan and submit its comments by 24 September 2017.”⁶

Overall, the Office of the Government contacted the working group three times: once for their input during action plan development, once for discussing the ongoing implementation activities, and once for their feedback on the self-assessment report. Interviewed members of this working group generally did not find their participation in the process to be useful and questioned the purpose of this mechanism.

3.5 Self-Assessment

The OGP Articles of Governance require that participating countries publish a self-assessment report three months after the end of the first year of implementation. The self-assessment report must be made available for public comments for a two-week period. This section assesses compliance with these requirements and the quality of the report.

The Office of the Government published a self-assessment report on its website together with an online consultation, which aimed to get feedback from the public on the action plan.⁷ The consultation was open for two weeks from 11 September to 24 September 2017.

The self-assessment report was published in Lithuanian and English, presented the outputs for each commitment, and planned the next steps.⁸ However, it did not include a review of consultation efforts during action plan development and implementation, nor did it provide information on challenges and delays in implementation. Also, when reviewing concrete results, the IRM researcher found several shortcomings when the indicated outcomes were not implemented in practice or were taken from previous activities of responsible institutions. The IRM researcher informed the Office of the Government about the misleading information, who promised that the report would be corrected and updated.⁹

The Office of the Government received 12 proposals during the consultation period. However, at the time of writing this report (September 2017), none of these proposals are available online. As Ieva Cesnulaityte from the Office of the Government noted, the Office is currently evaluating the proposals, and will publish them together with their feedback in October 2017.¹⁰

Although not publicly available, the IRM researcher received the summary of submitted proposals and the mailing list that the Office of the Government used to advertise the consultation. The latter consisted of representatives of responsible institutions, the OGP working group, members of academia, and some NGOs. All of them were invited to participate in the consultation, and an invitation was also posted on Facebook.

3.6 Response to Previous IRM Recommendations

Table 3.5: Previous IRM Report Key Recommendations

	Recommendation	Addressed?	Integrated into Action Plan?
1	Ensure the development of the next action plan is done in accordance with the recommendations of OGP and includes a wide range of stakeholders in the process, both during the development and the implementation of the OGP action plan.	✓	✗
2	Review and amend the lobbying regulations in Lithuania with the aim to expand the definition of lobbying, to achieve effective use of the lobby register, and to enhance transparency of lobbying by releasing all relevant data in open formats.	✗	✗
3	Create legal and technical guidelines for enhancing transparency in the beneficial ownership of companies registered or operating in Lithuania.	✗	✗
4	Ensure access to all official interest and asset disclosure declarations through a centralized online channel and in	✗	✗

	accordance with open data standards and encourage relevant data release in open formats.		
5	Ensure timely access to political party financial data through a centralized online channel in accordance with open data standards.	✓	✓

Of the five recommendations, the Office of the Government addressed two: to include a wider range of stakeholders during the development and implementation of the action plan, and open more data on political party finances. The latter was transferred into the action plan as Commitment 5 to “provide greater access to information on elections and voting procedures through the creation of legal, organizational, and technical tools”.

The first recommendation was only partly addressed. The current working group includes representatives from various CSOs and academia, while the former working group consisted only of government representatives. Although the Office of the Government technically engaged a broader range of the public during development and implementation of the action plan, it did not develop the action plan in accordance with OGP standards, and the number of CSO participants in the processes remained low.

Also, the Office of the Government addressed the recommendation from the previous IRM report to “consider educating their employees so that there is a shared understanding of the values and goals of OGP.” This was not among the top five recommendations, but the Office of the Government included a new commitment (Commitment 7) to “foster open public governance culture in public sector by introducing values of Open Government Partnership” in the current action plan.

According to the representatives of the Office of the Government, the action plan was drafted following the proposals of the working group, which were prioritized over the recommendations from the previous IRM report. Also, the Office of the Government did not understand the nature of the IRM’s key recommendations, as there were no reasons provided in the previous IRM report as to why the next action plan should include certain commitments, like the amendment of lobbying regulations or beneficial ownership.¹¹

¹ The ruling of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania of 10 January 1998, On The Programme Of The Government Of The Republic Of Lithuania, <https://goo.gl/sL34RD>.

² Association of Local Authorities in Lithuania, Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Transport and Communications, Ministry of Education and Science, Ministry of Social Security and Labour, all were members of the OGP working group.

³ Official letter to the Office of the Government, No. 33-966, 2 August 2017, a copy held by IRM researcher.

⁴ Online consultation about the action plan, “Offshore Government Partnership Proposals,” E-Citizen, 4 April 2016, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/konsultacijos/pasiulymai-atviros-vyriausybes-partnerystes-veikloms>.

⁵ IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum, International Association for Public Participation, 2014, http://c.yimcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations_course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum_FINAL.pdf.

⁶ An email to the members of the working group was sent on 13 September 2017. The IRM researcher has a copy of this email.

⁷ Online public consultation about the implementation of the action plan, the official website of the Government, <https://goo.gl/iiDHEp>.

⁸ Self-assessment report of Lithuania’s action plan, 11 September 2017, <https://goo.gl/NMfGZA>.

⁹ Ieva Cesnulaityte, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 27 September 2017.

-
- ¹⁰ Ieva Cesnulaityte, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 27 September 2017.
- ¹¹ Gitana Jurjoniene, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 3 August 2017.

IV. Commitments

All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that include concrete commitments over a two-year period. Governments begin their OGP action plans by sharing existing efforts related to open government, including specific strategies and ongoing programs.

Commitments should be appropriate to each country's unique circumstances and challenges. OGP commitments should also be relevant to OGP values laid out in the OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration signed by all OGP-participating countries.¹

What Makes a Good Commitment?

Recognizing that achieving open government commitments often involves a multiyear process, governments should attach time frames and benchmarks to their commitments that indicate what is to be accomplished each year, whenever possible. This report details each of the commitments the country included in its action plan and analyzes the first year of their implementation.

The indicators used by the IRM to evaluate commitments are as follows:

- **Specificity:** This variable assesses the level of specificity and measurability of each commitment. The options are:
 - High: Commitment language provides clear, verifiable activities and measurable deliverables for achievement of the commitment's objective.
 - Medium: Commitment language describes activity that is objectively verifiable and includes deliverables, but these deliverables are not clearly measurable or relevant to the achievement of the commitment's objective.
 - Low: Commitment language describes activity that can be construed as verifiable but requires some interpretation on the part of the reader to identify what the activity sets out to do and determine what the deliverables would be.
 - None: Commitment language contains no measurable activity, deliverables, or milestones.
- **Relevance:** This variable evaluates the commitment's relevance to OGP values. Based on a close reading of the commitment text as stated in the action plan, the guiding questions to determine the relevance are:
 - Access to Information: Will the government disclose more information or improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public?
 - Civic Participation: Will the government create or improve opportunities or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?
 - Public Accountability: Will the government create or improve opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions?
 - Technology & Innovation for Transparency and Accountability: Will technological innovation be used in conjunction with one of the other three OGP values to advance either transparency or accountability?²
- **Potential impact:** This variable assesses the *potential impact* of the commitment, if completed as written. The IRM researcher uses the text from the action plan to:
 - Identify the social, economic, political, or environmental problem;
 - Establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan; and
 - Assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the problem.

Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. In order to receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

- Starred commitments will have “medium” or “high” specificity. A commitment must lay out clearly defined activities and steps to make a judgement about its potential impact.
- 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.
- The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented.³
- The government must make significant progress on this commitment during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of "substantial" or "complete" implementation.

Based on these criteria, Lithuania’s action plan contained no starred commitments.

Finally, the tables 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 and all OGP-participating countries, see the OGP Explorer.⁴

General Overview of the Commitments

Lithuania’s third action plan is divided into three general themes: 1) openness to the public of the activities of government institutions, 2) preventing corruption and promoting transparency, and 3) increased civic participation and engagement in public governance.

¹ Open Government Partnership: Articles of Governance, June 2012 (Updated March 2014 and April 2015), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/attachments/OGP_Articles-Gov_Apr-21-2015.pdf.

² IRM Procedures Manual. Available at: http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/IRM-Procedures-Manual-v3_July-2016.docx.

³ The International Experts Panel changed this criterion in 2015. For more information visit: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/node/5919>.

⁴ OGP Explorer: bit.ly/1KE2Wil.

Theme I: Openness to the public of the activities of government institutions

1. To build Lithuania's open data portal, and integrate into the European single digital market

Commitment Text:

The EU policy trends, related strategic documents, as well as the latest developments in the area of open data in Lithuania, have necessitated the development of IT infrastructure, the open data portal for opening Lithuanian public data to business and people, which would enable a free and convenient access to data managed by Lithuanian and EU public institutions, for the purpose of business development as well as non-governmental initiatives. The open data portal would centrally store and distribute the metadata of open data, provide for central handling of open data in terms of their preparation, procession, compilation, retrieval and convenient delivery to users, which would otherwise require more resources from individual institutions, and the entire public sector to that matter; it would also make available all open data-based applications. Centrally handled anonymization of the information, removal of commercial information or other legally protected information, conversion to open formats would enable a more flexible and relatively cheaper implementation of technological solutions improving access to open data. The national open data portal will be integrated with the EU Open Data Portal providing access to the open data spaces.

Milestones:

1.1. Creation of an open data portal combining requisite technological means of metadata management, data anonymization and elimination, other statutory access restrictions, data conversion to open formats, finding semantic relationships, data retrieval and presentation management.

1.2. Creation/application of the existing interface required for an automated data delivery.

1.3. Development of metadata management guide, training of professionals in state institutions.

1.4. Integration of the open data portal with the EU Open Data Portal.

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

Supporting institutions: Ministries and their subordinate bodies

Start date: 31 May 2016

End date: 31 December 2018

Commitment Overview	Specificity	OGP Value Relevance	Potential Impact	On Time?	Completion
---------------------	-------------	---------------------	------------------	----------	------------

	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Yes	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
1. Overall			✓		✓			✓				✓	Yes		✓		

Context and Objectives

The commitment aims to create a centrally managed open data platform for citizens and businesses to access public sector data and reuse it for both non-profit and for-profit initiatives. The commitment also calls for training state professionals to manage data, and for the open data portal to be integrated into the European Union (EU) single digital portal. Lithuania committed to open its data in 2013 when it set the strategic direction to create an information society.¹ However, there have been no substantial changes since. According to the National Audit Office, 95 percent of public sector institutions have not inventoried their data, and no one knows the exact scope of data held by public sector institutions.²

The commitment outlines specific steps towards building Lithuania’s open data portal, such as training state officials in data management and integrating the portal with the EU Open Data Portal. However, it does not disclose the scope of institutions it would target, instead referring to the general term of “public sector,” nor does it identify the scope of the data to be opened. According to Julius Belickas from the Information Society Development Committee, this information will be available once public procurements are finished and selected service providers issue their calculations and analyses.³ Therefore, the commitment’s specificity is medium. The National Audit Office calculates that opening public sector data would bring an added value worth 2 percent of Lithuania’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (approx. 800 million EUR) to the country’s economy.⁴ If fully created, the open data portal could have a potentially transformative impact on the way public sector data is stored and accessed in Lithuania. Currently, open data is not prioritized in Lithuania, and there is no central database that offers open data of public sector institutions free of charge. However, according to Povilas Poderskis, the programmer and founder of the online platform Freedata.lt, the commitment might not have enough government support to open government.⁵

Completion

At the time of writing this report, the Information Society Development Committee, under the Ministry of Transport and Communications, was in the process of implementing all four milestones. Those milestones were incorporated into public procurements that aim to have a selected service provider complete them.⁶ The procurement to develop public sector capacity and draft methodological guidelines for the portal has already been launched, and currently the Information Society Development Committee is evaluating the proposals. The other procurement is for the creation of the portal, which is still in its draft stage.⁷ It will be finalized once the funding to implement the commitment is allocated.⁸ Procurement documents show that the duration of work is planned to be 29 months, with the possibility to prolong the contract.⁹

Julius Belickas from the Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications said that before launching the portal on a national level, it will be tested on several institutions, namely the State Labour Inspectorate, the National Paying Agency under the Ministry of Agriculture, the Centre of Information Technologies in Education, the Lithuanian Labour Exchange, and the Centre for Agriculture.¹⁰

According to the action plan, all milestones must be fulfilled before 31 December 2018. As there is no timeline for interim activities, the IRM researcher cannot track the schedule in more detail. However, procurement documents suggest the commitment might not be implemented until the deadline (as the work is planned to take place for 29 months with the possibility to prolong the contract).

Next Steps

The commitment is important to change the nature of accessing public sector data, but it should be more detailed and specific in the action plan. The IRM researcher recommends breaking down the milestones into lower scale activities through public procurement specifications. This would help measure the success of each milestone and the commitment as a whole. The IRM researcher also recommends consulting possible stakeholders before prioritizing data, which would better address the needs of potential users and ensure a more effective work planning.

¹ The report of National Audit Office about open data in Lithuania, No. VA-P-900-1-25, 29 November 2016, https://www.vkontrole.lt/pranesimas_spaudai.aspx?id=22997.

² The report of National Audit Office about open data in Lithuania, No. VA-P-900-1-25, 29 November 2016, https://www.vkontrole.lt/pranesimas_spaudai.aspx?id=22997.

³ Julius Belickas, Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications, interview by IRM researcher, 15 September 2017.

⁴ The report of National Audit Office about open data in Lithuania, No. VA-P-900-1-25, 29 November 2016, https://www.vkontrole.lt/pranesimas_spaudai.aspx?id=22997.

⁵ Povilas Poderskis, interview by IRM researcher, 27 September 2017.

⁶ Central Public procurement portal, open call for technical solutions, <https://goo.gl/6ZGtff>, <https://goo.gl/57Z3wx>.

⁷ A copy of draft documentation was received by IRM researcher by email, 15 September 2017.

⁸ Project proposal to get funding for open data portal, No. 02.2.1-CPVA-V-523-01, current stage – “under evaluation,” <https://goo.gl/ZjuSvy>.

⁹ Central Public procurement portal, procurement specifications, <https://goo.gl/6ZGtff>.

¹⁰ An email to IRM researcher, 18 September 2017.

2. To develop and implement measures for publicizing information about government activities and civic participation in governance

Commitment Text:

Public information about the activities of the Government should be easily accessible and presented in a clear and understandable form in most appropriate for them communication channels. At the same time, the public has to have access information on public governance processes and participation possibilities. It is necessary not only to systematically publicize this information, but also to ensure methodological assistance to institutions and strengthen their capacities needed for greater openness of public governance processes.

Milestones:

2.1. Development of the guidelines (recommendations) for the publicity of governmental activities with a view to ensure appropriate for the people publicizing of governmental activities, focusing on a common standard, interactivity, feedback and efficiency, through the application of the latest uniform communication standards, methods and tools.

2.2. Creation of an interactive electronic newsletter on governmental activities.

2.3. Development of a PowerPoint template for the presentation of governmental activities.

2.4. Creation of templates for publicizing government activities "Open Government" publicity campaign in "Facebook" social network.

Responsible institution: Office of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania

Supporting institution(s): N/A

Start date: 31 December 2016

End date: 31 December 2017

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
2. Overall		✓			✓					✓			Yes		✓		

Context and Objectives

This commitment seeks to increase the accessibility of information on government activities and civic engagement opportunities in governance. Specifically, it calls for standardizing the publication of information on government activities and providing capacity-building trainings for public officials who will later work to increase civic engagement in decision-making processes. According to Edita Baniene, the advisor

at the Communications Department in the Office of the Government, government ministries lack communication skills to promote public consultations, and there is currently no common template used by ministries for consultations.¹ Citizens of Lithuania are either not aware of the possibilities to engage in decision-making, or the available information is too complicated for most citizens to understand.² Public consultation is rare in Lithuania. According to a 2014 Transparency International Lithuania survey, only 5 percent of respondents said that they have participated in a consultation.³

Although Edita Baniene suggested a clearer view on the content of the commitment in an interview with the IRM researcher, the specificity is low because the commitment does not specify which government activities will be publicized. The commitment also does not have a coherent problem identified. In some parts, it is written that there is a lack of “positive information” about the government's activities, while elsewhere it states that there is a lack of “interesting information” or insufficient information on the activities in general. This commitment focuses on improving public awareness for opportunities to participate in consultations, but does little to improve the effectiveness of the consultations themselves. The current low level of public consultations in Lithuania suggests that increasing public participation requires more extensive measures than merely improved communication on consultation opportunities. Thus, the potential impact is marked as minor. It is worth noting that this commitment targets the same problem as Commitment 6 “To Create Public Consultation Mechanism.” According to the Office of the Government, this commitment is designed to better communicate opportunities for consultation to the public, while Commitment 6 is designed to create and the methodology for public consultations and organize them. Had these commitments been combined, the potential impact and specificity would have been greater, but taken individually, this commitment is unlikely to increase public participation.

Completion

The deadline for the commitment is the end of 2017, and the Office of the Government has begun implementation. At the time of writing this report, the Office of the Government has a final draft of its visual identity toolkit and has scheduled trainings for public officials, namely for communication specialists from the government and from the House of President.

Next Steps

Because the Office of the Government is working to both create a public consultation mechanism and develop its communication guidelines, the IRM researcher recommends joining this commitment with Commitment 6 on creating the public consultation mechanism. This would allow different teams at the Office of the Government to have their own roles and responsibilities to achieve the same goal.

¹ Edita Baniene, interview by IRM researcher, 22 September 2017

² “Citizens’ Survey on the Openness of municipalities”, Transparency International Lithuania, 2014, <http://www.transparency.lt/tils-tyrimai-ir-analizes/>.

³ “Citizens’ Survey on the Openness of municipalities”, Transparency International Lithuania, 2014, <http://www.transparency.lt/tils-tyrimai-ir-analizes/>.

Theme II: Preventing corruption and promoting transparency

3. To publish online information about revenues and spending of national and municipal institutions

Commitment Text:

The objective is to create legal basis, which will provide conditions for the provision of information and data electronically to citizens about the revenue and expenses of the State and municipal institutions and agencies, and fund recipients. Also, an information system to make public the revenue and expenses of the State and municipal institutions and agencies, and fund recipients, will be created and launched.

Milestones:

3.1. Legal acts regulating electronic provision of data and information on the revenue and expenses of the state and municipal institutions and agencies, and fund recipients, to the public have been drafted.

3.2. An information system to make public the revenue and expenses of the State and municipal institutions and agencies, and fund recipients, has been created and launched.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Finance

Supporting institutions: Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications, Special Investigation Service, Association of Local Authorities in Lithuania

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 31 December 2018

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
3. Overall		✓			✓			✓		✓			Yes		✓		

Context and Objectives

Many Lithuanian citizens have expressed disappointment in the lack of publicly available information on revenues and spending at the local level. According to survey conducted by Transparency International Lithuania, 51 percent of respondents say that there is not enough information on the responsibilities of municipal governments, and 28 percent would like to have more detailed and easier-to-understand information about the revenues and expenses of their municipalities.¹ This commitment seeks to address the above-mentioned lack of information on

municipalities by creating a regularly updated e-platform for the revenues and expenses of state and municipal institutions to prevent corruption.

Rasa Kavolyte, the deputy director at the Ministry of Finance, said the demand to have a centralized portal is obvious, as people need to easily understand how the central and local budgets are spent.² Paulius Murauskas from Transparency International Lithuania agreed with this position, but added that the Ministry of Finance needs to be more specific on what information will be available.³ The commitment states that the revenues and expenses for municipalities will be published on a portal, but it does not mention how many municipalities and institutions will publish their information, nor does it specify the scope of the published information on revenues and expenses, only that the information will be “regular.” It also does not provide a timeline for how frequently the information on the portal will be updated. Therefore, the specificity is low. The commitment addresses the general problem of corruption without specifying which corruption-related issues it seeks to reduce, or how citizens can report instances of corruption based on the information published in the portal. The potential impact of the commitment depends on the scope of opened data, which is not clear from the action plan, so the IRM researcher has marked it as minor. However, further developments of the commitments might lead to substantial increases in open government.

Completion

On 15 June 2017, the Ministry of Finance signed a contract with the European Social Fund Agency in Lithuania, which confirmed funding worth 580,000 EUR. The project was selected to develop the guidelines and the methodology needed to make accessible the revenues and spending on the national and municipal levels.⁴ To do this, the Ministry of Finance called for proposals and contracted Ernst & Young Baltic to provide these services, such as identifying the types of financial data to be available and the technical specifications for the online platform, using the most cost-effective approach.⁵

To gather public comments on what data should be published in the portal, the Ministry of Finance organized a meeting with CSOs but invited only three organizations working in the field of open data. Rasa Kavolyte, the deputy director at the Ministry of Finance, admitted that the communication regarding this consultation was inadequate and did not engage all interested stakeholders.⁶

According to the action plan, the commitment must be fully implemented by 31 December 2018. As there is no timeline for interim activities, the IRM researcher cannot track the schedule of implementation in more detail.

Next Steps

Currently, there is no final vision for the type and scope of the information the Ministry of Finance aims to disclose. For example, the portal could include a list of all recipients of public funds at the national and municipal levels, or it might be limited to a general overview of public spending. For this reason, the IRM researcher recommends narrowing the scope of the commitment and clearly identifying the types of data that need to be opened. This would make the commitment easier to manage and better show the relation between the problem and possible solutions.

¹ Public Survey “Lithuanian residents on local openness,” Transparency International Lithuania, 2014, <https://goo.gl/1BQFws>.

² Rasa Kavolyte, Ministry of Finance, interview by the IRM researcher, 18 September 2017.

³ Paulius Murauskas, Transparency International Lithuania, interview by the IRM researcher, 27 September 2017.

⁴ European Union Investment in Lithuania, project 10.1.2-ESFA-V-916-01 confirmation, <https://goo.gl/TBcm6d>.

⁵ Contract with “Ernst & Young Baltic”, No. 14P-61, 16 August 2017, sent to the IRM researcher on 21 September 2017.

⁶ Rasa Kavolyte, Ministry of Finance, interview by IRM researcher, 18 September 2017.

4. To create and broadcast social advertisements that target corruption in the healthcare system

Commitment Text:

Publicity on corruption prevention in healthcare system will be created and will be broadcast every year by 31 December 2019. In order to apply targeted anti-corruption measures, a strategy to implement anti-corruption publicity (corruption prevention in healthcare system) will be created. A plan of measures will be drawn up: aims and objectives for anti-corruption publicity will be set, specific entities responsible for drafting and provision of anti-corruption information to its disseminators will be appointed, broadcasting intensity will be scheduled, and budget for drafting and dissemination of information will be planned. The anti-corruption publicity implementation system (strategy) is necessary to seek that awareness-raising and education campaigns were carried out systemically and involved several mass media technologies, in order to achieve larger coverage of the information disseminated. A package of audio-visual measures will be developed.

Milestones:

4.1. A package of audio-visual measures to prevent corruption in healthcare system has been drafted.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Health

Supporting institution: Special Investigation Service

Start date: 1 January 2016

End date: 31 December 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
4. Overall		✓			Unclear					✓			No	✓			

Context and Objectives

According to sociological research by the Special Investigative Service, Lithuania's health care system is one of the most corrupt sectors in the country, with patients frequently giving bribes to health care providers for better treatment.¹ Among European countries, Romanian and Lithuanian citizens are most likely to pay a bribe for services in the health care sector.² 21 percent of Lithuanian residents say they have had to pay a bribe or give a gift or hospital donation in the past few years.³ Public procurement in health care is also vulnerable to corruption, mainly due to high knowledge asymmetry and shadow lobbying. According to the Public Procurement Office, 16 percent of all procurement funds are allocated to health care.⁴ The Lithuanian government acknowledged the problem in 2016 and set a goal to reduce

corruption in health care by more than one half (from 24 percent to 10 percent by 2020) as part of its National Anti-Corruption Program.⁵

To reduce corruption in the health care system, this commitment calls on the Ministry of Health to create and broadcast social advertisements that will provide citizens with anti-corruption information. The commitment is taken directly from the National Anti-Corruption Program and copied to the OGP action plan. However, the commitment does not specify what information will be included in these advertisements, or how the advertisements will be disseminated (apart from “audio-visual measures”), thus the specificity is low. Also, given the scale and scope of the problem of health care corruption, the dissemination of social advertisements as described in the commitment will only have a minor potential impact on this issue. Martynas Gedminas, the CEO at the Association of Young Doctors, noted that advertisements might change public perception of corruption slightly, but the Ministry should cooperate with doctors who could publicly say that bribes are not tolerated in their working space.⁶

Completion

The Ministry of Health has not yet begun the implementation of the commitment. Nadezda Buinickiene, the assistant to the minister, informed the IRM researcher that the Ministry of Health is preparing a project proposal for the European Social Fund Agency to secure the funding.⁷ The deadline for applications is 15 November 2017.⁸

At the time of writing (September 2017), the proposal was not finalized and did not have concrete activities within the commitment confirmed.

Next Steps

The commitment is only one of several measures taken by the Government of Lithuania to address corruption in the health care system. Although it might play an important role together with other anticorruption tools, as written, this commitment is not in line with any OGP values. For this reason, the IRM researcher does not recommend carrying it forward to the next action plan.

¹ Lithuanian Map of Corruption, Special Investigative Service, 2016, <https://goo.gl/974GZG>.

² Special Eurobarometer Survey on Corruption, European Commission, Directorate-General for Home Affairs, 2014, <https://goo.gl/S88bGn>.

³ Special Eurobarometer Survey on Corruption, European Commission, Directorate-General for Home Affairs, 2014, <https://goo.gl/S88bGn>.

⁴ Analysis of public procurements in health care, Public Procurement Office, 2015, <https://goo.gl/MVXkUq>.

⁵ The Action plan of the program of Lithuanian Government, No. 167, 2017, <https://goo.gl/A8ACwM>.

⁶ Martynas Gedminas, Association of Young Doctors, interview by IRM researcher, 25 September 2017

⁷ Nadezda Buinickiene, the Ministry of Health, interview by IRM researcher, 19 September 2017

⁸ Official invitation for the Ministry of Health to apply for European Social Fund Agency, No. 00621, a copy of invitation obtained by IRM researcher.

5. To create legal, organizational and technical tools to easily access detailed information about election and voting procedures, participation in the elections, donations to political campaign participants

Commitment Text:

A system will be designed and launched to provide access to detailed information on elections and voting procedures, participation in elections, and donations to a political campaign participant.

Responsible institution: Central Electoral Commission

Supporting institution: Ministry of Justice

Start date: Not specified

End date: Not specified

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	No	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
5. Overall		✓			✓			✓		✓				No		✓		

Context and Objectives

The Central Electoral Commission (CEC) is a principle state institution responsible for organizing and conducting elections, referendums and monitoring the financing of political parties and campaigns. Although the Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) described Lithuanian elections as transparent, the loopholes for monitoring financial flows remain problematic: “the correct estimation of the value of in-kind donations and the fact that they are rarely reported remain a serious challenge for transparency of funding.”¹ Financial statements and audit reports of political campaign financing are made public through the CEC website within 100 days following the proclamation of the final election results. However, the information on political party and campaign financing on the CEC website is difficult to find, a view shared by Kristina Ivanauskaite-Pettinari, the head of the Trainings and Communications Department at the CEC.²

The commitment aims to provide greater access to information on elections and voting procedures through the creation of legal, organizational, and technical tools. However, the commitment does not provide a measurable and verifiable definition of “legal, organizational, and technical tools,” and does not define what information will be made available. Thus, it has a low specificity. Due to the lack of clarity about the outcomes, the commitment’s potential impact is marked as minor.

Completion

The Chair of the CEC Laura Matjošaityte signed “The Concept of Opening Election Data for the Public” on 15 May 2017, and for the first time introduced a description of “detailed data about elections.”³ The CEC used its previous experience and analyses to determine what data is in public demand but is not currently available. According to Kristina Ivanauskaite-Pettinari of the CEC, both journalists and active citizens have called the CEC after major political scandals to ask about donations to political parties or politicians, which is how the CEC determined what specific data is on demand. However, when asked by the IRM researcher about the availability of any statistics or analysis for requests, she said such information was not systemized, and that the determination for on-demand data was made without consulting other interest groups.⁴

The CEC also proposed creating a system that would gather personal data on individual participation in the elections and citizens’ donations to the politicians. The CEC prepared a project proposal to receive financial support from the EU Structural Funds. At the time of writing this report (September 2017), CEC staff is amending its proposal based on the feedback it received from the donor.

The duration of the project is 30 months. Because the proposal is not yet approved, and it is unclear when it would start, it is already clear that the commitment will not be implemented until the end of 2018, and is thus behind schedule.

Next Steps

This commitment comes directly from the National Anti-Corruption Program for 2015–2019, a strategic long-term document that maps the areas of government most prone to corruption with exact measures and responsible institutions for each of them. The Lithuanian government made the CEC responsible to implement the commitment by the end of 2019, but the CEC coordinates its activities with the National Anti-Corruption Program rather than the OGP action plan. Therefore, the IRM researcher does not recommend carrying this commitment forward to the next action plan.

¹ OSCE/ODIHR Election Assessment Mission Report, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2012, available at: <http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/98586?download=true>.

² Kristina Ivanauskaite-Pettinari, Central Electoral Commission, interview by IRM researcher, 20 September 2017

³ The Concept of Opening Election Data for the Public, No. J1-14 (1.3), 15 May 2017 (not publicly available, IRM researcher received a hard copy by request).

⁴ Kristina Ivanauskaite-Pettinari, Central Electoral Commission, interview by IRM researcher, 20 September 2017.

Theme III: Increased civic participation and engagement in public governance

6. To create public consultation mechanism

Commitment Text:

The commitment to create a public consultation mechanism is linked to the objective to regulate the public consultation procedure, and, having drafted methodological documents, to set a shared consultation practice among institutions.

Milestones:

6.1. In compliance with the methodology provisions, joint public consultation practice will be shaped, and more active civic engagement will be encouraged.

6.2. The guidelines will help institutions achieve optimal way of consultation and will help, through concrete examples, shape joint practice of public consultation

6.3. An electronic publication and an awareness-raising video clip will be presented (made public) to institutions and the society through various channels of communication, hence encouraging institutions to make use of the methodological documents, and the society to take part in consultations

6.4. To assess the effect of various means of civic participation on public administration processes, a methodology for monitoring civic participation in public administration processes will be drafted and practically tested. The methodology will provide recommendations for carrying out monitoring, assessment, and publication of results on application of measures for public consultation and other methods of civic participation in public administration processes.

6.5. In compliance with the methodology provisions, regular monitoring and assessment of efficiency of civic participation in public administration processes will be carried out.

Responsible institution: Office of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania

Supporting institution: Ministry of the Interior

Start date: 31 December 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
6. Overall			✓			✓				✓			Yes		✓		

Context and Objectives

As mentioned in Commitment 3, the current level of public participation in decision-making processes in Lithuania is low. The commitment aims to encourage Lithuanian citizens to encourage greater civic participation in Lithuania by (1) developing a new public consultation methodology, (2) drafting guidelines on the application of the new methodology, (3) publishing an awareness-raising video for the new methodology, (4) drafting a new methodology for monitoring civic participation in public administration processes, and (5) regular monitoring and assessing the efficiency of civic participation in public administration processes based on the new methodology.

Interviewed government and CSO representatives have recognized that civic participation in the decision-making process is weak, and that institutions lack methodological aid and targeted competences to carry out effective public consultations. According to Gitana Jurjoniene, the advisor at the Office of the Government, Lithuania's accession to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) played a major role in drafting this commitment because the OECD identified a need to better engage Lithuanian citizens in decision making.¹ Mantas Zakarka, the CEO of the Lithuanian Youth Council noted that the commitment to introduce a concrete methodology and guidelines on how to carry out public consultations is important because there is currently no common understanding for what a public consultation means.² Similarly, Ieva Petronyte, the CEO of the Civil Society Institute, agreed that the public sector lacks guidelines on how to implement public consultations, but that methodology alone will not solve the problem.³

Although the commitment's overall objective of increasing civic participation through a new consultation methodology is clear, the individual milestones are vague. For example, the commitment does not specify which public institutions will apply the new methodology, only "municipal institutions and agencies," and it is unclear how the monitoring and assessment of the efficiency of the methodology will be carried out. However, the guidelines and awareness-raising video are concrete deliverables, so the commitment's specificity is medium. While creating guiding documents for implementing and monitoring public consultations is a positive step towards greater civic participation, the commitment's objective (to "encourage more active civic participation in public administration processes") is broader than what it can achieve if fully implemented. Given the current low levels of civic participation in Lithuania, the creation, implementation, and monitoring of a public consultation methodology would have a minor potential impact. Having such a broad commitment makes it difficult to measure its success. If the scope was narrower, or if the target audience was limited to a few identified institutions rather than the whole public sector, one could expect a greater potential impact.

However, it is important to note that the Office of the Government plans to achieve more than indicated in the action plan, which might result in a greater opening of government. Gitana Jurjoniene at the Office of the Government said they also plan to hold consultations for officials working at the ministries to test methodologies.⁴

Completion

On 21 November 2016, the Office of the Government contracted the company Civitta to create a public consultation mechanism, prepare the documents needed, test methodology in practice, and train public officials in using the new mechanism.⁵

At the time of writing this report (September 2017), the Office of the Government is in the process of drafting the methodology for public consultations and preparing the guidelines for public sector institutions on how to apply this methodology. The Office

of the Government sent the IRM researcher an email with a list of seven ministries that were assigned to test the experimental public consultations: The Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Energy, the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Economy, the Research and Higher Education Monitoring, and the Analysis Centre (MOSTA) under the Government of the Republic of Lithuania. The Office of Government plans to update the draft version of the methodologies once it is tested by the above-mentioned ministries.⁶

Each of the seven ministries were prescribed a different consultation methodology to test. For example, the Ministry of Health would carry out its consultation via survey and using online tools, while the Ministry of Interior had a focus group. Although closed circle meetings or interviews with identified stakeholders are not in line with OGP standards for open and participatory partnership with CSOs and other interested parties, the Office of the Government sees the above-mentioned methods as possible methodologies for public consultations.

According to action plan, the commitment must be fulfilled by 30 June 2018. As there is no timeline for interim activities, the IRM researcher cannot track the implementation in more detail.

Next Steps

The commitment is important to address the problem of low public participation. However, the IRM researcher recommends that Office of the Government narrow the commitment's scope because the foreseen deliverables alone could hardly increase civic participation in decision-making processes.

Also, as the aim of this commitment is to increase the quality of public consultations and encourage Lithuanian citizens to take part in the decision-making process, the IRM researcher recommends following the OGP values and principles when defining public consultation and making sure that consultations offer a combination of both open meetings and online engagement, involve groups throughout the country, and are open for an adequate duration.⁷ While the Office of the Government currently applies OECD standards of public consultation, this definition is too narrow and would not let all interested parties participate.

¹ Gitana Jurjoniene, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 3 August 2017.

² Mantas Zakarka, Lithuanian Youth Council, interview by IRM researcher, 4 August 2017.

³ Ieva Petronyte, Civil Society Institute, interview by IRM researcher, 4 August 2017.

⁴ Gitana Jurjoniene, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 3 August 2017.

⁵ Central Public procurement portal, contract with UAB "Civitta", <https://qoo.gl/Hj1X1J>.

⁶ Gitana Jurjoniene, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 3 August 2017. The IRM researcher received a copy of draft documents.

⁷ OGP Participation & Co-creation Standards, OGP, available here:

<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards>.

7. To foster open public governance culture in public sector by introducing values of Open Government Partnership

Commitment Text:

It is important that civil servants and employees, who deal with citizens in their daily tasks, understood well the essence and methods of open public administration, and correctly apply the principles of open public administration in their daily work. It is necessary that the State and municipal institutions had a platform for an organised cooperation with the civil society, which would help understand the essence and methods of open public administration, and create preconditions for the public institutions and civil society representatives to cooperate in their daily activities.

Milestones:

7.1. Conferences and seminars with the civil society have been held.

7.2. Training for civil servants has been organised.

Responsible institution: Office of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania

Supporting institutions: Representatives of ministries and agencies accountable to them, representatives of municipal administrations

Start date: 31 December 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
7. Overall		✓				✓				✓			Yes		✓		

Context and Objectives

The commitment aims to foster an open government culture in Lithuania's public sector by strengthening the capacities of civil servants in open public administration and by creating a forum for cooperation between the civil servants and society. The challenge of fostering open government in the public sector was addressed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) experts, who acknowledged Lithuania's efforts to promote open government, but also noted that a number of issues remain. For instance, in a 2015 report on public governance in Lithuania, the OECD recommended a set of guidelines, like "disseminating open government principles and practices; promoting a culture of civic engagement."¹ A 2016 survey about policymaking by the Ministry of the Interior also showed that neither municipal council members, nor the heads of local communities think people can influence the decision-making processes in practice. Only 34 percent of Council members and 28 percent of the heads of local communities agreed with this

statement.² According to Gitana Jurjoniene, the advisor at the Office of the Government, this commitment was included in the action plan based on OECD criticism of the lack of open government culture in Lithuania's public sector.³

The commitment is vaguely formulated and oriented towards achieving a process ("to foster open public administration culture") instead of tangible results. While the commitment calls for the Office of the Government to hold conferences with civil society and organize trainings for civil servants, the details of these conferences and trainings are not provided. Therefore, the specificity for the commitment is low. The Office of the Government plans to measure the change of culture by the number of officials participating in their awareness-raising events.⁴ The question about the value of events and their impact is a common challenge for public sector institutions. A 2016 study showed that they do not tend to measure the impact of their events, and it is not clear what short or long-term benefits they bring.⁵ Given the scope of the problem and the commitment's objectives, holding conferences would only have a minor potential impact.

Completion

Completion of the commitment is limited and has only recently begun.

The self-assessment report notes that the Office of the Government has already organized a roundtable discussion on the current state of open government in Lithuania in June 2017.⁶ The IRM researcher obtained an email with a registration sheet showing that 20 people participated, mainly representatives from the OGP working group and institutions responsible for the implementation of the commitments.⁷ As noted by Ieva Cesnulaityte from the Office of the Government, participants discussed the development of the action plan and its achieved results.⁸

Next Steps

The commitment reflects the recommendations from the previous IRM report and addresses the guidelines provided by the OECD. As noted in the previous IRM report, Lithuania lacked open government culture in its public sector and it was recommended to "educate their employees so that there is a shared understanding of the values and goals of OGP."⁹ However, if the Office of the Government seeks to substantially change the attitudes of public officials, the IRM researcher recommends choosing a sample of institutions to test how effective the trainings are and using more innovative tools than roundtable discussions.

¹ "Lithuania: Fostering Open and Inclusive Policy Making", Section "Assessment and recommendations", pg. 19, OECD Public Governance Reviews, 2015, <https://goo.gl/2c9ac2>.

² "Participation of citizens when making decision on local level", representative survey, the Ministry of Interior, 2016.

³ Gitana Jurjoniene, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 14 September 2017.

⁴ Gitana Jurjoniene, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 14 September 2017.

⁵ "Better Measurement of Efficiency and Benefits of Public Sector Events While Seeking to Increase the Competitiveness of Lithuanian Economy", situation analysis, Greta Juodokaite, Ieva Cesnulaityte, 2016, <https://goo.gl/xL23cD>.

⁶ Lithuania Mid-Term Self-Assessment 2016 – 2018, OGP, 29 September 2017, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-mid-term-self-assessment-2016-2018>

⁷ An email received by IRM researcher, 28 September 2017.

⁸ Ieva Cesnulaityte, the Office of the Government, Online correspondence, 27 September 2017 – 28 September 2017.

⁹ Lithuania IRM Progress Report 2014 – 2015, OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Lithuania14-15_final_Eng_0.pdf, pg. 54.

8. Creation of NGO database

Commitment Text:

The objective of a single NGO data base (including data on potential applicants seeking state funding and reporting on the funds paid) is to create an exclusive data system that would provide standardised information on the nongovernmental sector of Lithuania and its involvement in the implementation of the programmes financed by public state / municipal institutions through an open tender. This database would enable the creation of an instrument of collection and dissemination of consolidated information for the department of Statistics of Lithuania, representatives of the non-governmental sector and public institutions, academic community and the society as a whole.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Justice

Supporting institutions: State Enterprise Centre of Registers, Ministry of Social Security and Labour, NGO Council, National NGO Coalition

Start date: 30 September 2016

End date: 31 December 2017

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
8. Overall				✓	✓			✓			✓		No		✓		

Context and Objectives

Data on NGOs in Lithuania is currently stored at the State Enterprise Centre of Registers where legal entities provide information about their structure, contacts, activities, and financial performance.¹ This kind of accountability is required by law, but data is not publicly available unless purchased. The only portal to provide updated information on NGOs is a voluntarily database, NGO Atlas, where all NGOs may register and publish information on their activities, their donors, and how to get involved.² However, the platform is run by an NGO, Transparency International Lithuania, and it is not officially used at the government level. Besides this platform, there is no central authorized portal which contains information on NGO activities, structure, and funding.

This commitment seeks to establish a single public NGO database, which would include a pool of all NGOs and would help distinguish actual NGOs from other organizations (e.g. social businesses). It would also provide at least part of the information free of charge. According to the action plan, this database would contain information about NGO activities, field of expertise, structure, contacts of the employees, and their annual budgets. Marija Saraite, a member of the NGO Council, said that one of the main issues is specifying what exactly an NGO is, because the current Law on NGOs does not explicitly define what constitutes an NGO.³

This commitment provides clear delineation between information that would be public (i.e. contact details, short description of activities, and available human resources) and limited to the public (i.e. financial data, registration certificates, and statutes). Therefore, the specificity is marked as high. However, in practice it seems to be an open question because the NGO Council is still considering the level of publicity for each data set. If created, the NGO database could have a moderate potential impact on access to information. For the first time in Lithuania, data on NGOs from the State Enterprise Centre of Registers would be open to the public. Public sector institutions calling for project proposals would see financial and narrative records, statutes, registration certificates, and other supporting documents that NGOs must submit to receive funding for their project proposals. This would make the NGO sector more transparent and reduce administrative burdens for NGO activities. However, the commitment would likely not have a transformative impact, because it offers to make financial information and strategic documents like statutes or registration certificates available only to public sector institutions, not to the public.

Completion

Implementation of this commitment is not on schedule. The deadline to establish the NGO register is 31 December 2017, but at the time of writing this report (September 2017), the design of the NGO register has not been confirmed. The Office of the Government marked the implementation progress as “half way” in its self-assessment report, but agreed that it should be changed to “started.”⁴ Gitana Jurjonienė from the Office of the Government noted they had doubts over the progress and raised those concerns in their email to the OGP working group.⁵

The NGO Council is working to propose the layout of the register but faces opposition from the Ministry of Justice. According to Marija Saraite, there is a Ministry of Justice representative who is part of the NGO Council, but they oppose the idea of creating an NGO database.⁶ Jolita Slikiene of the Ministry of Justice noted that because of the lack of consensus on what the database should look like and the lack of a clear vision for the database, the commitment was beyond the responsibilities of Ministry of Justice. Slikiene said that it should be coordinated by the Ministry of Social Security and Labour instead.⁷ On 9 July 2017, the Ministry of Justice sent the Office of the Government a letter advising that the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour should be responsible for this commitment instead of them.⁸ Martinas Zaltauskas, the CEO of the Non-Governmental Organisations Information and Support Centre and a member of NGO Council, specified that the correct level of implementation is only at the “talking” stage, and neither the Ministry of Justice nor the Center of Registers support the idea.⁹

In September 2017, Create Lithuania, a program for young professionals with international experience who consult public sector institutions on national issues, began a new initiative to implement the commitment.¹⁰ According to Aurelija Olendraite from Create Lithuania, the group is in the process of gathering examples of NGO databases from other countries to draft a concept for Lithuania.¹¹ Despite this initiative, concerns over the ownership of the commitment remain.

Next Steps

The IRM researcher recommends amending the Law on NGOs to clarify the criteria that all currently listed NGOs fulfill the requirements to be considered NGOs. This would help answer the question of which legal entities would qualify to be included in the NGO database.

Also, the commitment clearly shows that cooperation and clear communication between public sector institutions is key to achieve concrete results. The current situation, with the responsible institution not willing to lead the implementation, creates obstacles for further implementation. The confusion over the responsibility for this commitment demonstrates a clear lack of communication between institutions during its development. Because of this confusion, the IRM researcher recommends to explicitly delegate the responsibility for this commitment to the Ministry of Social Security and Labour and to continue its implementation.

¹ State Enterprise Centre of Registers, <http://www.registrucentras.lt/>.

² A voluntary NGO database "NGO Atlas," www.nvoatlasas.lt.

³ Marija Saraite, NGO Council, interview by IRM researcher, 13 September 2017.

⁴ Self-assessment report of OGP Action plan, Vilnius, 11 September 2017, http://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/OGP%20ataskaita_LT_galutine.pdf.

⁵ Gitana Jurjoniene, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 14 September 2017.

⁶ Marija Saraite, NGO Council, interview by IRM researcher, 13 September 2017.

⁷ Jolita Slikiene, Ministry of Justice, interview by IRM researcher, 22 September 2017.

⁸ Ieva Cesnulaityte, the Office of the Government, interview by IRM researcher, 14 September 2017.

⁹ Martinas Zaltauskas, Non-Governmental Organisations Information and Support Centre, stakeholders' meeting, 1 August 2017.

¹⁰ Program Create Lithuania, "About Us," <http://kurklit.lt/en/apie-mus/>.

¹¹ Aurelija Olendraite, "Create Lithuania" programme, interview by IRM researcher, 29 September 2017.

9. Creation of NGO fund

Commitment Text:

The purpose of the fund is to finance the strengthening of institutional capacities of NGOs required for participation in the public decision-making process, as well as drafting of proposals by NGOs on decisions of public governance and presentation to the interested institutions and the public; strengthening of competences of NGO representatives required for the drafting and presentation of such proposals. The fund will promote the creation of the self-regulation mechanisms of the NGO sector, creation of transparency and accountability standards, communication of its activities by various means to the public, cultivation of competences and skills for participation in the public policies and their implementation with the aim to provide high-quality public services for the population.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Supporting institutions: Ministry of Social Security and Labour, NGO Council, National NGO Coalition

Start date: 31 December 2016

End date: 31 December 2017

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
9. Overall			✓			✓				✓			Yes		✓		

Context and Objectives

There is currently no data on how much Lithuania spends to finance NGOs.¹ According to a 2015 Transparency International Lithuania survey, 34 percent of Lithuanian NGOs say that national- and municipality- level institutions do not have clear criteria to finance NGO projects, and that the selection process is not transparent.² This commitment aims to strengthen the capacity of NGOs to participate in the decision-making process by creating a National Civil Society Fund (NGO Fund). The NGO Fund would finance different programs specifically for NGOs that want to develop their advocacy skills, increase their capacity to draft legal acts, and participate in policymaking. It would also focus on financing communication projects within NGO networks and would have a special program for training in cases when NGOs need to replace public sector institutions to carry out their social services.

There are over 2,000 registered NGOs in Lithuania,³ which have an average annual budget of around 3,000 EUR.⁴ Most NGOs in Lithuania are small local organizations that rely heavily on volunteers instead of full-time employees, and many do not have their own website. Because they often face difficulty participating in the decision-making process, the NGO Fund became an important commitment for the NGO

community. As the CEO of Non-Governmental Organisations Information and Support Centre Martinas Zaltauskas noted, the idea to have an NGO Fund is more than ten years old, so NGOs wanted to take the opportunity and the commitment into their own hands.⁵

While the creation of the NGO Fund is measurable and deliverable, and a specific annual budget (2 million EUR) is mentioned, the commitment does not provide criteria for which NGOs will receive funding and which public services will be transferred to NGOs. Therefore, the commitment's specificity is marked as medium. If created, the NGO Fund would strengthen NGOs to improve their capability to influence decisions. However, the potential impact of the commitment depends on the budget and the financial flows to be distributed to Lithuanian NGOs. The working group of NGOs has estimated that to finance around 700 NGOs per year, the Fund would need an annual budget of 19 million EUR.⁶ This is far greater than what the action plan has foreseen: no more than 2 million EUR per year. According to Tomas Kubilius, the CEO of the Human Rights Monitoring Institute, the Fund is timely and important, but its focus is too narrow: it specifically targets NGOs that participate in public policy, but there are many more NGOs that need assistance in carrying out their activities.⁷ Because of the inadequate budget expected to be allocated to the NGO Fund and the lack of understanding about the Fund's final model, the potential impact is rated as minor. The commitment also says that NGO Fund would bring more transparency to public spending, but does not specify how it would do this. The extent to which the Fund might open government could increase once the model is finalized and confirmed.

Completion

The deadline for implementing this commitment is 31 December 2017, and the Office of the Government marked the progress as "half way" in their self-assessment report.⁸ However, at the time of writing this report (September 2017), none of the results have been achieved. According to the participants of the stakeholders meeting, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour is in contact with a working group of NGOs, which is drafting the concept of the Fund for the Ministry and proposing how the Fund might operate.⁹ Although NGOs claimed to be satisfied with the role of the Ministry, some added that all the work is being done by the NGOs.¹⁰ Eitvydas Bingelis, the vice-minister at the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour, said that this method was chosen because it is very important the proposal comes from NGOs themselves.¹¹

After the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour confirms the Fund concept, the Fund must be discussed and passed in the Parliament. So far, the proposal has not reached the Minister of Social Affairs and Labour, because it is still being drafted. One of the reasons for this delay is that the commitment falls under the Program of the Government, where the deadline for the NGO Fund is the second quarter of 2018.¹² This is a strategic national document having priority over the OGP action plan and serves as a baseline for the commitment.

Based on the above-mentioned reasons, it is unlikely the commitment will be implemented on time and probably will continue into 2018.

Next Steps

Due to its importance to the NGO community, the IRM researcher recommends carrying this commitment forward to the next action plan. However, to have a greater potential impact, the commitment language should be more specific and detailed when it comes to planned results.

Also, the current situation suggests that the commitment was included in the action plan with no proper discussions among the NGOs, as the stakeholders of the initiative are discussing the concept of the NGO Fund from the very beginning. Therefore, if the commitment is carried forward, the IRM researcher recommends working with NGOs and other stakeholders in closer dialogue to be able to reach a consensus on how this Fund should operate

¹ NGO Transparency research, Transparency International Lithuania, 2015, <http://www.transparency.lt/tils-tyrimai-ir-analizes/>.

² “NGOs Survey on NGO transparency”, Transparency International Lithuania, 2015, <http://www.transparency.lt/nvo-atstovu-apklausa-apie-nvo-skaidruma/>.

³ Data from a voluntarily NGO Register “NGO Atlas”, www.nvoatlasas.lt.

⁴ “NGOs Survey on NGO Transparency”, Transparency International Lithuania, 2015, <http://www.transparency.lt/nvo-atstovu-apklausa-apie-nvo-skaidruma/>.

⁵ Martinas Zaltauskas, Non-Governmental Organisations Information and Support Centre, stakeholders' meeting, 1 August 2017.

⁶ Tomas Kubilius, Human Rights Monitoring Institute, interview by IRM researcher, 13 September 2017.

⁷ Tomas Kubilius, Human Rights Monitoring Institute, interview by IRM researcher, 13 September 2017.

⁸ Self-assessment report of the Office of the Government, 11 September 2017, [http://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/OGP%20ataskaita LT_galutine.pdf](http://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/OGP%20ataskaita_LT_galutine.pdf).

⁹ Stakeholders meeting, 1 August 2017.

¹⁰ Stakeholders meeting, 1 August 2017.

¹¹ Eitvydas Bingelis, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour, interview by IRM researcher, 25 September 2017.

¹² The decree of the Government, No. 167, 13 March 2017, <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/2389544007bf11e79ba1ee3112ade9bc>.

V. General Recommendations

Lithuania's third action plan focused on access to information and public participation, which are in line with Lithuania's open government goals and the country's eligibility for membership in the OECD. However, with nepotism and conflicts of interests being obstacles to transparent and inclusive decision making, stakeholders suggest focusing on a systematic approach of engaging interest groups into policymaking.

This section aims to inform development of the next action plan and guide completion of the current action plan. It is divided into two sections: 1) those civil society and government priorities identified while elaborating this report and 2) the recommendations of the IRM.

5.1 Stakeholder Priorities

Most stakeholders emphasized the importance of two commitments: the creation of the NGO database and the creation of the National Civil Society Fund (NGO Fund).¹ If fully implemented, these commitments could help make both public decisions and public spending more transparent and accountable to the public.

For the next action plan, stakeholders mentioned a few options for commitments, such as developing a consistent policy to engage CSOs and other interest groups into decision making, and creating a systematic approach to opening public sector data.

5.2 IRM Recommendations

Compared to the previous action plan, the Office of the Government was more transparent and invited a wider range of stakeholders to develop current commitments. However, it did not organize a multi-stakeholder forum during either development or implementation. This caused responsible institutions and CSOs to question concrete activities or to not support their prescribed role in the action plan.

To avoid this situation in the future, the Office of the Government may consider discussing drafted commitments with as wide a range of affected stakeholders as possible before confirming them as final commitments. Also, it is recommended to discuss the role and responsibilities with all public-sector institutions that would carry out the commitments. Even when commitments are taken from other strategic documents and institutions are aware of their responsibilities, institutions should be made more aware of the OGP initiative and the standards that need to be fulfilled.

In cases when the commitments are taken from strategic documents like the National Anti-Corruption Program or the Program of the Government, their implementation timeframe should correspond with the OGP two-year cycle. Resting upon the experience of the current action plan, responsible institutions organize their work according to the deadlines set in the Program of the Government and other strategic documents, not the action plan. For this reason, the Office of the Government should carefully ensure smooth implementation of the commitments with the OGP action plan timeframe.

It is important to mention that only commitments that are in line with OGP values should be incorporated into the action plan. Commitments that do not seek to improve access to information, civic participation, or public accountability should not be part of Lithuania's next action plan.

Finally, the Office of the Government should identify the criteria indicating the achievement of the commitments in the action plan. Otherwise it is difficult to evaluate if the commitments might have any impact on open government and were worth inclusion in the action plan.

Table 5.1: Five Key Recommendations

1	Ensure the proposals for the next action plan are discussed among stakeholders from public sector and CSOs before confirming them as commitments.
2	Ensure the commitments are in line with OGP values of access to information, civic participation, and public accountability.
3	Show good leadership and inform the public about the developments of the commitments, explain any possible delays, and provide supportive documents.
4	Ensure the proposed commitment can be fully implemented in the two-year timeframe and that it alone may achieve the relevant goal.
5	Identify the criteria which could indicate the achievement of the commitments and measure their implementation.

¹ Stakeholders meeting, 1 August 2017.

VI. Methodology and Sources

The IRM progress report is written by researchers based in each OGP-participating country. All IRM reports undergo a process of quality control to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

Analysis of progress on OGP action plans is a combination of interviews, desk research, and feedback from nongovernmental stakeholder meetings. The IRM report builds on the findings of the government's own self-assessment report and any other assessments of progress put out by civil society, the private sector, or international organizations.

Each IRM researcher carries out stakeholder meetings to ensure an accurate portrayal of events. Given budgetary and calendar constraints, the IRM cannot consult all interested or affected parties. Consequently, the IRM strives for methodological transparency and therefore, where possible, makes public the process of stakeholder engagement in research (detailed later in this section.) Some contexts require anonymity of interviewees and the IRM reviews the right to remove personal identifying information of these participants. Due to the necessary limitations of the method, the IRM strongly encourages commentary on public drafts of each report.

Each report undergoes a four-step review and quality-control process:

1. Staff review: IRM staff reviews the report for grammar, readability, content, and adherence to IRM methodology.
2. International Experts Panel (IEP) review: IEP reviews the content of the report for rigorous evidence to support findings, evaluates the extent to which the action plan applies OGP values, and provides technical recommendations for improving the implementation of commitments and realization of OGP values through the action plan as a whole. (See below for IEP membership.)
3. Prepublication review: Government and select civil society organizations are invited to provide comments on content of the draft IRM report.
4. Public comment period: The public is invited to provide comments on the content of the draft IRM report.

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual.¹

Interviews and Focus Groups

Each IRM researcher is required to hold at least one public information-gathering event. Researchers should make a genuine effort to invite stakeholders outside of the "usual suspects" list of invitees already participating in existing processes. Supplementary means may be needed to gather the inputs of stakeholders in a more meaningful way (e.g., online surveys, written responses, follow-up interviews). Additionally, researchers perform specific interviews with responsible agencies when the commitments require more information than is provided in the self-assessment or is accessible online.

During the evaluation period, the IRM researcher organized one stakeholder meeting and conducted 24 interviews.

The stakeholders meeting took place on 1 August 2017 and had representatives from eight different institutions, namely Mykolas Romeris University, the Open Society Fund, the NGO Council, the NGO Law Institute, the Human Rights Centre,

the Office of the Government, the Non-Governmental Organisations Information and Support Centre, and the Civil Society Institute. The aim of the meeting was to discuss their involvement in the development and implementation of the action plan, their priorities within the OGP initiative, and their stance on current commitments.

Conducted interviews:

- Gitana Jurjoniene, the Office of the Government (August-September 2017)
- Ieva Cesnulaityte, the Office of the Government (August-September 2017)
- Greta Juodokaite, the Office of the Government (August-September 2017)
- Edita Baniene, the Office of the Government (September 2017)
- Virgilijus Pajaujis, program “Create Lithuania” (September 2017)
- Aurelija Olendraite, program “Create Lithuania” (September 2017)
- Mantas Zimnickas, the programmer and co-founder of online community “Open data” (September 2017)
- Povilas Poderskis, the programmer and co-founder of online community “Freedata.lt” (September 2017)
- Mantas Zakarka, Lithuanian Youth Council (August 2017)
- Marija Saraite, NGO Council (September 2017)
- Tomas Kubilius, Human Rights Monitoring Institute (September 2017)
- Paulius Murauskas, Transparency International Lithuania (September 2017)
- Ieva Petronyte, Civil Society Institute (August 2017)
- Julius Belickas, Information Society Development Committee under the Ministry of Transport and Communications (September 2017)
- Nadezda Buinickiene, the Ministry of Health (September 2017)
- Nendre Cerniauskiene, the Ministry of Health (September 2017)
- Jolita Slikiene, the Ministry of Justice (September 2017)
- Rasa Kavolyte, the Ministry of Finance (September 2017)
- Kristina Ivanauskaite-Pettinari, Central Electoral Commission (September 2017)
- Eitvydas Bingelis, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour (September 2017)
- Martynas Gedminas, Association of Young Doctors (September 2017)
- Andrius Stasiukynas, Mykolas Romeris University (September 2017)
- Mantas Bileisis, Mykolas Romeris University (August 2017)
- Dalia Masaitiene, the Ministry of Interior (September 2017)

About the Independent Reporting Mechanism

The IRM is a key means by which government, civil society, and the private sector can track government development and implementation of OGP action plans on an annual basis. The design of research and quality control of such reports is carried out by the International Experts Panel, comprised of experts in transparency, participation, accountability, and social science research methods.

The current membership of the International Experts Panel is

- César Cruz-Rubio
- Hazel Feigenblatt
- Mary Francoli
- Brendan Halloran
- Hille Hinsberg
- Anuradha Joshi
- Jeff Lovitt
- Fredline M'Cormack-Hale
- Showers Mawowa
- Ernesto Velasco

A small staff based in Washington, DC, shepherds reports through the IRM process in close coordination with the researchers. Questions and comments about this report can be directed to the staff at irm@opengovpartnership.org.

¹ IRM Procedures Manual, V.3: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>.

VII. Eligibility Requirements Annex

The OGP Support Unit collates eligibility criteria on an annual basis. These scores are presented below.¹ When appropriate, the IRM reports will discuss the context surrounding progress or regress on specific criteria in the Country Context section.

In September 2012, OGP officially encouraged governments to adopt ambitious commitments that relate to eligibility.

Table 7.1: Eligibility Annex for Lithuania

Criteria	2011	Current	Change	Explanation
Budget Transparency ²	N/A	N/A	No change	4 = Executive's Budget Proposal and Audit Report published 2 = One of two published 0 = Neither published
Access to Information ³	4	4	No change	4 = Access to information (ATI) Law 3 = Constitutional ATI provision 1 = Draft ATI law 0 = No ATI law
Asset Declaration ⁴	4	4	No change	4 = Asset disclosure law, data public 2 = Asset disclosure law, no public data 0 = No law
Citizen Engagement (Raw score)	4 (10.00) ₅	4 (10.00) ⁶	No change	<i>EIU Citizen Engagement Index</i> raw score: 1 > 0 2 > 2.5 3 > 5 4 > 7.5
Total / Possible (Percent)	12/12 (100%)	12/12 (100%)	No change	75% of possible points to be eligible

¹ For more information, see <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/how-it-works/eligibility-criteria>.

² For more information, see Table 1 in <http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/open-budget-survey/>. For up-to-date assessments, see <http://www.obstracker.org/>.

³ The two databases used are Constitutional Provisions at <http://www.right2info.org/constitutional-protections> and Laws and draft laws at <http://www.right2info.org/access-to-information-laws>.

⁴ Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer, "Disclosure by Politicians," (Tuck School of Business Working Paper 2009-60, 2009), <http://bit.ly/19nDEfK>; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), "Types of Information Decision Makers Are Required to Formally Disclose, and Level Of Transparency," in *Government at a Glance 2009*, (OECD, 2009), <http://bit.ly/13vGtgS>; Ricard Messick, "Income and Asset Disclosure by World Bank Client Countries" (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2009), <http://bit.ly/1cloyf>. For more recent information, see <http://publicofficialsfinancialdisclosure.worldbank.org>. In 2014, the OGP Steering Committee approved a change in the asset disclosure measurement. The existence of a law and de facto public access to the disclosed information replaced the old measures of disclosure by politicians and disclosure of high-level officials. For additional information, see the guidance note on 2014 OGP Eligibility Requirements at <http://bit.ly/1EjLJ4Y>.

⁵ "Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat," The Economist Intelligence Unit (London: Economist, 2010), <http://bit.ly/eLC1rE>.

⁶ "Democracy Index 2014: Democracy and its Discontents," The Economist Intelligence Unit (London: Economist, 2014), <http://bit.ly/18kEzCt>.