Independent Reporting Mechanism

Action Plan Review: Romania 2025–2027

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Table of Contents

Section I. Overview 3
Section II. Promising Commitments 5
Section III. Methodology 15
Annex I. Commitment Data 17
Annex II. Action Plan Co-Creation 19

Section I. Overview

In 2025, Romania published its first Open Government Strategy and seventh national action plan. The plan proposes promising steps to improve the transparency of political finance and national investment funds, and pilot open government at the local level. The co-creation process was inclusive, adopting new public consultation practices.

Romania's seventh action plan includes 13 commitments. It builds on previous plans' efforts on open data, political finance transparency, de-bureaucratization, national investment funds, local open government, and inclusion and gender equality. New areas include reforms on the accessibility of the Romanian Gendarmerie, e-government services, and participation and transparency on infrastructure projects.

The plan aligns with broader strategies, including Romania's first Open Government Strategy 2025–2030, the European Union's National Recovery and Resilience Plan,[1] and OECD recommendations.[2] The co-creation process was led by the General Secretariat of the Government (SGG), accompanied by the National Coordination Committee (CNC)—Romania's OGP multistakeholder forum. The action plan shares a similar level of ambition as the previous two plans.

Three commitments propose promising reforms. Commitment 4 plans to enhance political finance transparency by addressing legislative gaps highlighted by civil society and the media following the 2024 presidential elections. Commitment 8 intends to publish data on all nationally funded investment programs, expanding on the previous action plan's successful efforts to open data on two programs. Under Commitment 13—submitted to the Open Gov Challenge, three local authorities will pilot their own open government action plans. The remaining commitments either build on ongoing initiatives, seek to implement existing legal provisions, or plan to test new practices within a few institutions.

At a Glance

MEMBERSHIP

2011	**Joined OGP**

COMMITMENTS

13/13	**Open government lens**
2/13	**Substantial potential for results**

PROMISING COMMITMENTS

- Increase transparency of political funding
- Increasing accessibility of data on investment programmes
- Strengthening open government at the local level

Met the minimum requirements during co-creation: Yes

In terms of co-creation, the action plan was developed through an inclusive process. Innovations included public consultation on the co-creation calendar, and the use of an online platform to solicit commitment proposals from the public as well as track progress and feedback in real time.

The start of co-creation was delayed by elections. The SGG opened the proposed co-creation calendar for public consultation in December 2024, followed by a six-month co-creation process. In January and February 2025, a public call gathered 28 commitment proposals—10 from civil

Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

society and 18 from government institutions. Over the next three months, the SGG facilitated iterative discussions with those who proposed commitments and relevant government institutions. The resulting draft action plan then went through a two-week public comment period. Participation in the CNC was sporadic, meeting once during the co-creation process to discuss and adopt the final action plan in June 2025. Three of the final 13 commitments originated from civil society proposals.

Following the co-creation process, the CNC began holding thematic working group meetings for each commitment and updated its structure. In 2025, it selected three alternate members from civil society who participate in all the plenary and thematic working group meetings but may not vote. This helped preempt any existing members' potential withdrawal and ensured continuity and wider representation. In case a regular spot becomes vacant, an alternate member steps in.

Maintaining steady engagement will be essential to the action plan's results. Potential challenges include budget constraints, reconfiguration of CNC membership after co-creation,[3] inconsistent participation by civil society and government decision-makers, political prioritization of open government issues, and understanding of open government among broader civil society.[4] Implementation will depend on striking a balance between political backing and support from technical staff. At the outset of implementation, representation of government institutions at the decision-making level would help enable work planning and drive the direction of forthcoming activities. Certain commitments (3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13) would benefit from clarifying civil society's expected role in implementation.

Romania's new Open Government Strategy provides an opportunity to institutionalize the OGP process. It aims to increase the resources allotted to open government initiatives and enhance the SGG's coordinating role. It also intends to strengthen the regulatory framework for open government, increase the use of digital platforms for transparency and civic participation, and improve civil society's operating environment. The Strategy envisions establishing a multistakeholder National Committee for Open Government. Ensuring systematic cooperation between the National Committee and the CNC would provide a stronger basis for implementing this action plan.

---

[1] "Strategia pentru Guvernare Deschisă," Secretariatul General al Guvernului (SGG), November 2024, https://sgg.gov.ro/1/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/Anexa-1_Strategia-pentru-Guvernare-Deschisa.pdf.
[2] "Open Government Review for Romania," Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 7 July 2023, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/open-government-review-of-romania_ff20b2d4-en.html.
[3] Andrei Nicoara (Member of the National Coordination Committee), interview by IRM researcher, 24 October 2025.
[4] Septimius Parvu (Expert Forum), interview by IRM researcher, 17 October 2025; Nicoara, interview.

Section II. Promising Commitments

This section analyzes commitments with the most promise to achieve notable results, according to IRM assessment. Promising commitments address a policy area important to stakeholders or the national context. They must be verifiable, have an open government lens, and a modest or substantial potential for results. This review looks at challenges, opportunities, and recommendations to support implementation.

Table 1. Promising Commitments

Commitment 4: This commitment aims to improve the transparency of political finance in Romania by addressing legislative gaps and strengthening collaboration with civil society.
Commitment 8: This commitment promises to increase the availability and accessibility of data on investment programs financed from national funds.
Commitment 13: This commitment intends for local authorities to pilot development and implementation of mechanisms for open government and public participation.

Commitment 4: Increase transparency of political funding

Implementers: Permanent Electoral Authority (AEP) and Expert Forum

For a complete description, see Commitment 4 of the action plan.

Context and objectives

This commitment aims to increase the transparency of political funding and electoral campaigns in Romania. It was proposed by the non-governmental organization Expert Forum. It continues efforts from the fifth OGP action plan[1] and aligns with the two previous national anti-corruption strategies' election integrity objectives.[2] Romania's legislation on financing the activities of political parties and electoral campaigns[3] includes some strong provisions aligned with international best practice – for instance, bans on foreign funding, limits on funding from corporations, contributions to campaigns, and spending, as well as requirements for regular, public, and itemized reporting.[4] Political finance legislation has been amended over the past decade—most recently in January 2025 through an emergency ordinance.[5]

Despite these amendments, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and Expert Forum have noted recurring challenges in accessing timely information regarding funding and expenditures. These include inconsistent reporting by political parties, with limited granularity and information on donors' identity or on activities beyond electoral campaigns.[6] They highlight a need for greater oversight of campaign finance, including detailed itemized expenditure reporting, enforceable legal requirements on regular publication, and a strengthened auditing role for the Permanent Electoral Authority (AEP).[7] While the AEP has increased the publication of control reports in more accessible formats, such information has not been sufficiently detailed for reuse and analysis.[8] In addition, they flag the lack of public debate and consultation around changes to the electoral law in January 2025.[9] The need for further reform has been particularly salient since the 2024 elections for European Parliament, Romanian Parliament, and Romanian President (later cancelled by the Constitutional Court), when key candidates did not report any expenditures or provided false information.[10]

Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting

Potential for results: Substantial

Members of the National Coordination Committee (CNC) expect this commitment to substantially improve political finance transparency if it has sufficient political backing.[11] Its reforms could respond to important gaps identified by the OSCE and civil society regarding public subsidies, political advertising, as well as the completeness, level of detail, and timeliness of data published. This could allow the public to track how public funding for political parties is being spent and strengthen the AEP's control capacity.

The commitment text outlines broad plans to analyze difficulties in financial data collection, propose legislative amendments for greater transparency on income and expenditure—particularly regarding state subsidies, and ensure efficient auditing. It also seeks to implement EU Regulation 2024/900 on political advertising, which covers clear labeling of political advertisements, quick publication of information on advertisements, and restrictions to online advertisement techniques and advertisement sponsorship by entities from non-EU countries.[12] The commitment text does not specify the particulars of intended reforms as stakeholders hoped to provide flexibility during implementation.[13] Both civil society and AEP representatives expect the commitment to incorporate systematic consultations to define improvements to be made to campaign finance legislation and the availability and usability of data.[14]

In January 2026, the AEP announced that it would be drafting legislation on political finance, along with two other major legislative projects.[15] Expert Forum expects the commitment to support development of this national legislation and clear public procedures for marking and reporting political advertising, particularly outside of campaign periods. It also expects the AEP to establish predictable and mandatory mechanisms for the publication of detailed income—particularly state subsidies—and expenditure data during campaigns in consistent and understandable formats. Expert Forum expects it to expand the AEP's capacity to produce more comprehensive control reports in open data format.[16]

Under this commitment, the AEP also plans to operationalize an online application for political actors to report their political funding information. This aims to make reporting faster, more structured, systematic, accurate, and verifiable.[17] This could be a positive step towards consistency in reporting—provided that use of the application becomes mandatory and that the AEP refines this tool in collaboration with civil society organizations to account for their difficulties in accessing relevant data.

These steps could improve access to detailed information on sources of funding and expenditures, as well as donors and beneficiaries of spending, in a format that can be easily analyzed and cross-checked with other databases. In turn, strengthened transparency could provide civil society with opportunities to demand accountability on public spending and oversight bodies' performance.[18]

Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations during implementation

This commitment offers an important opportunity to close legislative gaps that prevent the detailed reporting and publication of political finance data during and outside of electoral campaign periods as well as improving public participation in determining reforms. Its success will hinge on the scope of the reforms adopted following the consultation process and whether they address the challenges identified by the OSCE, Expert Forum, and the Council of Europe Group of States against Corruption. Passage of reforms will depend on making this effort a

Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

political priority and closing gaps prior to the next general election in 2028. Both the AEP and civil society have committed to using public consultations and outreach to political actors to galvanize interest. The IRM suggests focusing AEP's efforts on the following:

- **Use consultations to build political momentum.** Consultations with political parties and the Court of Accounts will be key to understanding where they encounter difficulties in reporting financial information and surfacing solutions. Including civil society in consultations can support political momentum by surfacing public demand for reform. The OGP platform can also help to establish regular dialogue and garner political buy-in prior to the 2028 election.
- **Make political finance data open, interconnected, and useable**. Explore the opportunity for interconnections between the AEP online reporting application and other public databases, such as those related to fiscal authorities and asset declarations.[19] Consider add-ons to the application that allow for automatic data verification. These would increase the verifiability of the data and the capacity for oversight, including by civil society.
- **Improve existing practices while legislative amendments are underway.** Prior to regulatory changes, the AEP could work with civil society to strengthen its internal practices in processing political parties' reports in compliance with current legislation as well as co-design efforts to implement the EU regulation on political advertising. The AEP could consider publication in open data formats in tandem with the General Secretariat of the Government's (SGG) efforts under Commitment 5.

Commitment 8: Increasing accessibility of data on investment programmes

Implementers: Ministry of Development, Public Works, and Administration (MDLPA), Expert Forum, Re:Rise Association, and Help Autism Association

For a complete description, see Commitment 8 of the action plan.

Context and objectives

This commitment's primary objective is to increase the availability and accessibility of data on nationally funded investment programs. It aims to solve the problem of previously limited, non-uniform, and hard-to-reuse publicly available data from these programs. This will be achieved by automating reporting and utilizing the investitii.mdlpa.ro platform to include comprehensive and uniform information from all relevant programs under the Ministry of Development, Public Works, and Administration (MDLPA) and subordinated institutions. Ultimately, the goal is to enhance transparency regarding public funds expenditure, facilitate data re-use by stakeholders, and improve institutional accountability. The project seeks to create replicable, machine-readable open datasets with new dimensions such as the spatial location of investments. This continues a commitment from the previous action plan which achieved significant results – publication of data on two substantial investment programs, totaling approximately EUR19 billion, provided a new avenue for public monitoring of the programs' implementation.[20]

Transparency and participation in decision-making around public investment funds have been a long-standing concern for civil society and the media.[21] Romania has seen major corruption cases related to public procurement in recent years, with allegations of preferential funding for certain companies based on political criteria.[22] In a 2023 audit, the Court of Accounts noted that the MDLPA had not utilized the same indicators across different investment programs and had

Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

limited capacity to conduct proper checks and controls. In addition, it noted waste of public resources in the implementation of housing programs.[23]

Potential for results: Substantial
Against this backdrop, this reform would make a clear departure from practices that have impeded journalists and civil society from accessing information, analyzing investment and project execution data, and demanding accountability on how public money is being spent. Members of the National Coordination Committee (CNC) view this commitment as having substantial potential for results on the transparency of nationally funded investment efforts, with the potential to achieve long-standing reform efforts.[24]

The MDLPA intends to begin consistently releasing information of all investment programs it manages, expanding from the two programs targeted by the previous action plan. An MDLPA representative clarified that the ministry is aiming for complete coverage of investments by the end of the implementation period, with published datasets on investment programs such as those managed by the National Investment Company and the National Housing Agency, totaling an additional EUR 4.7 billion approximately.[25] This would concretize an institutional shift in transparency practices started during the previous action plan. Beyond the data categories already being published, the ministry would also add the exact location of the field investment, which would be particularly useful for analysis of programs. Meanwhile, starting with the two programs targeted by the previous action plan, the ministry would improve data accuracy and begin using a common reporting template and platform. It will seek interconnections between the platform and other databases, such as the fiscal authority and the commerce registry for further data accuracy. This comes in response to civil society concerns on the lack of consistency in reporting and could ease data analysis across reporting entities.[26]

An MDLPA representative expects transparency to continue improving collaboration with civil society. In the past, the ministry noted that as more data were released, they received fewer requests for public information and saw more instances of data used for analyses by civil society and journalists.[27] With new information to be released under this commitment, they expect this trend to continue. According to an Export Forum representative, analysis by civil society and journalists could lead to fine-tuning the publication of information and improve investment program design.[28] In the longer term, this reform may provide a template for other public institutions facing similarly complex data transparency issues.

Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations during implementation

This commitment provides an opportunity to address major integrity issues with public funds expenditure, with the OGP platform helping maintain focus on this reform. Successful implementation would need to address the challenges faced by local authorities in adopting and implementing electronic tracking and reporting tools,[29] as the main recipients of the investment programs. Sustained dialogue between the MDLPA and civil society will be key to ensuring sustainability of the changes. With a small lead team dividing responsibilities across multiple priorities, resource constraints may continue to present a challenge as with the previous commitment. During implementation, the IRM recommends the following:

- **Maintain political support for adequate resourcing.** A dedicated team and budget are necessary to continue refining and expanding access to timely and accurate information, making this process sustainable in the long run.
- **Continue engaging civil society.** As in the past, the MDLPA can continue to partner with civil society on developing technical solutions, improving reporting standards, and leveraging public interest to maintain political support for this reform. Controls and social audits by civil society organizations can help the ministry to assess the effectiveness of programs it manages, whereas media reporting can help ensure that data is used to identify instances of malpractice or corruption. This could also respond to the issues raised in the national audit report of the Court of Accounts.[30]
- **Explore interconnectivity with other datasets.** The MDLPA could work with other authorities to improve data interconnectivity, supporting oversight from relevant bodies. There is a specific opportunity to collaborate with the Court of Accounts and National Archives as they implement Commitment 2 on data governance and interconnectivity.
- **Provide support to reporting authorities.** The MDLPA can work with civil society and other stakeholders to build local authorities' capacity—particularly smaller ones—to manage public investment funds and ensure proper reporting on the ministry's platform, therefore ensuring adequate resources, training, and support.

Commitment 13: Strengthening open governance at local level

Implementers: General Secretariat of the Government (SGG)

For a complete description, see Commitment 13 of the action plan.

Context and objectives

This commitment plans for a pilot to strengthen local-level open government practices. The commitment was submitted to the Open Gov Challenge[31] and aligns with priorities of Romania's Open Government Strategy. It builds on efforts from Romania's fourth national action plan, which included a commitment to support local authorities' adoption of open government practices and participation in OGP Local.[32] Through the OGP Local program, Iasi[33] and Timișoara[34] undertook seven commitments on citizen participation, open data, participatory budgeting, waste management, and capacity building on open government.

Potential for results: Modest

This commitment has modest potential for results, providing a positive step towards the long-term process of institutionalizing open government policies and practices at the local level. It intends for three local authorities to pilot co-creation of their own open government action plans – The General Secretariat of the Government (SGG) reported that stakeholder engagement would be modeled on the national OGP process.[35] The commitment also includes local authorities' adoption of innovative participatory practices, such as citizen juries and participatory budgeting. This is to be assisted by mapping existing participation tools as well as ongoing mentoring and monitoring support. Lessons learned from the pilot local authorities would be shared through replicable models and guidance, therefore informing national open government policies and enabling wider adoption across municipalities.

The commitment includes a detailed description of milestones and activities, but certain aspects had not yet been determined during the early implementation period. In April 2026, a selection process was underway to determine which municipalities would participate in the pilot.[36]

Stakeholders were unable to provide information about resources to be mobilized for implementation, and plans to scale the efforts beyond the two-year implementation period.[37] By February 2026, the dedicated National Coordination Committee (CNC) working group for this commitment had not yet met.

If successfully implemented, the pilot activities could inspire others or offer a proof of concept to those considering expanding their menu of citizen participation options. As a civil society member of the CNC expressed, this commitment can help build momentum for open government reforms by promoting good practices that can lead to greater uptake among other local authorities.[38] It responds to OECD's Open Government Review concerns of the lack of systematic and sustainable approaches to open government at the local level, combined with a lack of resources, expertise, and effectiveness.[39] If civil society at both national and local level is actively involved, the commitment could address residents' needs through the local action plans, and elicit citizen calls for other local authorities to start implementing open government measures.

Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations during implementation

The success of this commitment will depend on how locally owned and co-created open government action plans achieve concrete results for local communities. In the longer term, results will rest on how the open government processes being piloted become a sustainable part of the participating governments' practices, and how the practice of local open government action plans are scaled to more local governments beyond the pilot. The General Secretariat of the Government (SGG) can draw on the experiences of OGP counterparts like Spain and Mexico that have successfully scaled local open government in their countries,[40] as well as OGP Local members like Timișoara, which could potentially provide mentorship to the local authorities selected for the pilot. Sustained commitment and funding from the central and local governments would enable long-term success despite short-to-medium-term constraints.[41] To support implementation, the IRM recommends prioritizing ambitious local commitments and strong accountability mechanisms:

- **Implement the commitment in close collaboration with civil society and municipalities that have experience with open government measures.** To support this commitment, the SGG and the Ministry of Development, Public Works, and Administration (MDLPA) can leverage the expertise of civil society organizations and local authorities with prior experience implementing open government plans and participatory tools successfully as well as the Association of Public Managers.[42] To ensure that the pilot local action plans address local residents' needs, local authorities can embark on collaborative co-creation processes with meaningful local civil society participation.
- **Provide incentives to scale local open government practices.** The SGG and MDLPA could assess existing tools that could be used to incentivize the participation of local authorities in open government practices. For instance, provision of additional funding or earmarked percentages of local development funds could be specified for supporting public participation.[43] The framework of the National Anti-Corruption Strategy could also potentially be leveraged. MDLPA could also consider resuming monitoring the strategy's implementation at the local level,[44] or requiring local authorities to include open government principles in their integrity plans. As a model, some municipalities have been able to access EU funding for implementation of their integrity plans.[45]
- **Tailor OGP guidance to the needs of participating local authorities.** As local authorities design their own open government processes and plans, they could make use of

resources such as the OGP local handbook, local co-creation playbook, IRM toolkit for local monitoring, Participation and Co-Creation Standards, and Open Gov Guide.[46]

Other commitments

Other commitments that the IRM did not identify as promising commitments are discussed below.

The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure has undertaken two commitments to expand ongoing open government practices. Under **Commitment 1**, on two sections of its website, it would publish more infrastructure programs data and provide public interest information. Under **Commitment 12**, the ministry plans to formalize dialogue with civil society organizations by creating a Consultative Council—modeled on the good practices of the Social Dialogue Commission which includes trade unions and industry associations.[47] The ministry plans to leverage the Consultative Council to decide what additional information will be published under Commitment 1, although its wider functions have yet to be determined.[48] In implementing these commitments, the IRM recommends that the ministry and civil society co-develop the Consultative Council's procedures and selection process as well as providing it with a clear role in the ministry's decision-making processes. It would also be valuable to publish new datasets in an open data format.

Several commitments focus on digital and data governance. They respond to requirements and recommendations set out in other strategies, such as the OECD Open Government Review of Romania, the National Digital Connectivity Plan, Romania's Open Data Strategy for 2024-2028, and the Court of Accounts' 2023–2028 Digitalization Strategy.[49] **Commitment 2** intends to publish good practices on data management, co-created with the Romanian Court of Accounts, the National Archives, and the National Association of the Software Industry, and is expected to contribute to larger data governance reforms in Romania.[50] **Commitment 5** plans to pilot practices implementing a law on open data and the re-use of public sector information, in a limited number of public institutions. **Commitment 7** plans to leverage the General Secretariat of the Government's (SGG) Innovation Lab[51] to involve citizens and ministries in the initial testing of collaborative methods for designing e-government services and encouraging adoption of the Electronic Identity Card (EIC). Building from the experimentation and innovation planned by these commitments, implementers could raise their ambition level by systematically supporting uptake of resulting good practices across government institutions. These commitments can inform next steps to improve data governance, interoperability, and transparency in Romania.

Some commitments have internally-focused objectives. For all county-level Ministry of Culture offices, **Commitment 3** seeks to establish standard operating procedures on provision of information and services, continuing efforts from the previous action plan.[52] This could modestly improve access to information by standardizing the websites of the ministry's 42 offices. It could also have peripheral results on delays in issuing construction permits for sites under the Ministry of Culture's purview.[53] Implementation would benefit from starting with thorough public consultations on the changes needed, centering on beneficiaries' needs. **Commitment 6** aims to roll out a new IT application to digitize the management and implementation of EU-funded Internal Affairs programs for 2021–2027. While it promises to facilitate more efficient project submission, monitoring, and reporting, it has a weak open government lens. The commitment could be strengthened by focusing on wider transparency of relevant programs and offering a clear role for civil society in designing the process and providing feedback beyond the functionalities of the application.

Three commitments address inclusion and gender equality. **Commitment 10** focuses on the helpline for victims of domestic violence. Its milestones relevant to open government values are annual studies and beneficiary feedback analysis. Data related to the helpline is a small component of that needed by researchers and civil society, as standardized collection of domestic violence data is limited and fragmented in Romania. To raise this commitment's ambition, the government could address wider data needs and engage civil society to improve collection, structuring, clear indicators, public access, and analysis of data across institutions with different roles in processing requests, investigating allegations of domestic violence, and offering victim support.[54] **Commitment 11** aims to improve the General Inspectorate of the Romanian Gendarmerie's compliance with accessibility standards, but the targeted dimensions of accessibility remain unclear. Acting on existing policies, **Commitment 9** would develop a digital platform to monitor gender-based violence as well as public and workplace harassment. Success will depend on the platform's adoption and employers' compliance, which is a significant behavioral challenge. To achieve strong results, this commitment would require mechanisms to ensure verification, employers' compliance, enforcement by government bodies, actions in response to the information disclosed, and public access to the platform.

---

[1] "Transparency in the Funding of Political Parties," Open Government Partnership (OGP), 2022-2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/romania/commitments/RO0056/.

[2] "Strategia Națională Anticorupție 2021-2025," [National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2021–2025], Ministry of Justice, December 2021, https://www.just.ro/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Strategia-Nationala-Anticoruptie-2021-2025.pdf; "Strategia Națională Anticorupție pe perioada 2016–2020," Ministry of Justice, 2016, https://anabi.just.ro/storage/uploads/pagini/29/01%20Strategia%20Nationala%20Anticoruptie%20%20pe%20perioada%202016%20-%202020.pdf.

[3] "Legea nr. 334/2006 privind finanțarea activității partidelor politice și a campaniilor electorale," Parliament of Romania, 2006, https://finantarepartide.ro/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Legea_334_2006.pdf.

[4] "Political Finance Database: Romania," International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA), accessed on 7 November 2025, https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/country?country=183&database_theme=302.

[5] "Emergency Ordinance no. 1/2025 on some measures for the organization and conduct of the elections for the President of Romania in 2025 and the partial local elections in 2025," Government of Romania, 17 January 2025, https://www.roaep.ro/legislatie/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/OUG-1-2025_prezi_loc_part_ENG.pdf.

[6] "Prioritățile reformei electorale: finanțarea partidelor politice si a campaniilor electorale," [Electoral reform priorities: Financing political parties and electoral campaigns], Expert Forum, 18 June 2025, https://expertforum.ro/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Recomandari-reforma-finantare-politica.pdf.

[7] "Romania—Repeat Presidential Election, 4 and 18 May 2025: Limited Election Observation Mission Final Report," OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), 28 October 2025, https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/f/3/600295_0.pdf.

[8] "Electoral reform priorities: Financing political parties and electoral campaigns," Expert Forum.

[9] "Romania—Repeat Presidential Election, 4 and 18 May 2025: Limited Election Observation Mission Final Report," OSCE ODIHR; "Political advertising in the 2025 elections," Expert Forum, 30 July 2025, https://expertforum.ro/en/political-advertising-in-the-2025-elections.

[10] "Romanian 2024 Election Annulment: Addressing Emerging Threats to Electoral Integrity," International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), 20 December 2024, https://www.ifes.org/publications/romanian-2024-election-annulment-addressing-emerging-threats-electoral-integrity.

[11] Septimius Parvu (Expert Forum), interview by IRM researcher, 17 October 2025; Andrei Nicoara (Member of the National Coordination Committee), interview by IRM researcher, 24 October 2025; Larisa Barac (OGP Point of Contact at the General Secretariat of the Government), interview by IRM researcher, 22 October 2025.

[12] "Regulation (EU) 2024/900 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 March 2024 on the transparency and targeting of political advertising," 13 March 2024, EU, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/900/oj/eng.

[13] Parvu, interview.

[14] Cosmin Popp (Vice President of Permanent Electoral Authority), interview by IRM researcher, 4 November 2025; Parvu, interview.

[15] "EFOR met with the new president of the AEP to discuss electoral and political financing reform," Expert Forum, 22 January 2026, https://expertforum.ro/intalnire-presedinte-aep/.
[16] Parvu, interview.
[17] Popp, interview.
[18] Parvu, interview.
[19] "Open Gov Guide: Anti-Corruption & Political Finance," OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/open-gov-guide/anti-corruption-political-finance.
[20] "Romania: Results Report 2022-2024," OGP, January 2025, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Romania_Results-Report_2022-2024_EN.pdf.
[21] "Investiții locale" [Local Investments], Expert Forum, accessed November 10, 2025, https://expertforum.ro/investitii-locale/; "Observații norme Anghel Saligny" [Observations on Anghel Saligny Norms], Funky Citizens, September 2021, https://funky.ong/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Observatii-norme-Anghel-Saligny-Funky-Citizens.pdf.
[22] "Advancing Accountability and Transparency in Romania's Government," International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), 27 June 2023, 2025, https://www.ifes.org/news/advancing-accountability-and-transparency-romanias-government; Alex Nedea and David Muntean, "Mic tratat de corupție generalizata: cum sa prăbușești un pod proaspăt consolidat," Recorder, 4 July 2022, https://recorder.ro/mic-tratat-de-coruptie-generalizata-cum-sa-prabusesti-un-pod-proaspat-consolidat; "Dumnezeul achizițiilor se întoarce," Recorder, 25 September 2023, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ozANAmN5UDY; "Raport privind activitatea desfășurata in anul 2024," National Anti-Corruption Directorate, February 2025, https://www.dna.ro/obiect2.jsp?id=706.
[23] "Raportul public al Curții de Conturi pe anul 2023," [2023 Annual Report of the Court of Accounts] Court of Accounts of Romania, accessed 17 November 2025, https://www.curteadeconturi.ro/uploads/a0a73f0f/e041b923/12f53388/fc1887e8/d1ec52a7/4529445e/c070b221/529d3791/Raportul_public_al_Curtii_de_Conturi_pe_anul_2023.pdf.
[24] Barac, interview; Nicoara, interview; Parvu, interview.
[25] Marcel Alexandru Stoica and Radu Necsuliu (Ministry of Development, Public Works, and Administration), interview by IRM researcher, 30 October 2025.
[26] "Unde e Saligny? Stadiul implementării PNI Anghel Saligny," Expert Forum, 30 June 2025, https://expertforum.ro/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/PB220Saligny_30iunie.pdf.
[27] "Guvern, investiții, reducere deficit, autorități locale," [Government, Investments, Deficit Reduction, Local Authorities], Curs de Guvernare, 19 June 2025, https://cursdeguvernare.ro/guvern-investitii-reducere-deficit-autoritati-locale.html.
[28] Parvu, interview.
[29] "Comunele și orașele mici din România, în căutarea unui nou model de organizare: Raport întocmit la Ministerul Dezvoltării, Lucrărilor Publice și Administrației, 73105/29.10.2025," Court of Accounts of Romania, 31 October 2025, https://www.curteadeconturi.ro/rapoarte-audit/rapoarte-audit-performanta/comunele-si-orasele-mici-din-romania-in-cautarea-unui-nou-model-de-organizare-raport-intocmit-la-ministerul-dezvoltarii-lucrarilor-publice-si-administratiei-73105-29-10-2025.
[30] "2023 Annual Report of the Court of Accounts," Court of Accounts of Romania.
[31] "Open Gov Challenge," OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/the-open-gov-challenge/.
[32] "Open Local Government," OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/romania/commitments/RO0049.
[33] OGP, "Iasi, Romania Action Plan 2019-2021," 30 August 2019, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/iasi-romania-action-plan-2019-2021/.
[34] "Timișoara, Romania," OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/timisoara-romania.
[35] Robert Sabotici (General Secretariat of the Government), pre-publication comments, 31 March 2026.
[36] Sabotici, pre-publication comments.
[37] Barac, interview; Alexandrina Dinga (CIVICA Association, Iasi & Member of the CNC), interview by IRM researcher, 12 February 2026.
[38] Dinga, interview.
[39] "Open Government Review for Romania," Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 7 July 2023, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/open-government-review-of-romania_ff20b2d4-en.html.
[40] "Progress through Partnership. National-Local Collaboration to Advance Open Government,", accessed on 10 November 2025, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/Progress-through-Partnership-note-October-2024.pdf.
[41] "Prima reacție după ce România a intrat în recesiune: «Este un cost necesar pentru a construi o economie mai solidă și mai competitivă. Nu traversăm o criză»," Hot News, accessed 20 February 2026, https://hotnews.ro/ilie-bolojan-prima-reactie-dupa-ce-romania-a-intrat-in-recesiune-este-un-cost-necesar-pentru-a-construi-o-economie-mai-solida-si-mai-competitiva-nu-traversam-o-criza-2170459.
[42] See https://aapro.ro/wp.
[43] Dinga, interview.
[44] See https://www.mdlpa.ro/pages/rapoartedemonitorizare.

[45] See Integrity Plan of Targovishte 2022–2025, which includes an indicator on transparency, https://www.pmtgv.ro/anticor/Anexa-Dispozitia1492-Plan-Integritate.pdf.
[46] "OGP Local Handbook," OGP, 7 January 2021, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/ogp-local-handbook; "OGP Local Co-Creation Playbook," OGP, 4 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/local-co-creation-playbook; "IRM in a Box: Toolkit for OGP Local Monitoring Bodies," OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-in-a-box-a-toolkit-for-ogp-local-monitoring-bodies; "OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards," OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards; "Open Gov Guide," OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/open-gov-guide.
[47] See https://www.mt.ro/transparenta-decizionala/dialog-social/despre-comisia-de-dialog-social.
[48] Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure (MTI), correspondence with IRM researcher, 17 November 2025.
[49] "Strategia Națională privind Datele Deschise 2024–2028," General Secretariat of the Government (SGG), 2024, https://sgg.gov.ro/1/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Anexa.pdf; "Open Government Review for Romania," OECD; "Digital connectivity in Romania," European Commission, modified 30 June 2025, https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/digital-connectivity-romania; "Strategia Națională privind Datele Deschise 2024–2028," SGG, 2024, https://sgg.gov.ro/1/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Anexa.pdf; "Strategia de digitalizare a Curții de Conturi a României 2023–2028," [Digitalization Strategy of the Court of Accounts of Romania 2023–2028], Court of Accounts of Romania, January 2023, https://www.curteadeconturi.ro/uploads/a65264c7/9297662a/088613a7/deeb95e6/92061381/b09ab568/62d7d94e/b06dbddb/Strategia_de_digitalizare_a_Cur%C8%9Bii_de_Conturi_a_Rom%C3%A2niei_2023-2028.pdf.
[50] Barac, interview; Nicoara, interview.
[51] "InoLab," SGG, accessed 26 November 2025, https://sgg.gov.ro/1/laboratorul-de-inovare.
[52] "Commitment RO0080," OGP, accessed 10 November 2025, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/romania/commitments/RO0080.
[53] Anonymous stakeholder, interview by IRM researcher, 24 October 2025.
[54] Andreea Braga (FILIA Center), interview by IRM researcher, 10 November 2025.

Section III. Methodology

This product is a concise, 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, represent a high priority for country stakeholders, acknowledged as a priority in the national open government context, or a combination of these factors.

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 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 the Action Plan Review, the IRM reviews commitments using three indicators:

1. **Verifiability:** The IRM determines whether a commitment is verifiable as written in the action plan. The indicator is assessed as:
   - **Yes/No:** Are the stated objectives and proposed actions sufficiently clear and include objectively verifiable activities to assess implementation?

   Commitments that are not verifiable are considered not reviewable, and no further assessment is carried out.

2. **Open Government Lens:** The IRM determines if the commitment relates to the open government values of transparency, civic participation, and/or public accountability as defined by the Open Government Declaration and the OGP Articles of Governance. Based on a close reading of the commitment text, the indicator is assessed as:
   - **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 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, influence or co-create policies, laws and/or decisions? Will the government create, enable, or improve participatory mechanisms for minorities, marginalized or underrepresented groups? Will the government improve the enabling environment for civil society (which may include NGO laws, funding mechanisms, taxation, reporting requirements, et cetera)? Will the

government improve legal, policy, institutional or practical conditions related to civic space such as freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly that would facilitate participation in the public sphere? Will the government take measures which counter mis- and disinformation, especially online, to ensure people have access to reliable and factual information (which may include digital and media literacy campaigns, factchecking, or fostering an independent news media ecosystem)?

- **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?

3. **Potential for Results:** The IRM analyzes the expected results and potential that would be verified in the IRM Results Report after implementation. Potential for results is an early indication of the commitment's possibility 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 indicator is assessed 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 focuses its analysis on promising commitments. Promising commitments are verifiable, have an open government lens, and at least a modest potential for results. Promising commitments may also be a priority for national stakeholders or for the particular context. The IRM may cluster commitments with a common policy objective or that contribute to the same reform or policy issue. The potential for results of clustered commitments is reviewed as a whole.

This review was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with Corina Rebegea as researcher and Andy McDevitt as external expert reviewer. During the internal review process, 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).[1] The IRM methodology, product quality, and review process are overseen by the IEP.[2]

[1] "International Experts Panel," Open Government Partnership (OGP), accessed 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/who-we-are/international-experts-panel.
[2] For more information, see: "Overview – Independent Reporting Mechanism," OGP, accessed 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview.

Annex I. Commitment Data[1]

Commitment 1: Development of Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure website

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

Commitment 2: Transparency of public data schemas

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

Commitment 3: Increasing transparency of the Ministry of Culture

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

Commitment 4: Increase transparency of political funding

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

Commitment 5: Piloting implementation of law on open data

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

Commitment 6: Management of projects dedicated to Internal Affairs

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

Commitment 7: Co-creating e-government services

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

Commitment 8: Increasing accessibility of data on investment programmes

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

Commitment 9: Reducing gender-based violence

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

Commitment 10: Strengthening the HELPLINE National Telephone Line

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

Commitment 11: Accessibility for persons with disabilities, refugees and migrants

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

Commitment 12: Increasing involvement in decision-making of Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure

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

Commitment 13: Strengthening open government at the local level

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

[1] **Editorial note**: For commitments that are clustered, the assessment of potential for results is conducted at the cluster level, not individual commitments. Commitment short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see: "Romania National Action Plan 2025–2027," Government of Romania, July 2025, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Romania_Action-Plan_2025-2027_EN.pdf.

Annex II. Action Plan Co-Creation

The IRM uses the OGP Participation and Co-Creations Standards to assess countries' participatory practices throughout the action plan cycle.[1] Countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the standards and to meet the minimum requirements.[2]

Table 2. Compliance with Minimum Requirements

Minimum requirement	Met?
1.1 Space for dialogue: Romania's multi-stakeholder forum, the National Coordination Committee (CNC), included 14 members with even representation from government and civil society. Its rules of engagement are published on Romania's OGP website.[3] During the co-creation period, it met once in June 2025 to discuss and validate the draft action plan. In addition, its members contributed to the proposed co-creation calendar, participated in co-creation meetings, shared information about the process among their networks, and submitted commitment proposals.[4] Beyond the CNC, the General Secretariat of the Government (SGG) facilitated discussions between civil society stakeholders that proposed commitments and counterpart government institutions to identify partnerships and develop commitments.[5]	Yes
2.1 OGP website: The SGG maintains a publicly accessible OGP website which contains all of Romania's action plans, as well as information on the co-creation process, the previous plans' implementation, and the CNC.[6]	Yes
2.2 Repository: Romania's OGP website published up-to-date information on the co-creation process, as well as other information related to domestic and international OGP activities. This website was the main platform for receiving and tracking commitment proposals.[7] During development of the action plan, the live platform provided the public with access to commitment proposals and decisions on the proposals in real time.[8]	Yes
3.1 Advanced notice: The draft co-creation timeline was opened on 24 December 2024 for a three-week public consultation period on Romania's OGP website, prior to the official start of co-creation on 23 January 2025. The timeline included details regarding the opportunities to join co-creation meetings and consultations.[9] No comments on the timeline were received.[10]	Yes
3.2 Outreach: In February 2025, SGG hosted a hybrid launch event for the co-creation process, gathering over 70 participants, mainly from civil society.[11] The meeting was held as an OGP Club event, a meeting format established in 2014 by the OGP Secretariat in Romania to facilitate awareness raising and discussions with civil society about OGP topics and processes.[12] During the event, SGG and CNC members presented information about OGP and the co-creation process.[13] In addition, SGG and civil society CNC members made outreach efforts through social media, as well as directly contacting various stakeholders to inform them about the co-creation process and invite them to participate.[14]	Yes
3.3 Feedback mechanism: The SGG opened a co-creation platform for commitment proposals and tracking, which was live on Romania's OGP website for the six-month co-creation process. Government institutions submitted 18 proposals, whereas civil society and the public submitted 10 proposals. The SGG facilitated an iterative process for discussing and refining proposals with proposers. The draft action plan was opened for a two-week public comment period, receiving additional proposals which	Yes

expanded upon or suggested additions to the commitments.[15] Of the 13 final action plan commitments, three were originally proposed by civil society.	
4.1 Reasoned response: Romania' co-creation platform made commitment proposals publicly available, including feedback from the government on whether proposals were included in the action plan and the reasons for these decisions. In addition, during bilateral discussions with civil society stakeholders that proposed commitments, government counterparts provided explanations as to the decision to include or not include certain commitments in the action plan.[16]	Yes
5.1 Open implementation: The IRM will assess whether meetings were held with civil society stakeholders to present implementation progress and enable civil society to provide comments at least twice a year.	Not applicable

[1] "OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards," Open Government Partnership (OGP), 2021, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards.
[2] "IRM Guidelines for the Assessment of Minimum Requirements," Independent Reporting Mechanism, 2022, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/IRM-Guidelines-for-Assessment-of-Minimum-Requirements_20220531_EN.pdf.
[3] "CNC 2022–2024," General Secretariat of the Government (SGG), accessed 19 November 2025, https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/cnc-2022-2024.
[4] Larisa Barac (OGP Point of Contact at the General Secretariat of the Government), correspondence with IRM researcher, 14 November 2025.
[5] Larisa Barac (OGP Point of Contact at the General Secretariat of the Government), interview by IRM researcher, 22 October 2025.
[6] See https://ogp.gov.ro/nou.
[7] See https://ogp.gov.ro/nou.
[8] Barac, interview.
[9] "Propunere calendar elaborare PNA 2025–2027," SGG, 24 December 2024, https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Calendar-elaborare-PNA-2025-2027.pdf.
[10] Larisa Barac (OGP Point of Contact at the General Secretariat of the Government), correspondence with IRM researcher, 20 November 2025.
[11] "OGP Club: Elaborare PNA 2025–2027 4 Februarie 2025," SGG, 6 February 2025, https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/2025/02/06/ogp-club-elaborare-pna-2025-2027-4-februarie-2025.
[12] "Club OGP," SGG, accessed 19 November 2025, https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/club-ogp.
[13] "OGP Club: Elaborare PNA 2025–2027 4 Februarie 2025," SGG.
[14] Barac, interview; Septimius Parvu (Expert Forum), interview by IRM researcher, 17 October 2025.
[15] "Etape parcurse în procesul de elaborare, în colaborare, a PNA 2025–2027," SGG, accessed 19 November 2025, https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Etape-PNA2025.pdf.
[16] Barac, interview.