

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Lithuania Co-Creation Brief
2025

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Overview

This brief from the OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) supports the co-creation process and design of Lithuania's seventh action plan. It provides an overview of OGP processes in the country and presents recommendations based on collective and country-specific IRM findings. The co-creation brief draws from [prior IRM reports for Lithuania](#), the [OGP National Handbook](#), [OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards](#), and IRM guidance on [the minimum requirements](#). Section 1 offers guidance for OGP processes and co-creation and Section 2 for commitment design. Government and civil society can determine the extent to which this brief is used to shape the next action plan's trajectory and content.

The co-creation process of Lithuania's sixth action plan (2023-2025) [saw](#) improvements compared to previous action plan cycles. The Office of the Government formed a new Working Group that operates as a multi-stakeholder forum, where most government members have decision-making powers within their institutions. The Office of the Government reached a wider range of stakeholders compared to previous cycles, and the drafting of the action plan involved a variety of workshops in the Working Group. The Working Group confirmed the final list of commitments by voting.

To build on these improvements for the co-creation, the IRM recommends the Office of the Government take the following steps for the seventh action plan:

- Before the co-creation process, publish a timeline and overview of the opportunities to get involved.
- Conduct targeted outreach to new and/or underrepresented groups.
- Publish a summary of the results of the co-creation process before the action plan is finalized.

Section I: Action Plan Co-Creation

The following recommendations present opportunities for national reformers to strengthen OGP institutions and processes in the country.

Recommendation 1. Before the co-creation process, publish a timeline and overview of the opportunities to get involved.

Per the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards, the Office of the Government should publish on the [OGP webpage](#) the co-creation timeline and overview of the opportunities for Working Group members and other interested stakeholders to participate *at least two weeks before the start of the action plan co-creation process*. This could include background information on the OGP process in Lithuania and a summary of the process of drafting and selecting the commitments for the action plan. It should also provide appropriate notice of consultations to facilitate the participation of any interested stakeholders.

Recommendation 2. Conduct targeted outreach to new and/or underrepresented groups.

During the sixth action plan's co-creation process, the Office of the Government published invitations to participate in the consultations on its website and on the government's Facebook page. Although the Office of the Government organized a two-week public consultation, no additional comments from the public were submitted. For the seventh action plan, the Office of the Government and the Working Group could take a more proactive approach to increasing stakeholder engagement. This could involve targeted outreach to stakeholder groups that have not participated in previous OGP action plans, with an aim of having more diverse perspectives represented in the process. The IRM recommends inviting new stakeholder groups to participate in Working Group discussions around topics that may be of interest to these groups. The Office of the Government could engage civil society organizations at the local and municipal levels, as well as underrepresented groups such as women, youth, ethnic minorities, and persons with disabilities.

When reaching out to new organizations the Office of the Government could first define the policy areas they are prioritizing and then clearly communicate these policy areas. For example, they could ask youth groups to define challenges that youth face in participating in national policy-making processes and what the solutions could be. This way, the commitment proposals are specific and relevant to the group, giving an incentive in terms of concrete outcomes.

Recommendation 3. Publish a summary of the results of the co-creation process before the action plan is finalized.

For the sixth action plan, the Office of the Government documented contributions from Working Group members and shared them within the group. The Office of the Government and other government institutions also gave feedback to the proposals by Working Group members during the consultation workshops. While this method of reasoned response adheres to OGP's Participation and Co-Creation Standards, the Office of the Government could go further for the seventh action plan. This could entail centralizing all commitment proposals and discussions from the consultations in a single document with the government's response next to each proposal, as well as the voting results from the Working Group (if the process involves voting, like the sixth action plan). The Office of the Government could also produce a summary of the Working Group consultations from the co-creation process.

Section II: Action Plan Design

The following recommendations offer policy areas for national actors to consider in the next action plan. They may represent opportunities for new commitments to address issues of national importance or to advance existing reforms.

Area 1. Strengthen participatory and deliberative democracy

According to a [national survey](#) by the Special Investigation Service in 2023, only 11 percent of the public in Lithuania, 10 percent of company managers, and 20 percent of civil servants think decision-making is open. Lithuania's sixth OGP action plan included a commitment that would [apply common standards](#) for drafting legal acts at the ministerial and subordinate levels and a commitment that [foresees](#) a library of best practices and learning channels for public officials, as well as piloting public consultations. The seventh action plan provides an opportunity to deepen the government's culture of participatory and deliberative democratic processes at the national and local levels. The OECD has [outlined](#) ways to institutionalize deliberative democracy, including giving citizens the right to demand a deliberative process, requiring deliberation before certain kinds of policy decisions, sequencing deliberative processes throughout a policy cycle, and connecting deliberation to parliamentary committees.

Lithuania could consider the following steps and methods for participatory and deliberative democracy in the seventh action plan:

- **Piloting co-creation methods and training civil servants:** Lithuania could expand its previous commitments in nurturing co-creative and participatory processes. This could involve running more co-creation pilots and offering training and support to civil servants in conducting participatory processes, at both national and local levels. As an example, Estonia is using several OGP action plans to [develop](#) a government-wide digital tool for citizens to participate in the lawmaking process, create a toolbox of co-creation methods for policy makers, and test co-creation methods in real-life policy-making exercises. Estonia is also creating a roadmap for wide adoption of co-creative policy-making methods at the national and local government levels.
- **National dialogues:** Lithuania could adopt the "National Dialogues" model, [piloted](#) by Finland during the COVID-19 pandemic. This model aims to provide an informal environment for citizens, particularly those living in regions, to meet people from diverse sectors and discuss topics that are important to them. Lithuania could draw on the experiences of Finland, which is [expanding](#) the format in its 2023-2027 OGP action plan, as well as Latvia, which [has been using](#) the format since 2023. If Lithuania pursues the National Dialogues model, the government could specify how the feedback collected by the dialogues will be included in the country's policy-making processes.
- **Creation of a participation team:** Lithuania could create a specialized citizen participation team or network in the government to support participatory and deliberative methods in decision-making. The team would help institutions follow participation guidelines, maintain institutional knowledge, and increase the quality of participatory and deliberative mechanisms. For example, France's Interministerial Center on Citizen Participation [offers](#) interdepartmental support,

advice, and expertise dedicated to citizen participation. In Estonia, most ministries have public engagement coordinators, and the government has used OGP action plans to [develop](#) a toolbox of co-creation methods for these coordinators.

- **Explore deliberative practices for defense and security matters:** National security has been a topic of concern for the Lithuanian government and public since Russia's military invasion of Ukraine. It is important for the government to build and maintain the public's trust and understanding in its decisions and policies around defense. To do so, the government could engage citizens in discussions of defense matters before it takes actions that might affect the lives of ordinary citizens.
- **Citizens' assemblies:** Lithuania could incorporate citizens' assemblies in national and local policy-making. This could entail establishing rules for how deliberative processes will interact with constitutional, legislative, and regulatory processes, such as clarifying when they will occur and how they will inform final decisions. For example, Ireland [has used](#) citizen assemblies for discussing constitutional changes and major policy reforms, while Paris [has institutionalized](#) a permanent citizens' assembly, contributing to policy solutions for topics such as homelessness and climate-friendly urban development.

The brief was reviewed by IRM senior staff for consistency, accuracy, and with a view to maximize the context-relevance and actionability of the recommendations. Where appropriate, external reviewers or members of the IRM International Experts Panel (IEP) review briefs.