

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Action Plan Review:
Lithuania 2023–2025

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Table of Contents

Section I: Overview of the 2023 - 2025 Action Plan	3
Section II: Promising Commitments in Lithuania 2023 - 2025 Action Plan	5
Section III. Methodology and IRM Indicators	10
Annex 1. Commitment by Commitment Data	13
Annex 2: Action Plan Co-Creation	14

Section I: Overview of the 2023 - 2025 Action Plan

Lithuania's sixth action plan includes a promising commitment to establish new regulatory practices around public consultations at the ministerial and subordinate levels. During implementation, the Office of the Government needs to specify the commitments further by identifying what it aims to achieve through each and by setting measurable indicators to ensure accountability.

Lithuania's sixth action plan has three commitments: establishing well-structured and high-quality legislative processes, building a customer-centric approach in the public sector, and improving the co-creation process on the national level. The previous action plan had commitments from the Public Procurement Office and the Center of Registers. Being independent from the Office of the Government, those institutions were not obliged to follow the timeline of the action plan when implementing their commitments. This time, the working group and the Office of the Government prioritized commitments whose implementation is, in most cases, in the hands of the Office.

On 6 February 2023, the Office of the Government confirmed a new Working Group that operates as a multi-stakeholder forum.¹ The Working Group is mandated to co-create and approve the sixth action plan and monitor its implementation. The Office of the Government addressed previous IRM recommendations by forming a Working Group where most government members have decision-making powers within their institutions.² During the previous cycle, the lack of involvement of senior representatives left some agencies unaware of their role in implementing commitments. The Office of the Government reached a wider range of stakeholders, including experts in public policy, as well as lobbying organizations.³ The IRM welcomes this diversity in the Working Group, as the action plan focuses on improving law-making and acknowledging the experiences of different interest groups.

The drafting of the action plan started with a brainstorming session in the Working Group and an online public consultation launched on 14 March 2023.⁴ No proposals came from the public consultation so only the proposals from the Working Group were discussed in later stages. Proposals from the Working Group were discussed during three workshops. The Working Group confirmed the final list of commitments by voting online. After the voting, there were various meetings with stakeholders and the Working Group to specify the commitments. The Office of the Government received several written comments from Working Group members. These comments were discussed with them, and the plan was amended accordingly.⁵ However, a few members refrained from voting, saying that the commitments did not fully represent the

AT A GLANCE

Participating since: 2011
Action plan under review: 2023–2025
Number of commitments: 3

Overview of commitments:
Commitments with an open government lens: 2 (67%)
Commitments with substantial potential for results: 1 (33%)
Promising commitments: 1

Policy areas:

Carried over from previous action plans:

- Participation in legislative process
- Improving the quality of public services

Emerging in this action plan: N/A

Compliance with OGP minimum requirements for co-creation: Yes

discussions they had during the workshops.⁶ For instance, the action plan mentions a lack of data utilization and evidence-based law-making, but the commitments do not directly address this issue. The Office of the Government noted that the action related to the data utilization was not among the most voted for, but the action plan as a whole was designed to foster greater openness within the public sector, bridging the gap between government and citizens and promoting data-driven decision-making.⁷

The IRM has assessed Commitment 1 as promising. Common standards for drafting legal acts at the ministerial and subordinate levels could facilitate greater engagement in the passing of legal acts by citizens and interest groups. The other two commitments are less ambitious and are framed vaguely. The Office of the Government noted that the Working Group tried to reach a consensus on what as possible to achieve at the time of action plan's development, rather than aiming for ambition alone.⁸ Commitment 2's activities focus on the internal work of civil servants, without clearly aiming to improve the transparency, participation, or accountability of the government. Commitment 3 foresees developing a library of best practices and learning channels for public officials, and piloting public consultations, but lacks details on the implementation of the pilot or the contents of the library. The success of the action plan will largely depend on how the Office of the Government will specify the commitments and identify what it aims to achieve.

¹ The Decree of the Chancellor of the Office of the Government, No. V-25.

² See <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-action-plan-review-2021-2023/>

³ The IRM researcher received a list of attendees via email from the Office of the Government, 31 October 2023. 60 people participated in the three sessions.

⁴ Office of the Government, Public consultation for the new action plan, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/konsultacijos/viesoji-konsultacija-del-atviros-vyriausybes-veiksmu-plano>

⁵ Information provided by the Office of the Government during the pre-publication review, 25 January 2024.

⁶ The IRM researcher has depersonalized emails from members of the Working Group, expressing their concerns. Received via email from the Office of the Government, 31 October 2023.

⁷ Information provided by the Office of the Government during the pre-publication review, 22 January 2024.

⁸ Information provided by the Office of the Government during the pre-publication review, 22 January 2024.

Section II: Promising Commitments in Lithuania 2023 - 2025 Action Plan

The following review looks at the one commitment that the IRM identified as having the potential to realize the most promising results. Promising commitments address a policy area that is important to stakeholders or the national context. They must be verifiable, have a relevant open government lens, and have modest or substantial potential for results. This review also provides an analysis of challenges, opportunities, and recommendations to contribute to the learning and implementation process of this action plan.

Table 1. Promising commitments

Promising Commitments
1. Establish a common framework for legislative process: This commitment entails establishing new regulatory procedures to the ministerial legislative process, including methodological guidance and education to ensure the practical implementation of a quality legislative process.

Commitment 1: Streamline the legislative decision-making process at the institutional and government levels and establish a common framework for legislative oversight [the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Government]

For a complete description of the commitment, see Commitment 1 in Lithuania's 2023-2025 action plan [here](#).

Context and objectives:

Under this commitment, the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Government seek to introduce a unified legislative standard to all ministries, government agencies, and bodies subordinate to ministries that now apply through the Government's Rules of Procedure.⁹ The commitment also entails publishing the legislative plan while the Legal Acts Information System (TAIS) is being upgraded.¹⁰ Until the TAIS is upgraded, the commitment will enable the publication and monitoring of the planned work of the Parliament, and make the legislation process of every legal act publicly available from its registration to the final version.

Public consultations are often hampered by fast-tracked legislative procedures. According to the Statute of the Parliament, urgency procedures may be applied in special cases when, due to political, social, economic, or other circumstances, it is necessary to establish new legal regulations or change existing regulations.¹¹ The adoption of laws under urgency and extreme urgency prevent thorough assessments of draft laws.¹² A 2018 National Audit Office report showed that 50 percent of draft legislation were rushed or adopted with urgency.¹³ In 2019, after analyzing the procedures for the urgent amendments to the Law on Forestry (No I-671), the Constitutional Court recognized that the fast-tracked procedures under the Law Amending Articles was in conflict with the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania, the rule of law, and responsible governance.¹⁴ However, during the current Parliamentary term (2020-2024) speedy law-making has been in decline and accounted for 16 percent of all laws passed by the MPs.¹⁵

Lithuania has attempted to improve public consultations in its 2016-2018 and 2018-2020 action plans. Those action plans focused on developing the methodology to conduct public consultations but not changing regulatory practices. The current commitment goes further by aiming to address the entire legislative process, not just the quality of public consultations. The proposal to supplement the existing methodology with amendments of the legislation process came from the Working Group and was discussed during the co-creation workshops.¹⁶ The topic of changing the legislative process received the most votes from stakeholders. According to the Office of the Government, due to the complexity of the reform, the Working Group chose to address it via a series of activities that fall under the responsibility of several actors (the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Government). The Office of the Government expects input from other stakeholders during implementation. As such, the willingness to adhere to new practices ought to come from all involved in the law-making process.¹⁷

Potential for results: Substantial

This commitment is timely and, if successfully implemented, might facilitate greater engagement in the decision-making process by citizens, interest groups, and other stakeholders. Common standards for drafting legal acts at the ministerial and subordinate levels would make legislation clearer and more transparent, since ministerial acts and decrees are currently often confirmed without consultations.¹⁸ Moreover, the commitment will, for the first time, clarify the number of days to gather public input, allowing citizens to know what to expect procedure-wise and when to get engaged. The public would have 10 working days to submit their proposals and 12 working days when draft legal acts are longer than 10 pages.¹⁹ According to Ieva Duncikaite, senior manager at Transparency International Lithuania, given the sporadic consultations and little trust in decision-making, this commitment could help make the legislative process more inclusive.²⁰ However, she notes its success will rely on how the Office of the Government engages public officials to change their practice of drafting legal acts.²¹

Additionally, government agencies would be required to provide feedback to comments submitted during the consultation.²² Feedback from the governmental and subordinate levels would create a two-way communication with citizens and interest groups, which is missing in Lithuania's current public consultation process.²³ The level of detail of the feedback required of institutions is yet to be determined and may depend on the comments received. According to the Ministry of Justice, citizens do not usually provide specific proposals, so their proposals might be clustered before preparing official feedback.²⁴ This will be important when foreseeing any additional administrative burdens on public officials from this commitment.

This commitment would not directly address the over-reliance of fast-tracked legislative procedures and drafting laws with urgency. A lobbyist notes that Parliament continues drafting laws with urgency and sometimes gives only three days for the public to react.²⁵ The amended procedures under this commitment will only apply to consultations at the ministerial and subordinate levels and not to the drafting of laws in Parliament.

Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations during implementation

The commitment has the ambitious goals to standardize the legislation drafting process and create better conditions for public consultations. However, the Ministry of Justice is concerned about the limited timeline for implementation. The upgrade of the TAIS is already under way but will not be finished during the action plan.²⁶ To mitigate this risk, the Office of the

Government is planning to incorporate some functions of the TAIS in its website, but the scope is unclear.

Another possible challenge is institutionalizing the common procedures once the commitment is implemented. The Office of the Government and the Ministry of Justice will develop methodological guidance for public officials on how to improve the quality of consultations and feedback mechanism but the question of how to make those guidelines a living document remains open. Currently, there is no strategy or measures to assist public officials to implement the guidelines. According to the Office of the Government, there will be a training campaign, but its content and scale will depend on the availability of resources.²⁷

To maximize the results of this commitment, the IRM recommends the following steps:

- **Ensure maximum transparency by making information on the TAIS available in open data formats and by including the legislative footprint in the updated platform.** Lithuania ranks behind most European Union member states in opening and using data for public interest in the Global Data Barometer.²⁸ Open data is essential to analyze and understand the legislative process and the acts that are registered and discussed, and for stakeholders to see and react to each other's proposals. While the upgrades to the TAIS are technically beyond the scope of this commitment, the IRM recommends ensuring the TAIS operates transparently and provides data in open data formats. Furthermore, it is important that the updated platform is user-friendly, understandable, and includes data on lobby and other meetings, reasoned response to proposals, current progress, next steps, etc. The IRM recommends making the legislative footprint publicly available and easily accessible in the updated platform.
- **Continuously update the guidance and trainings based on the experiences of public institutions.** As more public institutions draft legislation using the new standards, the Office of the Government and the Ministry of Justice could use these experiences to continuously improve the guidance and trainings to public officials. To help offset limits in capacity, the Office of the Government and the Ministry of Justice could encourage public institutions to share their own experiences in carrying out legislative processes under the new standards, particularly cases with high levels of public engagement. The Office of the Government and the Ministry of Justice could also update the guidance and trainings while monitoring the compliance with the new standards (see below).
- **Encourage public institutions to provide adequate feedback to comments.** It will be important to ensure that feedback to interested parties is detailed and includes proper considerations from the relevant public body. The IRM recommends preparing guidelines for public sector staff, explaining how to answer the public in an informative and understandable way. As an example, Croatia's e-consultation portal allows users to see each comment in real time, and links comments to specific parts of the proposed act.²⁹ After a consultation finishes, the comments and the government responses can be downloaded in Excel format, and the entire process remains visible on the portal. Finished consultations also have an accompanying report with the government's responses to the comments.

- **Monitor the compliance of future consultations with the new standards.** The utility of the standards and the guidelines will largely depend on public officials' knowledge of how to use them. Once the commitment is finished, the IRM recommends the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Government choose a group of volunteer public institutions and evaluate how this group is implementing the new standard. This could help the Office of the Government adapt its guidelines, trainings, and strategic approach to better public engagement.

Other commitments

Other commitments that the IRM did not identify as promising commitments are discussed below. This review provides recommendations to contribute to the learning and implementation of these commitments.

Under Commitment 2, the Office of the Government aims to build a customer-centric approach in the public sector. The commitment entails, among other things, training public sector staff, incentivizing innovations in customer service, developing a network of competences for service professionals, and developing a standard for exemplary customer service. The Office of the Government wishes to clarify the activities during implementation.³⁰ The IRM recommends developing specific indicators when measuring changes to the work culture in public service delivery in order to give the commitment a stronger open government lens. For example, the government could organize citizen satisfaction surveys to assess changes to public service delivery and reduced administrative burdens. Moreover, the anticipated involvement of consumer rights NGOs and private sector organizations in developing best practice exchanges could be clarified.

Under Commitment 3, the Office of the Government will improve the co-creation process in decision-making at the national level and strengthen the role of public consultations. According to a national survey by the Special Investigation Service, only 11 percent of the public, 10 percent of company managers, and 20 percent of civil servants think decision-making is open.³¹ Through this commitment, the Office of the Government aims to "ease-in" institutions with co-creation practices, as few institutions are familiar with such methods.³² The commitment foresees developing a library of best practices and learning channels for public officials, and piloting public consultations. Pilot public consultations might serve as good examples for other institutions and create a roadmap for future engagement. However, currently, the Office of the Government does not have more details about the pilot or the library.³³ For the library of best practices, the Office of the Government could look to the example of Estonia's "toolbox" of co-creation methods.³⁴ This toolbox includes guides for implementation that the Estonian government updates regularly based on lessons from implementing the methods in actual policy-making processes.

⁹ Resolution of the Government of Lithuania regarding the approval of the work regulation of the Government, amendment No. 23-15135, <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAK/e2e695906cef11eea182def3ac5c11d6?positionInSearchResults=1&searchModelUUID=e35fd987-72f0-4170-90a8-4d69fdea2e7e>

¹⁰ The Parliament is collecting proposals from the public to understand which features of TAIS need to be made more user-friendly. Parliament of Lithuania, The modernization of the TAIS system, https://www.lrs.lt/sip/portal.show?p_r=40324&p_k=1

¹¹ The Statute of Seimas, No. I-399, <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.5734/asr>

¹² Ibid.

-
- ¹³ National Audit Office, Audit of the Legislative Process, 2018, <https://www.valstybeskontrolė.lt/EN/Product/23773/legislative-process>
- ¹⁴ The ruling of the Constitutional Court of Lithuania, KT12-N4/2019, <https://lrkt.lt/en/court-acts/search/170/ta1930/content>
- ¹⁵ Research Center of the Office of the Parliament, Law-making tendencies during the Parliamentary term 2021 - 2024, 2023, https://www.lrs.lt/sip/getFile3?p_fid=36628
- ¹⁶ Office of the Government, The co-creation process of the Action Plan and the problems identified, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/atvira-vyriausybe-3/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/2024-2025-m-atviros-vyriausybes-planas-1>
- ¹⁷ Information provided by the Office of the Government during the pre-publication review, 25 January 2024.
- ¹⁸ The explanation of the Resolution of the Government of Lithuania regarding the approval of the work regulation of the Government, amendment No. 23-15135, <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAK/e2e695906cef11eea182def3ac5c11d6?positionInSearchResults=1&searchModelUUID=e35fd987-72f0-4170-90a8-4d69fdea2e7e>
- ¹⁹ The amendments to the work regulation of the Government, No. 23-15135, <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAP/b7ec63116cef11eea182def3ac5c11d6?ifwid=pyjr3nm78>
- ²⁰ Ieva Duncikaite (Transparency International Lithuania), interview by the IRM, 5 January 2024.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² The amendments to the work regulation of the Government, No. 23-15135, <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAP/b7ec63116cef11eea182def3ac5c11d6?ifwid=pyjr3nm78>
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Darius Trinkūnas (Ministry of Justice), interview by the IRM, 17 November 2023.
- ²⁵ Andrius Romanovskis, public discussion at the Parliament of Lithuania, official recording, Atviras Seimas, 21 November 2023, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zMY8hVF81Y>
- ²⁶ Darius Trinkūnas (Ministry of Justice), interview by the IRM, 17 November 2023.
- ²⁷ Ieva Kimontaite (Office of the Government), interview by the IRM, 30 October 2023.
- ²⁸ Global Data Barometer, Lithuania, 2021, <https://globaldatabarometer.org/country/lithuania/>
- ²⁹ Croatia's e-Consultation portal, <https://esavjetovanja.gov.hr/ECon/Dashboard>
- ³⁰ Ieva Kimontaite (Office of the Government), interview by the IRM researcher, 30 October 2023.
- ³¹ Lithuanian Map of Corruption, 2022/2023, Special Investigation Service, https://www.stt.lt/data/public/uploads/2023/06/d2_tyrimo_pristatymas_lietuvos_korupcijos_zemelapis_2022_2023.pdf
- ³² Information provided by the Office of the Government during the pre-publication review, 25 January 2024.
- ³³ Ieva Kimontaite (Office of the Government), interview by the IRM, 30 October 2023.
- ³⁴ Open Government Partnership, Estonia, Increasing the capacity for co-creative policy-making within government authorities, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/estonia/commitments/ee0054/>

Section III. Methodology and IRM Indicators

The purpose of this review is not an evaluation. It is intended as a quick, independent, technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process. The IRM highlights commitments that have the highest potential for results, a high priority for country stakeholders, a priority in the national open government context, or a combination of these factors.

The three IRM products provided during a national action plan cycle include:

- **Co-Creation Brief:** A concise brief that highlights lessons from previous IRM reports to support a country's OGP process, action plan design, and overall learning.
- **Action Plan Review:** A technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process.
- **Results Report:** An overall implementation assessment that focuses on policy-level results and how changes happen. It also checks compliance with OGP rules and informs accountability and longer-term learning.

In the Action Plan Review, the IRM follows a filtering and clustering process to identify promising reforms or commitments:

Step 1: Determine what is reviewable based on the verifiability of the commitment as written in the action plan.

Step 2: Determine if the commitment has an open government lens. Is it relevant to OGP values?

Step 3: Review commitments that are verifiable and have an open government lens to identify if certain commitments need to be clustered. Commitments that have a common policy objective or contribute to the same reform or policy issue should be clustered. The potential for results of clustered commitments should be reviewed as a whole. IRM staff follow these steps to cluster commitments:

- a. Determine overarching themes. If the action plan is not already grouped by themes, IRM staff may use OGP's thematic tagging as reference.
- b. Review commitment objectives to identify commitments that address the same policy issue or contribute to the same broader policy or government reform.
- c. Organize commitments into clusters as needed. Commitments may already be organized in the action plan under specific policy or government reforms.

Step 4: Assess the potential for results of the clustered or standalone commitment.

Filtering is an internal process. Data for individual commitments is available in Annex 1. In addition, during the internal review process of this product, the IRM verifies the accuracy of findings and collects further input through peer review, OGP Support Unit feedback as needed, interviews and validation with country stakeholders, an external expert review, and oversight by IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).

As described earlier, IRM relies on **three key indicators** for this review:

I. Verifiability

- **Yes, specific enough to review:** As written in the action plan, the stated objectives and proposed actions are sufficiently clear and include objectively verifiable activities to assess implementation.
- **No, not specific enough to review:** As written in the action plan, the stated objectives and proposed actions lack clarity and do not include explicitly verifiable activities to assess implementation.
- Commitments that are not verifiable will be considered not reviewable, and further assessment will not be carried out.

II. Open government lens

This indicator determines if the commitment relates to the open government values of transparency, civic participation, or public accountability as defined by the Open Government Declaration and the OGP Articles of Governance by responding to the following guiding questions. Based on a close reading of the commitment text, the IRM first determines whether the commitment has an open government lens:

- **Yes/No:** Does the commitment set out to make a policy area, institution, or decision-making process more transparent, participatory, or accountable to the public?

The IRM uses the OGP values as defined in the Articles of Governance. In addition, the following questions for each OGP value may be used as a reference to identify the specific open government lens in commitment analysis:

- **Transparency:** Will the government disclose more information, improve the legal or institutional frameworks to guarantee the right to information, improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public, or improve the transparency of government decision-making processes or institutions?
- **Civic Participation:** Will the government create or improve opportunities, processes, or mechanisms for the public to inform or influence decisions? Will the government create, enable, or improve participatory mechanisms for minorities or underrepresented groups? Will the government enable a legal environment to guarantee freedoms of assembly, association, and peaceful protest?
- **Public Accountability:** Will the government create or improve opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions? Will the government enable legal, policy, or institutional frameworks to foster accountability of public officials?

III. Potential for results

The IRM adjusted this indicator—formerly known as the “potential impact” indicator—to take into account the feedback from the IRM Refresh consultation process with the OGP community. With the new results-oriented strategic focus of IRM products, the IRM modified this indicator to lay out the expected results and potential that would be verified in the IRM Results Report after implementation. Given the purpose of this Action Plan Review, the assessment of potential for results is only an early indication of the possibility the commitment has to yield meaningful results based on its articulation in the action plan in contrast with the state of play in the respective policy area.

The scale of the indicator is defined as:

- **Unclear:** The commitment is aimed at continuing ongoing practices in line with existing legislation, requirements, or policies without indication of the added value or enhanced open government approach in contrast with existing practice.
- **Modest:** A positive but standalone initiative or change to processes, practices, or policies. The commitment does not generate binding or institutionalized changes across government or institutions that govern a policy area. Examples are tools (e.g., websites) or data release, training, or pilot projects.
- **Substantial:** A possible game changer for practices, policies, or institutions that govern a policy area, public sector, or the relationship between citizens and state. The commitment generates binding and institutionalized changes across government.

This review was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with Rugile Trumpyte and was externally expert reviewed by Thomas Kalinowski. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products, and review process are overseen by IRM's IEP. For more information, see the IRM Overview section of the OGP website.³⁵

³⁵ IRM Overview: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/>

Annex 1. Commitment by Commitment Data³⁶

Commitment 1: Establish a common framework for legislative process

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes
- Potential for results: Substantial

Commitment 2: Building a customer-centric approach and customer-based dialogue practices in the public sector

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? No
- Potential for results: Unclear

Commitment 3: Ensure the co-creation process at the national level

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes
- Potential for results: Modest

³⁶ Editorial notes:

1. For commitments that are clustered, the assessment of potential for results is conducted at the cluster level, rather than the individual commitments.
2. Commitment short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see Lithuania's action plan: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Lithuania_Action-Plan_2023-2025_December_EN.pdf

Annex 2: Action Plan Co-Creation

OGP member countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards that came into force on 1 January 2022.³⁷ The IRM assesses all countries that submitted action plans from 2022 onward under the updated standards. Table 2 outlines the extent to which the countries’ participation and co-creation practices meet the minimum requirements that apply during development of the action plan.

OGP instituted a 24-month grace period to ensure a fair and transparent transition to the updated standards. Action plans co-created and submitted by 31 December 2023 fall within the grace period. The IRM will assess countries’ alignment with the standards and their minimum requirements.³⁸ However, countries will only be found to be acting contrary to process if they do not meet the minimum requirements for action plans co-created in 2024 and onwards.

Please note that, according to the OGP National Handbook, countries implementing four-year action plans must undertake a refresh process at the two-year mark. Countries are expected to meet minimum requirements 3.1 and 4.1 during the refresh process.³⁹ IRM assessment of the refresh process will be included in the Results Report.

Table 2. Compliance with minimum requirements

Minimum requirement	Met during co-creation?	Met during implementation?
1.1 Space for dialogue: In Lithuania, there is a Working Group that consists of 24 representatives from public and private sectors, NGOs, and academia. ⁴⁰ This Working Group developed the action plan and will monitor its implementation. It met three times between February and October 2023. ⁴¹	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
2.1 OGP website: The Office of the Government maintains a publicly accessible website that contains the latest action plan, the previous action plans, and official OGP documentation. ⁴²	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
2.2 Repository: The website has a repository that is updated at least twice a year with information on co-creation and implementation of the action plans. ⁴³ Although the website contains all relevant information to the OGP process, the Office of the Government could consider adding more timestamps to the website, particularly for the activities and announcements during the co-creation process. In redesigning the website, the Office of the Government could look to the websites of Italy and Romania, which offer user-friendly structure of information on their OGP processes. ⁴⁴	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
3.1 Advanced notice: The Office of the Government published the timeline and opportunities to engage in the co-creation process on the OGP website. ⁴⁵ Preparation for developing the action plan began at the first Working Group meeting on 28 February 2023. The Office of the Government could not retrieve a timestamp for the timeline. ⁴⁶ However, an announcement about the start of the co-creation process was published on the OGP webpage on 1 March 2023, two weeks before the public consultation kicked off on 14 March 2023. ⁴⁷	Yes	Not applicable

3.2 Outreach: The Office of the Government published the opportunities to get involved on its website and on Facebook. ⁴⁸ The Office of the Government also sent invitations for stakeholders to attend the workshops. ⁴⁹	Yes	Not applicable
3.3 Feedback mechanism: Stakeholders could propose suggestions for the action plan during three co-creation workshops. Additionally, a public consultation was open from 14 March to 31 July 2023. ⁵⁰	Yes	Not applicable
4.1 Reasoned response: The Office of the Government documented contributions from Working Group members and shared them within the group. ⁵¹ The Office of the Government and other government institutions gave feedback to the proposals by Working Group members during the consultation workshops. ⁵²	Yes	Not applicable
5.1 Open implementation: The IRM will assess whether meetings were held with civil society stakeholders to present implementation results and enable civil society to provide comments in the Results Report.	Not applicable	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>

³⁷ OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards, 2021, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>

³⁸ IRM Guidelines for the Assessment of Minimum Requirements, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-guidelines-for-the-assessment-of-minimum-requirements/>

³⁹ OGP National Handbook 2022, Section 2.3, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/ogp-national-handbook-rules-and-guidance-for-participants-2022/>

⁴⁰ The Decree of the Chancellor of the Office of the Government, No. V-25.

⁴¹ Open Government Working Group, The protocols of all Working Group meetings, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/atviros-vyriausybes-darbo-grupe>

⁴² The official OGP website for Lithuania's participation, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste> and <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/atvira-vyriausybe-3/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/2024-2025-m-atviros-vyriausybes-planas-1>

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Italy: <https://open.gov.it/>, Romania: <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/>

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ieva Kimontaite (Office of the Government), correspondence with the IRM, 1 December 2023.

⁴⁷ Preparation of the Open Government Plan for 2023-2025 begins, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos/pradedamas-rengti-2023-2025-m-atviros-vyriausybes-planas?_cf_chl_rt_tk=3f3wk4Zn2pzj1mTqLqRulaZplfKzyEMS0BQgfja31DM-1702046880-0-gaNycGzNECU

⁴⁸ Office of the Government Facebook post, Invitation to get engaged in the co-creation process, 1 March 2023, <https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=206952951992147&set=pb.100080323298840.-2207520000&type=3>

⁴⁹ Information provided by the Office of the Government during the pre-publication review, 13 February 2024.

⁵⁰ Public consultation for the co-creation process, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/konsultacijos/viesoji-konsultacija-del-atviros-vyriausybes-veiksmu-planu>

⁵¹ Problem tree for the action plan: https://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/Problem%C5%B3%20medis_Atviros%20Vyriausybe%C4%97s%20planas.pdf

⁵² Meeting minutes of the three Working Group sessions during the co-creation process, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/atvira-vyriausybe-3/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/2024-2025-m-atviros-vyriausybes-planas-1>