

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Results Report:
Czech Republic 2022–2024

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 2

Section I. Key Observations 4

Section II. Early Results 6

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation 13

Section IV. Methodology 17

Annex I. Commitment Data 19

Executive Summary

The Czech Republic's sixth action plan saw moderate early results across three commitments, with progress in whistleblower protection, state grant transparency, and public participation. Compared to previous cycles, the co-creation process was more ambitious and inclusive, with expanded civil society involvement and a more inclusive approach. Moving forward, stakeholders could prioritize sustained high-level engagement and secure adequate funding for commitment implementation.

Implementation

The Czech Republic's sixth action plan comprised eight commitments.¹ Three commitments—on whistleblowing, state grant transparency, and public participation—achieved moderate early results. Notable early results included the enactment of legal protections for whistleblowers, as well as improvements in the availability and quality of state grant data.

Five commitments were fully or substantially completed, while three—on open data in education, strategy data availability, and small-scale public contracts transparency—saw limited progress. The most successful commitments, such as whistleblower protection, public participation, and state grants transparency, were initiated in the previous OGP cycle. This highlights the value of long-term reform efforts in achieving meaningful change. Institutional commitment, coupled with active collaboration with civil society organizations (CSOs), was instrumental in ensuring sustained progress and broader stakeholder engagement.

The Action Plan Review identified two promising commitments. Commitment 6, focused on transparency guidelines for small-scale procurement contracts, did not yield early results due to a strategic shift in ministerial priorities towards a national public procurement strategy away from partial reforms. Commitment 7 on state grants transparency produced modest results due to a strategic shift to a different reporting system midway through its implementation.

The previous action plan showed similar completion and early results levels, with two of five commitments—on judicial transparency and whistleblower protection—yielding early results. Institutional and context-dependent challenges, such as the length of public procurement processes and changes in implementation strategies, were largely the reasons behind delays in both plans.² The factors behind the limited completion of the remaining commitments were largely the same as the 2022–2024 action plan.

Participation and Co-Creation

The Czech Republic's OGP process is coordinated by the Ministry of Justice's Anti-Corruption Unit, with oversight from the Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency, which also serves as the multi-stakeholder forum (MSF). During the 2022–2024 action plan cycle, a new process for selecting new CSO members was piloted. It

At a Glance

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

5/8

Complete or substantially complete commitments

EARLY RESULTS

3/8

Commitments with early results

0/8

Commitments with significant results

KEY OBSERVATIONS

- Political engagement led to a more ambitious action plan
- Commitments of modest ambition can provide a foundation for longer-term ambitious change
- Long-term commitments yielded results despite delays
- Limited resources hampered implementation progress

Met the minimum requirements during implementation: Yes

involved an open call for applications to expand the scope of actors and candidates self-selecting representatives among themselves. This expanded civil society participation, but the institutional setup remained unchanged.

Key achievements in participation included the inclusion of additional commitments after high-level political discussions and the introduction of a new methodology for CSO representation within the MSF. However, challenges such as limited participation from a broader range of CSOs and underrepresentation of marginalized voices such as ethnic minorities persisted.

The co-creation process yielded three new commitments and the introduction of two ministries to the OGP process: the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry for Regional Development. While the co-creation involved high-level discussions of the action plan in the Government Council, discussions in the MSF increased but remained formal. These improvements marked a step forward from previous cycles, but efforts to ensure more diverse and sustained participation in future cycles are essential.

Implementation in Context

During the implementation period, several domestic factors influenced progress. A significant development was the departure of the Pirate Party from the coalition government in September 2024. This occurred following the dismissal of Regional Development Minister Ivan Bartos due to issues with digitizing the building permit system. This political shift led to a cabinet reshuffle but did not disrupt the overall majority in parliament.³

In terms of institutionalization, the Czech Republic continued its commitment to open government by aligning OGP initiatives with the Government Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2023–2026.⁴ This strategy emphasizes priorities such as enhancing transparency and accountability, hence reinforcing the country's dedication to open governance principles. These developments underscore the ongoing efforts to strengthen open government practices in the country, despite facing political and administrative challenges.

¹ The Czech Republic submitted its action plan with start and end dates in 2023–2024. However, it was submitted to OGP in December 2022 and is therefore referenced in this report as the 2022–2024 action plan.

² Alexandra Dubová, “IRM Results Report: Czech Republic 2020–2022,” Open Government Partnership, June 2023, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Czech-Republic_Results-Report_2020-2022_EN.pdf.

³ Jan Lopatka and Jason Hovet, “Junior party on brink of leaving Czech coalition after PM pushes out minister,” Reuters, 24 September 2024, <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/czech-pm-dismisses-outgoing-junior-party-chief-cabinet-2024-09-24>.

⁴ “Vládní koncepce boje proti korupci na léta 2023 až 2026,” [Government Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2023–2026], Ministry of Justice, March 2023, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Vladni-koncepce-boje-proti-korupci-na-leta-2023-az-2026.pdf>.

Section I. Key Observations

The key observations below offer reflections from the Czech Republic's sixth action plan cycle. These lessons aim to support the Czech Republic's future action plans and broader open government journey.

Observation 1: Political engagement led to a more ambitious action plan. Discussions at higher political levels led to more ambitious commitments in this action plan. While the initial co-creation process was conducted within the multi-stakeholder forum (MSF), the draft action plan was discussed at the Government Council level in late 2022, following the initiative of a Czech Pirate Party MP, who advocated for a more ambitious plan.¹ As a result, Commitments 6 and 7 on public procurement as well as Commitment 8 on beneficial ownership data were added before the government approved the action plan in February 2023.² This political engagement helped secure stronger backing for reforms but also introduced trade-offs as discussions were rushed, limiting detailed deliberations on feasibility and implementation strategies.³ While some civil society organizations (CSOs) welcomed the political attention,⁴ others saw an opportunity to create a more dynamic and informal setting for government-civil society collaboration earlier in the process.⁵ Future action plans could benefit from earlier involvement of key decision-makers to balance ambition with realistic execution while ensuring a more inclusive and deliberative co-creation process.

Observation 2: Commitments of modest ambition can provide a foundation for longer-term ambitious change. The Czech Republic made the greatest implementation progress on feasible reforms of modest ambition during the implementation period. However, such modest reforms may miss opportunities to meaningfully open government to citizens. Reformers are encouraged to plan strategically so that incremental steps build towards long-term transformational change. For example, Commitment 1 on piloting the methodology for civil society participation in public decision-making produced non-binding guidelines, which had limited uptake across public administration. In the next 2025–2027 action plan, the Office of the Government has included a commitment to train civil servants on the available avenues for collaboration with civil society, building on this work. Commitment 5 on increasing citizen engagement in public procurement through integrity pacts did not lead to an increase of actual use of integrity pacts by stakeholders at the moment of assessment.⁶ This commitment has not been continued in the next action plan, showcasing how modest reforms that do not have a long-term strategic aim for greater ambition can fail to deliver results. Reformers can also continue to take advantage of windows of opportunity to pursue ambitious commitments, as demonstrated by Commitment 2 on strengthening whistleblower protection.

Observation 3: Long-term commitments yielded results despite delays. Commitments with strong institutional foundations, such as whistleblower protection and state grant transparency, demonstrated that long-term efforts can lead to results, even when faced with delays. Despite significant legislative hurdles, the commitment to improve whistleblower protection has shown progress over multiple action plan cycles. Although the legislative changes were slow, the persistence of advocacy and political will has led to incremental advances. Similarly, state grants transparency has been a priority in previous cycles and has steadily moved forward. The gradual but consistent progress in these areas proves that long-term commitment and political backing can overcome challenges and drive policy change, especially in sectors that require legislative action or complex systemic shifts. This reinforces the importance of taking a long-term view when addressing issues that require both political support and structural change.

Observation 4: Limited resources hampered implementation progress. Commitment 6 to improve transparency in small-scale public procurement was not completed in the foreseen timeline due to limited dedicated personnel and financial resources at the Ministry for Regional Development.⁷ While some initial activities, such as data analysis and forming a working group, were started, they were not completed within the planned time frame. This highlights the importance of allocating sufficient resources to key commitments to ensure smoother implementation. Moving forward, stakeholders could ensure that lead implementing agencies in future action plans have the necessary financial and human resources in place.

¹ “Meeting minutes of 14 November and 12 December 2022,” Government Council for the Coordination of the Fight against Corruption, 2022, <https://korupce.cz/rada-vlady/zaznamy-z-jednani/?a=rada-vlady>.

² “Meeting minutes of 14 November and 12 December 2022,” Government Council for the Coordination of the Fight against Corruption.

³ Ján Dupák (Transparency International Czech Republic), interview by IRM researcher, 9 May 2023; Lukáš Kraus (Frank Bold & Rekonstrukce Státu), interview by IRM researcher, 10 May 2023.

⁴ Marek Zelenka (Oživení), interview by IRM researcher, 10 May 2023; Dupák, interview; Kraus, interview.

⁵ Dupák, interview; Kraus, interview.

⁶ Dupák, interview.

⁷ Officer of the Ministry for Regional Development, interview by IRM researcher, 20 March 2025.

Section II. Early Results

This section analyzes commitments that achieved the strongest early results in the action plan. To assess early results, the IRM considers commitments’ objective, the country context, the policy area, and the evidence of changes. The IRM early results assessment is determined by the depth of change that occurred and evidence that the change is expected to be sustained in time.

Table 1. Commitments with Early Results

Commitment 2: New legislation as well as awareness raising and capacity building activities strengthened whistleblower protection in the country.
Commitment 7: Enhancements to the Register of Subsidies have improved the transparency of state grants.

Commitment 2: Improving the status of whistleblowers

Implementers: Ministry of Justice

Context and Objectives

Commitment 2 aimed to pass a whistleblower protection law, accompanied by educational and awareness-raising activities. It was carried forward from the previous action plan cycle due to legislative redrafting.¹ While the law was not adopted during the previous action plan cycle as initially planned, the Ministry of Justice launched a new website dedicated to whistleblowing,² provided a form for reporting illegal behavior,³ and published a guidance on the direct application of the EU Whistleblower Directive in the absence of national legislation.⁴

Prior to this commitment, whistleblower protection in the Czech Republic had long been fragmented, as targeted legislation safeguarding whistleblowers was missing. Aligning national legislation with the EU Whistleblowing Directive, while obligatory, was essential to strengthening legal safeguards, combating corruption, and ensuring transparency in both public and private sectors.

Early results: Moderate Results

This commitment is assessed as having moderate early results. The adoption of the Whistleblower Protection Act and the accompanying awareness-raising and capacity-building efforts mark a notable shift in the Czech Republic’s approach to whistleblower protection. The legislative framework has laid the foundation for stronger safeguards, and early implementation efforts—such as training programs, public outreach, and increased reporting—indicate growing institutional engagement.

The commitment advanced open government principles by enhancing public accountability. Citizens now have clear mechanisms to report wrongdoing and oversight mechanisms are in place to ensure compliance with the new law. However, challenges remain, particularly regarding the practical application of the law, the independence of oversight mechanisms, and the adequacy of resources allocated for enforcement. While the rise in whistleblower reports suggests initial progress, the true depth of change will depend on sustained commitment, judicial interpretation, and continued refinement of the protection framework.

The commitment consisted of two milestones. The first milestone was the adoption of the whistleblower protection law, transposing the EU Whistleblower Directive into Czech law. The second milestone was related to capacity building and awareness raising activities, comprising six sub-milestones: a comparative study, a media campaign, an international conference, workshops and trainings for judiciary and public administration staff, as well as ongoing publicity and statistical monitoring of whistleblower cases.

The new Whistleblower Protection Act was adopted in June 2023 and came into effect in August 2023.⁵ Adopting the new act was a breakthrough in whistleblower protection in the Czech Republic, offering a comprehensive mechanism for reporting, safeguarding, and supporting whistleblowers. The adoption of the legislation was accompanied by intense public debate. The main contentious points being the absence of protections for anonymous whistleblowers and the

Act's application to all criminal offenses or misdemeanors for which the maximum fine is at least approximately 100,000 CZK.⁶ Additionally, a civil society stakeholder expressed concerns with the Ministry of Justice being designated as the responsible authority for whistleblower, given that it is not an independent body.⁷ According to the government, establishing an independent and autonomous external reporting channel within the Ministry of Justice falls within the EU Directive requirements.⁸

The number of whistleblower reports has been steadily increasing since the adoption of the new legislation. In 2022, prior to the new legislation taking effect, the Ministry of Justice, the designated authority for handling whistleblower reports, processed 36 submissions, only four of which fell within the scope of whistleblower protection. Between January and July 2023, the Ministry of Justice received 19 reports and only one fell under its jurisdiction. However, from August to December 2023, following the enactment of the new law, the number of reports surged to 62, with 22 meeting the criteria set by the new legislation.⁹ In 2024, whistleblower reports more than doubled, with the Ministry of Justice registering 156 reports, of which 59 were deemed relevant under whistleblower protection provisions.¹⁰ Of these, 13 reports were forwarded to the competent authorities, and criminal proceedings were already underway for 2 reports.¹¹ Public awareness of whistleblowing remains very low albeit with slight improvement since the adoption of the new legislation, increasing from 12% in 2020 to 14% in 2023. Awareness of the new whistleblower protection legislation is strikingly low, with only 13% of respondents being clearly aware of it.¹² However, according to Transparency International, public pressure led to the reinstatement of a Ministry of Justice department head who was dismissed for whistleblowing.¹³

Awareness raising and capacity building activities under Milestone 2 included a comparative study on whistleblower protection, an international conference to exchange legal insights and experience, a media campaign which generated more than 24 million impressions, as well as 16 workshops and trainings reaching hundreds of participants.¹⁴ However, the Ministry of Justice has not measured the impact of the campaign.¹⁵ The also produced methodological guidelines on implementing the new legislation, an information leaflet for the public, and an annual report on its activities in the field of whistleblower protection.¹⁶

While the new legislation marks a positive step forward, the European Union Court of Justice imposed a €2.3 million fine on the Czech Republic in March 2025 for delaying the transposition of the EU Whistleblower Directive into national law and failing to communicate transposition measures.¹⁷ Looking at the implementation of the law, its true impact moving forward will depend on how national courts apply it in practice.¹⁸ Out of three whistleblowing cases litigated by CSOs to date, the courts have ruled in favor of whistleblowers in two of them.¹⁹ At the same time, according to civil society stakeholders, the first whistleblower case under the new legislation revealed flaws in the independence in the whistleblower protection framework—particularly the fact that oversight is entrusted to the Ministry of Justice rather than an independent body.²⁰ According to the government, in this first whistleblowing case, the court acknowledged that the Ministry of Justice fulfilled its role in duly operating the internal reporting mechanism.²¹ While also acknowledging the professionalism and expertise of the officials handling the cases, CSOs have highlighted the inadequate budget allocated to the Ministry of Justice's department responsible for whistleblower protection.²²

Successful implementation of the commitment was enabled by a convergence of political will, institutional engagement, and civil society advocacy. A key factor was the renewed determination of the government to fulfil its transposition obligation under the EU Whistleblowing Directive, after repeated delays in previous action plan cycles. This political commitment was reflected in the government's program and anti-corruption priorities, helping to secure the necessary legislative momentum.²³ CSOs also played an important enabling role by contributing expertise and sustaining public pressure for reform.²⁴ The Ministry of Justice's leadership, particularly in coordinating with stakeholders and initiating capacity building activities such as training sessions and awareness raising campaigns, helped advance commitment implementation.

Several constraints limited the depth of change. The biggest challenge in the view of non-governmental stakeholders was that oversight remains with the Ministry of Justice, which is viewed as insufficiently independent to handle whistleblower reports.²⁵ This arrangement was largely a result of political negotiations during the legislative process, where establishing a new

independent authority was deemed too resource intensive and politically sensitive. Delegating oversight to an existing institution was seen as a more expedient and administratively feasible solution, despite concerns raised by civil society about potential conflicts of interest and the need for independent monitoring.²⁶ Public awareness remained low despite outreach efforts, and the budget for enforcement and monitoring was limited. Additionally, early judicial interpretations of the law highlighted gaps in protection, demonstrating the need for further legal clarification.²⁷ Many of these roadblocks were anticipated in the Action Plan Review, and while they did not halt implementation, they shaped the challenges that remain in ensuring the law's effectiveness in practice.²⁸

The enactment of whistleblower protection legislation ensures the long-term sustainability of the reform. Moving forward, the Ministry of Justice plans to provide ongoing training for those responsible for handling reports, develop methodological materials supporting legislation implementation, and improve the technical infrastructure of the external whistleblowing system.²⁹ While challenges remain, particularly in public perceptions of whistleblowing, implementing of the law, and addressing capacity building issues indicate a commitment to sustaining the reform beyond the initial implementation period.

Looking Ahead

While whistleblower protection has not been incorporated into the 2024–2026 action plan, the new legislation ensures the sustainability of the reform in the future. Moving forward, to strengthen whistleblower protection in the country, the Ministry of Justice could:

- **Enhance public awareness through media coverage.** The Ministry of Justice and civil society could work together with the media to highlight positive examples of whistleblowing, ensuring whistleblowers clearly understand their rights and available reporting channels. The Ministry of Justice could draw from the 2022 campaign promoting whistleblowing organized by the Slovak Republic's Whistleblower Protection Office.³⁰
- **Improve legal clarity and guidance** by providing comprehensive interpretation materials and case law summaries to assist whistleblowers, employers, and authorities in applying the law effectively.
- **Ensure sustainable funding and personnel capacity** within the Ministry of Justice and other relevant institutions to maintain the effectiveness of the whistleblowing system.

In the longer-term, reformers can consider and advocate for the government to:

- **Establish an independent oversight body** to handle whistleblower reports, ensuring impartiality and strengthening trust in the system. Stakeholders could draw from the experience of Spain's experience, which has created the Independent Authority for Whistleblower Protection.³¹
- **Expand whistleblower protections** beyond criminal offenses and serious misdemeanors to cover a broader range of unethical or harmful conduct, such as some property related offences (e.g., frauds with lower damage), bribery, or certain violation of labor law (e.g., allowing illegal work).³²

Commitment 7: State grants transparency

Implementers: Ministry of Finance

Context and Objectives

Commitment 7 aimed to enhance transparency in state grants by expanding the existing information system and improving data quality. Specifically, the commitment aimed to adapt the existing Register of Subsidies at the Ministry of Finance where data on subsidies, repayable financial assistance, and other similar grants funded from the state budget are recorded. Creating unified public evidence of state grants is part of the government program statement, which was published in 2023.³³

Before this commitment, information on state grants was available but fragmented across multiple, unconnected databases, making comparisons difficult. In the consultations conducted during the previous OGP cycle, stakeholders favored adapting the existing information system to

ensure that data is published in a uniform format.³⁴ This would enable one grant information system to provide standardized sets of information, improving accessibility and transparency.³⁵

Early Results: Moderate Results

While this commitment was assessed as having substantial potential for results in the 2022-2024 Action Plan Review, early results are assessed as moderate with the addition of new data and the consolidation of records on the Register of Subsidies. Improved data quality has been achieved through manual cleaning and close coordination with relevant authorities providing data. Yet, the reform's early results remain modest, as data experts estimate that one-third to one-fourth of the records still contain errors. The register also does not support analytical use. Furthermore, an unforeseen strategic shift for Milestone 1 required additional time and resources not initially foreseen.

This commitment consisted of two milestones: deciding on the technical implementation method and consolidation process of the existing databases and deploying a version of the information system that provides comprehensive data on state grants and is intuitive to use.

Throughout 2023, the General Financial Directorate, as the implementing agency, prioritized integrating new data into the Register of Subsidies while also cleaning and consolidating existing data to enhance its quality. As part of these efforts, the directorate collaborated with other state entities to standardize the exchange of subsidy data. Additionally, they introduced new control processes to ensure data accuracy, automate key steps, and strengthen analytical capabilities for improved financial planning and monitoring.³⁶ Furthermore, a portion of the data was published in an open data format, enhancing transparency in state subsidies and ensuring better accessibility and understanding for the public.³⁷

Interviewed CSOs expressed doubts about the completion of the second milestone, pointing out the persisting unreliability of data in the Register of Subsidies, the lack of information on grants awarded by municipalities, EU funds, and agricultural subsidies, as well as the inability to effectively analyze the data.³⁸ According to a civil society stakeholder, out of 4 million records, one-third to one-fourth still contain errors due to the lack of data accuracy verification by the General Financial Directorate. This has led to the creation of an alternative CSO-run state subsidy registry.³⁹

The limitations of the Registry of Subsidies led the authorities to change their approach. In early 2024, the Ministry of Finance decided to publish comprehensive subsidy data on the publicly accessible website of the State Treasury's website, MONITOR,⁴⁰ instead of further developing the Register of Subsidies. The key reason for this shift was that the older Register of Subsidies made it difficult to integrate new features for efficient and fast data processing. In contrast, MONITOR is a relatively modern and user-friendly platform that supports analytical processing and open access.⁴¹ This shift set back the reform timeline in the short term.

To ensure a smooth transition, a ministerial working group was established and legislative changes were drafted to facilitate the publication of state subsidy data on MONITOR.⁴² Once the legislation is passed, stakeholders plan to transfer all existing data from the Register of Subsidies to MONITOR, discontinue the register's operation, and publish all new state grant data exclusively on MONITOR. The timeline for this transition will depend on the legislative process and the upcoming parliamentary elections scheduled for autumn 2025.⁴³

CSOs generally view MONITOR positively, as it is more modern and intuitive to use.⁴⁴ A significant advantage is that all authorities, including municipalities, regularly use MONITOR, which could make it easier to include data on municipal subsidies. However, there are concerns that it may provide less detailed data than the Register of Subsidies, such as missing grant numbers, since MONITOR was primarily developed as an accounting system for different purposes. Additionally, the Ministry of Finance has not yet engaged data experts and CSOs in discussions about the new approach.⁴⁵ CSOs agree that the need for comprehensive and reliable state grants data is critical for public oversight and preventing misuse of funds, as evidenced by the ongoing investigation into a €3.9 million subsidy fraud involving the baking business Penam.⁴⁶

Looking Ahead

This commitment has not been carried forward into the 2024–2026 action plan. Developments in this policy area will largely depend on the outcome of the upcoming parliamentary elections in autumn 2025. Adoption of the necessary legislative changes before the elections would point to the reform being carried forward.

Moving forward, the Ministry of Finance could:

- **Involve interested stakeholders in the transition to MONITOR.** Engage civil society organizations, data experts, and the private sector in ensuring greater accountability and broader support in the transition to MONITOR. CSOs could share lessons learned from their independent subsidy monitor. Involving interested stakeholders could ensure that the system is technically functional, interoperable, and aligned with open data standards. They could also be helpful in ensuring that data on MONITOR is easily accessible and understandable to a wide range of users, such as the public, journalists, and policy makers. Transparent communication throughout the reform process will be crucial to keep stakeholders informed, build trust, and ensure their active involvement.
- **Ensure comprehensive data on MONITOR** by ensuring that all types of relevant data currently available in the Register of Subsidies, such as grant numbers, to are maintained. The Ministry of Finance could collaborate with data experts to adapt MONITOR for transparency purposes, ensuring that no critical information is lost. Establishing a formal monitoring mechanism or working group, with representation from transparency stakeholders, could help ensure accountability during the transition.
- **Leverage international best practices to explore examples from other countries** that have successfully transitioned to modern state subsidy information systems, such as the UK's grant management system⁴⁷ or Estonia's e-Government platforms.⁴⁸
- **Regularly report on and promote available MONITOR data** in collaboration with civil society. Reports could also provide guidelines on accessing the link to the information portal and on how to understand data published on the platform. This would help interested journalists, academics, and citizens understand what information is available.

¹ Alexandra Dubová, "IRM Results Report: Czech Republic 2020–2022," Open Government Partnership, June 2023, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Czech-Republic_Results-Report_2020-2022_EN.pdf.

² "Whistleblower," Ministry of Justice, <https://oznamovatel.justice.cz>.

³ "Secure Notification Form," Ministry of Justice, <https://oznamovatel.justice.cz/chci-podat-oznameni>.

⁴ "Guidance on Direct Applicability of the EU Whistleblower Directive," Ministry of Justice, 15 December 2021, https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/met-wb_aktualizace_2021-12-15.pdf.

⁵ The act on the protection of whistleblowers and its accompanying act were adopted and published in the Collection of Laws as "Act No. 171/2023 Coll," *Zákony pro Lidi*, 2023, <https://www.zakonyprolidi.cz/cs/2023-171>; "Act No. 172/2023 Coll," *Zákony pro Lidi*, 2023, <https://www.zakonyprolidi.cz/cs/2023-172>; <https://www.e-sbirka.cz/eli/cz/sb/2023/171/2025-02-15>;

"Understanding the new whistleblowing law in the Czech Republic: Key aspects and implications," Whistle Link, <https://www.whistlelink.com/blog/understanding-the-new-whistleblowing-law-in-the-czech-republic-key-aspects-and-implications>.

⁶ "Zákon o ochraně oznamovatelů dnes nabývá účinnosti. Jaký bude mít dopad?" [The Whistleblower Protection Act comes into effect today. What will be the impact?], Transparency International Czech Republic, <https://www.transparency.cz/zakon-o-ochrane-oznamovatelu-dnes-nabyva-ucinnosti-jaky-bude-mit-dopad>.

⁷ Marek Zelenka (Oživení), interview by IRM researcher, 24 February 2025.

⁸ František Kučera (Czech Republic OGP Point of Contact), pre-publication period comment, 22 May 2025.

⁹ Ministry of Justice, "Výroční zpráva o činnosti Ministerstva spravedlnosti na úseku ochrany oznamovatelů v roce 2023," [Annual Report on the Activities of the Ministry of Justice in the Field of Whistleblower Protection in 2023], Ministry of Justice, March 2024, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Vyrocní-zpráva-o-činnosti-Ministerstva-spravedlnosti-na-úseku-ochrany-oznamovatelů-v-roce-2023.pdf>, p. 5 and 12.

¹⁰ Kučera, comment.

¹¹ František Kučera and Dalibor Fadrný (Anti-Corruption Unit of the Ministry of Justice), interview by IRM researcher, 30 January 2025; "Výroční zpráva o činnosti Ministerstva spravedlnosti na úseku ochrany oznamovatelů v roce 2024," [Annual report on the activities of the Ministry of Justice in the field of whistleblower protection in 2024], Ministry of Justice, March 2025, <https://oznamovatel.justice.cz/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Vyrocní-zpráva-o-činnosti-Ministerstva-spravedlnosti-na-úseku-ochrany-oznamovatelů-v-roce-2024.pdf>.

¹² “O existenci zákona o ochraně oznamovatelů ví málokdo, většina lidí ani nezná pojem whistleblower,” [Few people are aware of the existence of the Whistleblower Protection Act, and most do not even know the term ‘whistleblower’], Oživení, 5 January 2024, <https://oziveni.cz/2024/01/o-existenci-zakona-o-ochrane-oznamovatelu-vi-malokdo>, p. 5.

¹³ “EU Whistleblower Protection: Falling short when it matters most,” Transparency International, 16 December 2024, <https://www.transparency.org/en/news/eu-whistleblower-protection-falling-short-when-it-matters-most>.

¹⁴ “Comparative Study on Whistleblower Protection,” Oživení, 2022, https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Komparativni_studie_WB_grafika_finalni.pdf; “Whistleblower,” Ministry of Justice, <https://whistleblower.justice.cz>; “Fáze implementace. 4.2 Zlepšení postavení oznamovatelů ...” [Implementation phase. 4.2 Whistleblower Protection], Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/narodni-akcni-plan-4-2-zlepseni-postaveni-oznamovatelu-protipravniho-jednani-vcetne-zvyseni-informovanosti-o-oznamovani-protipravniho-jednani>; “Annual Report on the Activities of the Ministry of Justice in the Field of Whistleblower Protection in 2023,” Ministry of Justice, p. 9; “Mezinárodní konference Zintenzivnění boje proti korupci: whistleblowing,” [International Conference Strengthening the Fight Against Corruption: Whistleblowing], Ministry of Justice, 17–18 January 2023, <https://korupce.cz/projekt-zintenzivneni-boje-proti-korupci/zintenzivneni-boje-proti-korupci-whistleblowing>; Kučera and Fadrný, interview.

¹⁵ Kučera and Fadrný, interview.

¹⁶ “Právní úprava a metodické doporučení,” [Legal Framework and Methodological Recommendations], Ministry of Justice, <https://oznamovatel.justice.cz/pravni-uprava-a-metodicke-doporuceni>; “Annual Report on the Activities of the Ministry of Justice in the Field of Whistleblower Protection in 2023,” Ministry of Justice.

¹⁷ Failure to fulfil obligations: Five Member States are ordered to pay financial penalties for failing to transpose the Whistleblowers directive, Court of Justice of the European Union, 6 March 2025, <https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2025-03/cp250029en.pdf>; “Judgment of the Court (Sixth Chamber) in Case C-152/23,” Court of Justice of the European Union, 6 March 2025, <https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=296197&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=req&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=7703528>.

¹⁸ Zelenka, interview.

¹⁹ “Případ Jany Chaloupkové” [Jana Chaloupkova case], Oživení, 14 February 2024, <https://www.whistleblowingcenter.cz/knihovna/pripad-jany-chaloupkove>; “Případ Pavla Kodyma” [Pavel Kodym case], Oživení, 23 May 2024, <https://www.whistleblowingcenter.cz/knihovna/pripad-pavla-kodyma>; “Případ Jana Benyška” [Jan Benysek case], Oživení, 24 May 2024, <https://www.whistleblowingcenter.cz/knihovna/pripad-jana-benyska>.

²⁰ Zelenka, interview; “EU Whistleblower Protection: Falling short when it matters most,” Transparency International.

²¹ Kučera, comment.

²² Zelenka, interview.

²³ “Policy Statement of the Government, 7 January 2022,” Government of the Czech Republic, 7 January 2022, <https://vlada.gov.cz/en/jednani-vlady/policy-statement/policy-statement-of-the-government-193762>.

²⁴ “Comparative Study on Whistleblower Protection,” Oživení; “Vláda Petra Fialy (ODS) schválila návrh zákona o ochraně oznamovatelů, který jde naproti korupci,” [The Government of Petr Fiala approved a bill on the protection of whistleblowers, which goes against corruption], Rekonstrukce Statu, 23 November 2022, <https://www.rekonstrukcestatu.cz/archiv-novinek/vlada-petra-fialy-ods-schvalila-navrh-zakona-o-ochrane-oznamovatelu-ktery-jde-naproti-korupci>.

²⁵ Zelenka, interview.

²⁶ Zelenka, interview; “EU Whistleblower Protection: Falling short when it matters most,” Transparency International.

²⁷ “Jana Chaloupkova case” Oživení; “Pavel Kodym case” Oživení; “Jan Benysek case” Oživení.

²⁸ Alexandra Dubová, “IRM Action Plan Review: Czech Republic 2022–2024,” Open Government Partnership, October 2023, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Czech-Republic_Action-Plan-Review_2022-2024_EN.pdf.

²⁹ Kučera and Fadrný, interview.

³⁰ “Slovakia’s Whistleblower Protection Office is celebrating its one year anniversary with a nation-wide whistleblowing campaign,” Whistleblower Protection Office of Slovakia, September 2022, <https://www.oznamovatelka.sk/en/za-prvy-rok-sa-na-urad-obratilo-300-ludi-bezi-desat-trestnych-konani>.

³¹ “El Gobierno aprueba las dos primeras medidas del Plan de Acción por la Democracia orientadas a combatir la corrupción,” Ministry of the Presidency, Justice, and Relations with the Courts of Spain, 29 October 2024, <https://www.mpr.gob.es/prencom/notas/Paginas/2024/291024-medidas-plan-accion-democracia-corrupcion.aspx>.

³² “Whistleblowing: na jaká protiprávní jednání dopadá nový zákon?” [Whistleblowing: which offences are covered by the new law?], Frank Bold, 5 December 2023, <https://frankbold.org/poradna/korupce-a-transparentnost/korupce-a-jednani-uredniku/ochrana-oznamovatelu/rada/whistleblowing-na-jaka-protipravni-jednan>.

³³ “Programové prohlášení vlády,” [Government’s programme statement], Government of the Czech Republic, 1 March 2023, <https://www.vlada.cz/cz/programove-prohlaseni-vlady-193547>.

³⁴ Lenka Kubíčková and Petr Kobza (Ministry of Finance), interview by IRM researcher, 24 February 2025; “Fáze implementace. 4.7 Zprůhlednění dotací poskytovaných státem,” [Implementation phase 4.7 State grants transparency], Ministry of Justice,

[https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/narodni-akcni-plan-nap/sesty-akcni-plan-2023-2024/faze-
implementace/4-7-zpruhledneni-dotaci-poskytovanych-statem](https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/narodni-akcni-plan-nap/sesty-akcni-plan-2023-2024/faze-implementace/4-7-zpruhledneni-dotaci-poskytovanych-statem).

³⁵ “Závěrečná zpráva k závazku 4.5 OGP,” [Final Report on Commitment 4.5 OGP], Ministry of Justice, April 2022, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Zaverecna-zprava-zavazek-4.5-OGP.pdf>.

³⁶ “Final Report on Commitment 4.5 OGP,” Ministry of Justice.

³⁷ “Register of Subsidies - Open Data,” Ministry of Finance, <https://red.fs.gov.cz/open-data>.

³⁸ Michal Bláha (Hlidac Statu), interview by IRM researcher, 11 March 2025; Zelenka, interview.

³⁹ Bláha, interview; “Hlídač dotací,” [Subsidy Watchdog], Hlidac Statu, <https://www.hlidacstatu.cz/dotace>.

⁴⁰ Kubičková and Kobza, interview; “Information System of the State Treasury MONITOR,” Ministry of Finance, <https://www.mfcr.cz/cs/ministerstvo/informacni-systemy/iissp--monitor>.

⁴¹ Kubičková and Kobza, interview.

⁴² “Implementation phase 4.7 State grants transparency,” Ministry of Justice.

⁴³ Kubičková and Kobza, interview.

⁴⁴ Zelenka, interview; Bláha, interview.

⁴⁵ Bláha, interview.

⁴⁶ Ketrin Jochecová, “Czech cops level charges in megabucks toast EU fraud case,” Politico, 25 October 2024, <https://www.politico.eu/article/two-people-and-a-company-charged-in-czech-toast-fraud-saga>.

⁴⁷ “Grant Management Function,” Government of the United Kingdom, <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/grants-management-function>; “Grant Tracker,” Government of the United Kingdom, <https://www.find-government-grants.service.gov.uk>; “Open Grants Data,” Government of the United Kingdom, <https://www.data.gov.uk>.

⁴⁸ “Estonia: Increasing the Transparency of the Funding of Non-Governmental Organisations,” Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/estonia/commitments/EE0046/?utm>.

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation

Action plan co-creation included higher level political discussions which led to the inclusion of additional commitments and expanded civil society engagement through the piloting of a new methodology for selecting MSF members, bringing two new CSO representatives into the process. Consistent MSF meetings helped civil society monitor implementation. Moving forward, the MSF could create spaces for more informal dialogue on commitments and conduct outreach to groups that have been underrepresented in the OGP process.

OGP in the Czech Republic

The OGP process in the Czech Republic is coordinated by the Anti-Corruption Unit within the Ministry of Justice. The Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency has served as the country's multi-stakeholder forum (MSF) since 2018.¹ The MSF has 15 members, consisting of 8 government and 7 civil society-academia representatives. The forum meets quarterly and is chaired by one of four senior directors at the Ministry of Justice.² An open call for applications which aimed to expand the scope of actors involved in the OGP process led to the selection of two new CSO members in 2023. Candidates selected two representatives among themselves, with the MSF acting as an observer.³ Ethnic minorities and other marginalized communities remained underrepresented. The remit, membership, and governance structure were developed prior to the 2022–2024 action plan cycle and did not change during implementation. While ministerial officials regularly attend MSF meetings, CSOs have reported that their own capacity and financial limitations hindered their ability to engage more actively in the OGP process.⁴

The Ministry of Justice maintains a regularly updated OGP website and dedicated repository, where all documents relevant to the OGP process, including national action plans, updates, and assessments are publicly accessible.⁵ Additionally, public calls for participation, such as the co-creation timeline and invitations to workshops, are announced in advance to facilitate an informed engagement. Efforts have also been made to encourage participation beyond government institutions, namely through a commitment proposal workshop for the public in 2022.⁶ However, actual participation remained largely centered around a familiar group of stakeholders already involved in the MSF. While there have been efforts to expand engagement—such as cooperation with the Government Council for Non-Governmental Non-Profit Organizations to reach a broader network, there is still room to further diversify participation and involve new actors.⁷

Action Plan Co-Creation

The action plan was co-created within the Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency. As the country's OGP MSF, the commission launched an open call in March 2022 and organized a workshop in April 2022 to collect commitment proposals from the public.⁸ The workshop was intentionally planned in a less formal way following an IRM recommendation.⁹ However, participation remained limited, with only one CSO outside of the MSF attending and submitting proposals.¹⁰ Commitments were further refined during MSF meetings before being sent for interdepartmental consultation, where the public could also provide input. The final commitments included in the action plan were jointly selected by the government and CSOs at two MSF meetings, with two new ministries joining the OGP process and four out of eight commitments included being based on civil society proposals.¹¹

Somewhat untraditionally, the draft action plan was also discussed by the Government Council for the Coordination of the Fight against Corruption in November and December 2022. This was an initiative of a Czech Pirate Party MP, following advocacy by CSO group Reconstruction of the State. This resulted in the inclusion of three new commitments to the draft action plan.¹² Both the government and CSO representatives agreed that this raised the action plan's ambition.¹³ CSOs saw the discussion on the Council level as a clear sign of political will sometimes lacking at the MSF level.¹⁴ The government approved the 2022–2024 action plan on 15 February 2023.

While the co-creation process followed a structured and formalized approach, some CSO representatives saw opportunities for a more open and informal setting for discussions between the government and CSOs.¹⁵

Participation During Implementation

During implementation, the MSF served as the primary platform for discussions, meeting approximately every three to four months. CSOs played an active role in monitoring and providing feedback to shape commitment implementation. Officials responsible for commitment implementation were regularly present in MSF meetings, allowing CSOs to directly discuss, ask questions, and provide feedback. For example, Commitment 7 on state grants transparency was actively debated between government and CSO representatives in the MSF, shaping its development.¹⁶ In addition to MSF meetings, information on commitment implementation was regularly provided on the official website.¹⁷

Engagement and dialogue between the government and CSOs improved compared to the previous action plan cycle. More CSOs participated in discussions, and the MSF meetings became livelier, allowing non-governmental stakeholders to provide greater input regarding commitment implementation. The inclusion of two new CSO members contributed to this development. Several good practices and innovative approaches helped strengthen participation throughout the action plan cycle. The regular MSF meetings dedicated to implementation served as a valuable mechanism for monitoring progress and ensuring transparency. Furthermore, conducting wider outreach to CSOs through collaboration with the Government Council for Non-Governmental Non-Profit Organizations as part of co-creation and piloting a new methodology for participatory selection of MSF members can be counted among innovative approaches of this action plan cycle.

Despite these improvements, there remained some challenges in CSO engagement. Dialogue within the MSF often retained a formal, negotiation-like character and efforts to broaden participation beyond well-established actors in the OGP process faced difficulties, with marginalized voices still underrepresented. Addressing these challenges will be crucial to ensure an inclusive and iterative dialogue between government and civil society.

The IRM uses the OGP Participation and Co-Creations Standards to assess countries' participatory practices throughout the action plan cycle.¹⁸ Countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the standards and to comply with the minimum requirements under each standard.¹⁹

Table 2. Compliance with Minimum Requirements

Minimum requirement	Co-creation	Implementation
1.1 Space for dialogue: The Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency is the Czech Republic's multistakeholder forum. ²⁰ Its basic rules of participation are publicly available online. ²¹ During the implementation phase, it met in March 2023, June 2023, October 2023, January 2024, April 2024, June 2024, September 2024, and December 2024. ²²	Yes	Yes
2.1 OGP website: The Ministry of Justice maintains the OGP website, which is publicly accessible with no password or registration required. ²³ It contains all past action plans, including the 2022–2024 action plan. ²⁴	Yes	Yes
2.2 Repository: The Ministry of Justice maintains the OGP repository, which is publicly available with no password or registration required. ²⁵ The repository is regularly updated and contains information on co-creation, implementation, and assessment of the national action plans. ²⁶	Yes	Yes
3.1 Advanced notice: See the Action Plan Review. ²⁷	Yes	Not applicable
3.2 Outreach: See the Action Plan Review.	Yes	Not applicable
3.3 Feedback mechanism: See the Action Plan Review.	Yes	Not applicable
4.1 Reasoned response: See the Action Plan Review.	Yes	Not applicable

5.1 Open implementation: The MSF met every 3–4 months during implementation, with the government providing implementation updates and CSOs providing comments. ²⁸ The updates are also provided on the national OGP website. ²⁹	Not applicable	Yes
--	----------------	-----

¹ “Komise k otevřenému vládnutí a transparentnosti státní správy,” [Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency], Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/rada-vlady/pracovni-komise-predsedy-rady-vlady-pro-koordinaci-boje-s-korupci/komise-k-otevrenemu-vladnuti-a-transparentnosti-statni-spravy>.

² The chair of the Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency is Michal Franek, Senior Director of the Section for Regulatory Coordination and Corruption Prevention. See “Management of the Ministry of Justice,” Ministry of Justice, <https://justice.cz/web/msp/vedeni-ministerstva>; František Kučera and Dalibor Fadrný (Anti-Corruption Unit of the Ministry of Justice), interview by IRM researcher, 30 January 2025.

³ “Public call for nominations for members of the Working Commission on Open Government and Transparency in Public Administration,” Ministry of Justice, 9 May 2023, <https://korupce.cz/verejna-vyzva-k-nominaci-kandidatu-na-cleny-pracovni-komise-k-otevrenemu-vladnuti-a-transparentnosti-statni-spravy>; Kučera and Fadrný, interview.

⁴ Jan Dupák (Transparency International Czech Republic), interview by IRM researcher, 11 February 2025; Marek Zelenka (Oživení), interview by IRM researcher, 24 February 2025.

⁵ “Partnersství pro otevřené vládnutí (OGP),” [Open Government Partnership (OGP)], Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-ogp>; “Národní akční plány (NAP),” [National Action Plan (NAP)], Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/narodni-akcni-plany-nap>; “Knihovna dokumentů,” [Repository], Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/knihovna-dokumentu>.

⁶ “Záznam z 1. veřejného workshopu k vytváření Akčního plánu České republiky Partnersství pro otevřené vládnutí na léta 2023 až 2024,” [1. Public workshop on the co-creation of the 2022–2024 Action Plan, Minutes], Ministry of Justice, May 2022, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Zaznam-z-1.-verejneho-workshopu-k-vytvareni-Akcniho-planu-Ceske-republiky-Partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-na-leta-2023-az-2024.pdf>.

⁷ Kučera and Fadrný, interview.

⁸ “Zapojte se do přípravy nového akčního plánu České republiky v rámci iniciativy Partnersství pro otevřené vládnutí na roky 2025 a 2026: veřejné konzultace a veřejný workshop Ministerstva spravedlnosti,” [Get involved in the preparation of the Czech Republic’s new Action Plan under the Partnership for Open Government 2025 and 2026: public consultation and public workshop by the Ministry of Justice], Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/zapojte-se-do-pripravy-noveho-akcniho-planu-ceske-republiky-v-ramci-iniciativy-partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-na-roky-2025-a-2026-verejne-konzultace-a-verejny-workshop-ministerstva-spravedlnosti>; “Minutes of the 1st public workshop on the development of the Czech Republic’s Open Government Partnership Action Plan 2023–2024,” Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Zaznam-z-1.-verejneho-workshopu-k-vytvareni-Akcniho-planu-Ceske-republiky-Partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-na-leta-2023-az-2024.pdf>.

⁹ František Kučera (Czech Republic OGP Point of Contact), correspondence with OGP Country Support, 18 June 2024.

¹⁰ “Attendance list,” Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Prezencni-listina-k-1.-verejnemu-workshopu-k-vytvareni-Akcniho-planu-Ceske-republiky-Partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-na-leta-2023-az-2024.pdf>.

¹¹ “Minutes of the MSF meetings,” Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/rada-vlady/pracovni-komise-predsedy-rady-vlady-pro-koordinaci-boje-s-korupci/komise-k-otevrenemu-vladnuti-a-transparentnosti-statni-spravy>; “Settlement of the comments on the Czech Republic’s Open Government Partnership Action Plan for the period 2023 to 2024,” Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Vyporadani-pripominek-k-Akcniimu-planu-Ceske-republiky-Partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-na-obdobi-let-2023-az-2024.pdf>.

¹² Commitments 5 and 6 on public procurement and Commitment 8 on beneficial ownership data; see “List of members,” Government Council for the Coordination of the Fight against Corruption, November 2022, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Seznam-clenu-Rady-vlady-pro-koordinaci-boje-s-korupci-rijen-2022.pdf>.

¹³ František Kučera (Czech Republic OGP Point of Contact), interview by IRM researcher, 5 May 2023; Lukáš Kraus (Frank Bold & Rekonstrukce Státu), interview by IRM researcher, 10 May 2023; Jan Dupák (Transparency International Czech Republic), interview by IRM researcher, 9 May 2023.

¹⁴ Dupák, interview, 9 May 2023.

¹⁵ Dupák, interview, 9 May 2023.

¹⁶ “Záznam z 35. jednání pracovní komise předsedy Rady vlády pro koordinaci boje s korupcí k otevřenému vládnutí a transparentnosti státní správy,” [Minutes of the 35th Meeting of the Working Commission of the Chairman of the Government Council for Coordination of the Fight against Corruption on Open Government and Transparency of Public Administration], Ministry of Justice, 25 October 2023, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Zaznam-z-35.-jednani-pracovni-komise-k-OVTSS-2023-10-25.pdf>.

¹⁷ “Implementation Phase,” Ministry of Justice, [https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/narodni-akcni-plan-
nap/sesty-akcni-plan-2023-2024/faze-implementace](https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/narodni-akcni-plan-
nap/sesty-akcni-plan-2023-2024/faze-implementace).

¹⁸ “OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards,” Open Government Partnership, 2021, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards>.

¹⁹ “IRM Guidelines for the Assessment of Minimum Requirements,” Open Government Partnership, 31 May 2022, [https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/IRM-Guidelines-for-Assessment-of-Minimum-
Requirements_20220531_EN.pdf](https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/IRM-Guidelines-for-Assessment-of-Minimum-
Requirements_20220531_EN.pdf).

²⁰ “Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency,” Ministry of Justice.

²¹ “Rada vlády pro koordinaci boje s korupcí,” [Statute and Rules of Procedure], Government Council for the Coordination of the Fight against Corruption, <https://korupce.cz/rada-vlady>.

²² “Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency,” Ministry of Justice.

²³ “Open Government Partnership (OGP),” Ministry of Justice.

²⁴ “National Action Plan (NAP),” Ministry of Justice.

²⁵ “Repository,” Ministry of Justice.

²⁶ “National Action Plan (NAP),” Ministry of Justice.

²⁷ Alexandra Dubová, “IRM Action Plan Review: Czech Republic 2022–2024,” Open Government Partnership, October 2023, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Czech-Republic_Action-Plan-Review_2022-2024_EN.pdf.

²⁸ “Working Commission on Open Government and State Administration Transparency,” Ministry of Justice.

²⁹ “Sixth National Action Plan 2023–2024 - Implementation Phase,” Ministry of Justice, [https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-
otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/narodni-akcni-plan-
nap/sesty-akcni-plan-2023-2024/faze-implementace/](https://korupce.cz/partnerstvi-pro-
otevrene-vladnuti-ogp/narodni-akcni-plan-
nap/sesty-akcni-plan-2023-2024/faze-implementace/).

Section IV. Methodology

This report supports countries' accountability and learning through assessment of the action plan's level of completion and early results. The report provides in-depth analysis of commitments or clusters that achieved the strongest early results in the action plan. It also assesses the country's participation and co-creation practices throughout the action plan cycle.¹

The 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 the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process.
- **Midterm Review:** A review for four-year action plans after a refresh at the midpoint. The review assesses new or significantly amended commitments in the refreshed action plan, compliance with OGP rules, and provides an informal update on implementation progress.
- **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 Results Reports, the IRM assesses commitments using two indicators:

Completion

The IRM assesses the level of completion for each commitment in the action plan, including commitments clustered in the Action Plan Review.² The level of completion for all commitments is assessed as one of the following:

- No Evidence Available
- Not Started
- Limited
- Substantial
- Complete

Early Results

The IRM assesses the level of early results from implementation for each commitment or cluster. To do so, the IRM considers commitments' objective, the country context, the policy area, and the evidence of changes. The Early Results indicator is determined by the depth of change that occurred and the evidence of whether the change will be sustained in time. The early results indicator establishes three levels of results:

- **No Notable Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.), the implementation of the open government commitment led to little or no positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes (if any), the IRM did not find meaningful changes towards:
 - improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector,
 - enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.
- **Moderate Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.) the implementation of the open government commitment led to positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes, the IRM found meaningful changes towards:
 - improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector, or
 - enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.

- **Significant Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.) the implementation of the open government commitment led to significant positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes, the IRM found meaningful changes towards:
 - improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector, or
 - enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.

Significant positive results show clear expectations for these changes (as defined above) will be sustainable in time.

This report was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with Alexandra Matiaško and was reviewed by Brendan Halloran, IRM external expert. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products and review process is overseen by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).³ For more information, refer to IRM webpage⁴ or the glossary of IRM and OGP terms.⁵

¹ For definitions of OGP terms, such as co-creation and promising commitments, see "OGP Glossary," Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary>.

² The IRM clusters commitments that share a common policy objective during the Action Plan Review process. In these instances, the IRM assesses "Potential for Results" and "Early Results" at the cluster level. The level of completion is assessed at the commitment level. For more information on how the IRM clusters commitments, see Section IV on Methodology in the Action Plan Review.

³ "International Experts Panel," Open Government Partnership, Independent Reporting Mechanism, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/who-we-are/international-experts-panel/>.

⁴ "IRM Overview," Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/>.

⁵ "OGP Glossary," Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/>.

Annex I. Commitment Data¹

Commitment 1: Pilot implementation of methodology for civil society participation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Modest	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion: Complete• Early results: Moderate Results
<p>Commitment 1 involved piloting the implementation of the guidelines on CSOs participation in public decision-making developed during the previous OGP cycle.² Milestones included pilot preparation, implementation in 2–3 ministries, and evaluation with follow-up recommendations. All milestones were completed with six ministries and the Office of the Government being involved in the testing phase. CSO participation was primarily tested in the adoption of strategic documents at ministries and in selection procedures for ministerial working committees.³</p> <p>In December 2024, the methodology was adopted by the Government Council for Non-Governmental Organizations and plans are underway to have it approved by the government as a non-binding document in the first quarter of 2025, paving the way for broader implementation. As the methodology has been in the testing phase with a limited number of projects, it has yielded moderate results. Given that the guidelines are not binding, securing their broader adoption across public administration beyond the pilot stage would enhance their overall effectiveness.</p>	
Commitment 2: Improving the status of whistleblowers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Modest	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion: Complete• Early results: Moderate Results
<p>This commitment is assessed in Section II above.</p>	
Commitment 3: Open data on education and the educational system	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion: Limited• Early results: No Notable Results
<p>The objective of this commitment was to expand the set of open data within the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports by creating a unified Information Systems in Education, focusing on data related to education and the educational system. This commitment was carried over from the previous OGP cycle, where its implementation was limited due to a last-minute overhaul of the entire reform.</p> <p>The milestones of this commitment included completion dates for various stages of the project, such as analytical work and public procurement for technical solutions. The timeline was postponed midway through the implementation of the action plan. Out of ten milestones, only three have been completed while two other are still underway and the remaining ones were scheduled for the future. According to the government self-assessment report, delays were caused by late work from the contractor, slow cooperation from the client, and a lack of applicants for one of the procurement competitions.⁴</p>	
Commitment 4: Expand and make available data in the Strategy Database system	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Limited • Early results: No Notable Results
<p>The objective of Commitment 4 was to enhance the quantity and quality of data, as well as the user-friendliness, of the database of strategy documents adopted by various central government bodies. Its four milestones included preparing a needs assessment, developing an implementation plan, signing a contract with the supplier, and carrying out the actual technical update of the database, planned to be implemented after the end of the action plan period (end of 2025). The first three milestone were completed. Since the transformation of the database had not yet taken place, there were no notable early results to report at this stage.</p>	
<p>Commitment 5: Involvement of the public in the monitoring of public procurement</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Complete • Early results: No Notable Results
<p>Commitment 5 sought to raise awareness about public monitoring of procurement processes among the public and contracting authorities through integrity pacts. Milestones included providing basic information about the involvement of the public in procurement for both the public and contracting authorities, sharing practical experience with integrity pacts, and conducting workshops on public participation in procurement procedures. While all commitment milestones were completed, their impact had been limited in terms of the actual use of integrity pacts by stakeholders at the time of assessment.⁵ The commitment could have broader results if uptake of integrity pacts is increased.</p>	
<p>Commitment 6: Small-scale public contracts transparency</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Limited • Early results: No Notable Results
<p>The objective of Commitment 6 was to agree on key rules in the awarding of small-scale public contracts (SSPCs) to facilitate public monitoring by making relevant data available. It consisted of three milestones: obtaining and analyzing more accurate SSPC data, establishing a working group to address SSPC transparency and limits, and developing key negotiation outputs in the form of a methodological guidance. While the commitment was considered promising in the Action Plan Review, activities for the first two milestones began but were not completed within the implementation period. As lead implementer, the Ministry for Regional Development (MRD) was fully engaged in drafting and securing government approval of the National Public Procurement Strategy for 2024–2028, which was adopted in April 2024.⁶ It covers a chapter on small-scale contracts outlining plans to adjust SSPC thresholds, establish a unified approach to publishing key contract information, and standardize the environment for awarding small-scale public contracts.⁷ In September 2024, the MRD launched a pilot operation of the Register of Public Contracts, making data on public procurement more transparent and accessible.⁸ Meanwhile, in February 2025, the Senate passed an amendment of the Public Procurement Act, inter alia, raising the thresholds for SSPC, which several anti-corruption CSOs described as controversial.⁹ The anti-corruption CSOs warned that this legislation has been passed without implementing the necessary reforms to ensure their transparency.¹⁰ This commitment has been carried over to the 2024–2026 OGP Action Plan.¹¹</p>	
<p>Commitment 7: State grants transparency</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Substantial • Early results: Moderate Results

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Potential for results: Substantial 	
This commitment is assessed in Section II above.	
Commitment 8: Improving the quality of beneficial ownership records data	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Verifiable: Yes ● Does it have an open government lens? Yes ● Potential for results: Unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Completion: Complete ● Early results: No Notable Results
<p>Commitment 8 sought to map the efficiency and potential weaknesses of the beneficial ownership register and suggest measures to enhance data accuracy and reliability. It included two milestones: the development of a progress report and an analysis of the beneficial ownership registry data quality, both of which were completed.¹² The analysis is meant to serve as a basis for implementing new EU legislation on beneficial ownership registration in the coming years.¹³ The Ministry of Justice promised to progressively implement recommendations that do not require legislative amendments.¹⁴ However, the commitment was not incorporated into the upcoming action plan. Interviewed CSOs were skeptical about the conclusions and further use of the analysis. According to their analysis,¹⁵ data in the beneficial ownership register are error-prone and the enforcement mechanism vested with the courts is weak. At the same time, there are concerns that the ministry may restrict public access to the registry due to data protection considerations.¹⁶ Since the commitment focused solely on research, with no clear pathway for its implementation at the moment of assessment, the commitment is assessed as having achieved moderate early results. Results may be achieved in the longer-term if the report and analysis contribute to improving beneficial ownership transparency.</p>	

¹ Editorial notes:

1. For commitments that are clustered, the assessment of potential for results and early results is conducted at the cluster level, rather than the individual commitment level.
2. Commitments' short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see the Czech Republic's action plan: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Czech-Republic_Action-Plan_2022-2024_December_EN.pdf.
3. For more information on the assessment of the commitments' design, see the Czech Republic's Action Plan Review: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Czech-Republic_Action-Plan-Review_2022-2024_EN.pdf

² "Metodika participace nestátních neziskových organizací v poradních a pracovních orgánech a při tvorbě dokumentů státní správy," [Methodology of CSOs participation in advisory and working bodies and in the development of state administration documents], Government Council for Non-Governmental Non-Profit Organisations, May 2022, https://www.vlada.cz/assets/ppov/rnno/dokumenty/Metodika-participace-NNO_verze-po-verejnych-konzultacich_23_5_2022_final.pdf.

³ Pavel Mička (Secretariat of the Government Council for Non-Governmental Non-Profit Organisations), interview by IRM researcher, 11 March 2025.

⁴ "Czech Republic OGP Government Self-Assessment Report," Ministry of Justice, p. 7.

⁵ Jan Dupák (Transparency International Czech Republic), interview by IRM researcher, 11 February 2025.

⁶ Officer of the Ministry for Regional Development, interview by IRM researcher, 20 March 2025.

⁷ "National Public Procurement Strategy in the Czech Republic for the period 2024–2028," Ministry for Regional Development, https://mmr.gov.cz/getmedia/fd12c1a1-7b37-40fb-9a8f-1248ea12998a/NSVZ_STRATEGIE_tisk.pdf.aspx?ext=.pdf.

⁸ "Spuštění pilotního provozu a vydání dokumentace k Registru veřejných zakázek," [Launch of the pilot operation and release of documentation for the Public Contracts Register], Ministry for Regional Development, 17 September 2024, <https://portal-vz.cz/info-forum-vzdelavani/aktuality/spusteni-pilotniho-provozu-a-vydani-dokumentace-k-registru-verejnych-zakazek>.

⁹ "Senát schválil novelizaci ZZVZ, včetně zvýšení limitů pro veřejné zakázky malého rozsahu," [Senate approves amendments to the Public Procurement Act, including an increase in the limits for small-scale public procurement], Ministry for Regional Development, 27 February 2025, <https://portal-vz.cz/info-forum-vzdelavani/aktuality/senat-schvalil-novelizaci-zzvz-vcetne-zvyсени-limitu-pro-verejne-zakazky-maleho-rozsahu>.

¹⁰ “TI varuje Senát: U veřejných zakázek malého rozsahu hrozí nárůst korupčních rizik,” [TI warns Senate: Small-scale public procurement risks increasing corruption], Transparency International Czech Republic, 25 February 2025, <https://www.transparency.cz/ti-varuje-senat-u-verejnych-zakazek-maleho-rozsahu-hrozi-narust-korupcnich-rizik>.

¹¹ See Commitment 4.6 in “Action Plan of the Czech Republic Open Government Partnership for 2024 to 2026,” Ministry of Justice, February 2025, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/Czech-Republic_Action-Plan_2024-2026_EN.pdf.

¹² “Zpráva o stavu prací na analýze kvality evidence skutečných majitelů,” [Report on the status of work on the analysis of the quality of beneficial ownership records], Ministry of Justice, <https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Zprava-o-stavu-praci-na-analyze-kvality-evidence-skutecných-majitelu.pdf>; “Analýza kvality evidence skutečných majitelů,” [Analysis of the quality of beneficial ownership registry], Ministry of Justice, 2024, https://korupce.cz/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Analýza-kvality-ESM_FINAL.pdf.

¹³ “Czech Republic OGP Government Self-Assessment Report,” Ministry of Justice, p. 12.

¹⁴ Kučera and Fadrný, interview.

¹⁵ “Analýza spolehlivosti Evidence skutečných majitelů,” [Analysis of the reliability of the beneficial ownership register], Datlab, 5 December 2022, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/12EYwFMdb53DzRqt5fgE2OkHp8ojHnecq/view>.

¹⁶ Jiří Skruhovec (Datlab), interview by IRM researcher, 20 March 2025; Zelenka, interview.