

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Results Report:
Lithuania 2023–2025

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Table of Contents

Executive Summary2

Section I. Key Observations.....5

Section II. Early Results7

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation 11

Section IV. Methodology 16

Annex I. Commitment Data 18

Executive Summary

Lithuania’s sixth action plan established a unified regulatory process for drafting legal acts across all public institutions and produced materials to help civil servants conduct effective consultation processes. While co-creation included a broader range of stakeholders compared to previous cycles, nongovernment stakeholders had limited opportunities to influence commitment implementation. Moving forward, there is opportunity to strengthen nongovernmental participation during implementation.

Implementation

Lithuania’s sixth action plan (2023–2025) included three commitments: establishing unified legislative standards for public involvement in the legislative process; building a customer-centric approach in the public sector; and making government decision-making more participatory at the national level. Two commitments achieved early results. Compared to previous action plans, completion levels remain similar.¹

Commitment 1, identified as promising in the IRM Action Plan Review, had the strongest early results. The Office of the Government and the Ministry of Justice introduced a legally binding unified legislative procedure for all ministries and subordinate bodies, addressing long-standing inconsistencies in lawmaking and strengthening the public consultation framework. The standardized framework has improved institutional coherence and legal predictability around public consultations on draft legislation. Under Commitment 3, the Office of the Government produced methodological guidance and consolidated a library of good practices and a peer exchange network in public engagement.

Participation and Co-Creation

The Office of the Government continued to coordinate Lithuania’s OGP process. The action plan was drafted and approved together with the new permanent multistakeholder forum, the Open Government Working Group (OGWG).² The OGWG originally comprised 24 members: 11 from the public sector, eight from civil society organizations, and five from the private sector and academia. Co-creation involved senior public-sector decision makers, which helped clarify

At a Glance

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

3/3	Complete or substantially complete commitments
------------	---

EARLY RESULTS

2/3	Commitments with early results
1/3	Commitments with significant results

KEY OBSERVATIONS

- Engaging senior decision-makers clarified institutional responsibilities, but some ownership gaps remained.
- There is opportunity to strengthen nongovernmental participation in commitment implementation.
- Nongovernmental stakeholders propose a shift toward change-oriented rather than activity-focused commitments

Met the minimum requirements during implementation: Yes
--

institutional responsibilities around commitments in the final text of the action plan. OGWG members noted that the co-creation process had improved compared to previous action plans.

During implementation, the OGWG's composition changed twice, resulting in an ultimate reduction from 24 members to 11, following a decision of the Office of the Government.³ There was no public call for members of the new OGWG in its 2025 reestablishment, as, according to the Office of the Government, the Office aimed to keep most topically relevant and active organisations without extending its scope.⁴ Three of the original nongovernmental members remained and five were not invited back. The OGWG criticized the lack of transparency around this decision.⁵ A government representative noted that this concern had not been communicated to the Office of the Government.⁶

The Office of the Government provided updates on commitment implementation during nine OGWG meetings. However, implementation was largely done internally among responsible institutions.⁷ This meant that OGWG members had limited opportunities to meaningfully influence implementation choices. A government representative noted that this was not communicated during implementation to the Office of the Government and that it will be taken into consideration moving forward.⁸

Implementation in Context

In November 2024, a parliamentary election resulted in the Social Democratic Party winning a majority and forming a new government in coalition with the right-wing party Nemunas Dawn and center-left Democratic Union "Vardan Lietuvos".⁹ In August 2025, Prime Minister Gintautas Paluckas resigned over concerns around a potential conflict of interest, and Finance Minister Rimantas Šadžius was appointed as acting prime minister.¹⁰ Democratic Union "Vardan Lietuvos" also left the coalition government.¹¹ At the end of August 2025, Inga Ruginienė was elected prime minister by the parliament. As the OGWG partially consisted of high-level political appointees, the changes in the government's composition led to the dissolution and reestablishment of the OGWG.

In October 2025, there were nationwide protests against the government's decision to assign the Ministry of Culture to Nemunas Dawn.¹² In November, the parliament proposed a change in the law governing the country's public broadcaster, Lithuanian Radio and Television (LRT) to lower the threshold for dismissing their Director General.¹³ This proposal sparked another wave of protests. While the protests highlighted national concern around freedom of the press, they did not have any immediate impact on action plan implementation.¹⁴

¹ Open Government Partnership, *Lithuania Transitional Results Report 2018–2020*, 2 Jul. 2021, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-transitional-results-report-2018-2020/>; Open Government Partnership, *Lithuania Results Report 2021–2023*, 25 Jul. 2024, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-results-report-2021-2023/>.

² Lithuania, Government of the Republic, *Vyriausybės Kancleris Įsakymas Dėl Darbo Grupės Sudarymo* [Chancellor of the Government Order on the Establishment of a Working Group], no. V-25, 6 Feb. 2023, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/VK_%C4%AFsakymas_Atviros_Vyriausyb%C4%97s_darbo_grup%C4%97.docx.pdf.

³ Lithuania, Government of the Republic, *Vyriausybės Kancleris Įsakymas Dėl Darbo Grupės Sudarymo* [Chancellor of the Government Order on the Establishment of a Working Group], no. V-168, 8 Dec. 2025, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1765197040/2432/VK+%C4%AFsakymas_Atviros+Vyriausyb%C4%97s+darbo+grup%C4%97_atnaujiniamas.docx.pdf.

⁴ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), interview by IRM researcher, 16 Jan. 2026.

⁵ Gaja Šavelė (Dir. Gen. at Nacionalinė NVO koalicija [National NGO Coalition]), interview by IRM researcher, 22 Jan. 2026.

⁶ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

⁷ Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės darbo grupė [Open Government Working Group],” E-pilietis, accessed 28 Mar. 2026, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/suzinokite/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/darbo-grupe/>.

⁸ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

⁹ Mariusz Antonowicz, “Lithuania’s 2024 elections: a turning point in political stability?,” Heinrich Böll Stiftung, Warsaw Office, 17 Jan. 2025, <https://pl.boell.org/en/node/5893>; Joanna Hyndle-Hussein, “Centre-left government forms government in Lithuania,” Centre for Eastern Studies, 13 Dec. 2024, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2024-12-13/centre-left-government-forms-government-lithuania>.

¹⁰ Andrius Sytas, “Lithuania coalition partner threatens to quit unless PM resigns,” Reuters, 30 Jul. 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/lithuania-coalition-partner-threatens-quit-unless-pm-resigns-2025-07-30/>.

¹¹ Oliver Morwinsky and Fausta Šimaitytė, “Government formation in Lithuania,” Konrad Adenauer Foundation, 27 Aug. 2025, <https://www.kas.de/en/country-reports/detail/-/content/government-formation-in-lithuania>.

¹² Kultūros Asamblėja [Cultural Assembly], “Kultūros bendruomenės protestas [Cultural community protest],” 24 Nov. 2025, <https://kulturosasambleja.lt/kulturos-bendruomenes-protestas>; Kultūros Asamblėja [Cultural Assembly], “Kodėl „Nemuno aušra“ yra grėsmė demokratijai? [Why is “Dawn of Nemunas” a threat to democracy?],” 11 Oct. 2025, <https://kulturosasambleja.lt/kodel-nemuno-ausra-yra-gresme-demokratijai>.

¹³ European Federation of Journalists, “Lithuania: MFRR raises alarm as political pressure campaign on LRT widens,” European Federation of Journalists, 4 Dec. 2025, <https://europeanjournalists.org/blog/2025/12/04/lithuania-mfrr-raises-alarm-as-political-pressure-campaign-on-lrt-widens/>.

¹⁴ International IDEA, “Lithuania - November 2024: Outcry against inclusion of party with antisemitic links in government,” The Global State of Democracy: Democracy Tracker, accessed 28 Mar. 2026, <https://www.idea.int/democracytracker/report/lithuania/november-2024-0>; LibertiesEU, “Protests erupt in response to surprise coalition with controversial party, court rules freedom of information protects LGBTQ+ public representation in Lithuania,” Civil Liberties Union for Europe (Liberties), 20 Feb. 2025, <https://www.liberties.eu/en/stories/civicus-report-lithuania-lgbtqj/45370>; Laura Tatarėlytė, “Lithuania Forms New Government,” Friedrich Naumann Foundation, 8 April 2025, <https://www.freiheit.org/central-europe-and-baltic-states/lithuania-forms-new-government>; Jurga Bakaitė, “Almost half of people in Lithuania support protests against Nemunas Dawn – poll,” LRT, 10 Oct. 2025, <https://www.lrt.lt/en/news-in-english/19/2707235/almost-half-of-people-in-lithuania-support-protests-against-nemunas-dawn-poll>.

Section I. Key Observations

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

Observation 1: Engaging senior decision-makers clarified institutional responsibilities, but some ownership gaps remained

Following IRM recommendations, the Office of the Government established a permanent multistakeholder forum—the Open Government Working Group (OGWG)—to co-create the 2023–2025 action plan. The OGWG included representatives with decision-making authority within their respective institutions. This approach addressed gaps from the prior cycle, where limited involvement of senior officials left some agencies unclear about their responsibilities for implementing commitments.¹ Including officials with decision-making power ensured that institutions were aware of their role in implementation and eased communication among agencies.

However, Commitment 1 involved developing a monitoring indicator for measuring the proportion of legal acts prepared in accordance with the new standard. As the Office of the Government did not clearly assign responsibility to a specific institution, no entity assumed ownership of this task, and the indicator was not developed.² Furthermore, due to the lack of the monitoring indicator, interviewed members of the OGWG indicated there lacked a shared or consistent understanding of the actual impact of the commitment.³ Moving forward, the Office of the Government could ensure that milestones reflect all commitment objectives.

Observation 2: There is opportunity to strengthen nongovernmental participation in commitment implementation

The new multistakeholder forum included a broader range of stakeholders than previous action plans, including public policy experts and lobbying organizations. Interviews with OGWG members highlighted that this diversity offered a wider scope of opinions and perspectives. However, this more inclusive action plan co-creation did not translate into equally inclusive participation during implementation. Government institutions largely carried out implementation internally. While OGWG members were regularly informed about commitments' progress, they had limited opportunities to influence implementation choices for most commitment milestones.⁴ This could be partly attributed to the fact that implementation of some commitments was already planned before the action plan was adopted.⁵ Moving forward, the Office of the Government could consider including deliberate moments during implementation for implementers to solicit input from OGWG members, as well as assigning concrete roles to OGWG members in commitment implementation.

Observation 3: Nongovernmental stakeholders propose a shift toward change-oriented rather than activity-focused commitments

Implementation of Lithuania's action plans has generally improved over time. However, nongovernmental stakeholders noted that it remains challenging to understand commitments' results, even when activities are completed. They highlighted that focusing on completing activities often overshadows the need for measurable change. They suggested pairing commitments with clear success indicators, rather than pursuing numerous activity-driven initiatives without tracking outcomes.⁶ In their analysis, an activity-oriented approach limits the ability to assess whether commitments are achieving their intended objectives or contributing to meaningful improvements. Designing commitments with a stronger emphasis on outcomes,

paired with measurable indicators, would enable evidence-based progress assessment and clearer guidance for implementation.

¹ Viktorija Gegznaite-Iljina (Product Manager at the Centre of Registers), interview by IRM researcher, 26 Mar. 2024.

² Darius Trinkūnas, (Senior Advisor at the Ministry of Justice), interview by IRM researcher, 22 Jan. 2026; Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), interview by IRM researcher, 16 Jan, 2026.

³ Rasa Bortkevičiūtė (Lecturer at Vilnius University, the Institute of International Relations and Political Science), interview by IRM researcher, 20 Jan. 2026; Gaja Šavelė (Dir. Gen. at Nacionalinė NVO koalicija [National NGO Coalition]), interview by IRM researcher, 22 Jan. 2026; Ieva Dunčikaitė (Program Manager at Transparency International Lithuania), interview by IRM researcher, 20 Jan. 2026.

⁴ Dunčikaitė, interview; Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

⁵ For example, Commitment 1 was already foreseen in the Ministry of Justice's 2024–2026 strategic business plan, no. 23.900.0551, available at: <https://tm.lrv.lt/media/viesa/saugykla/2024/2/2OWs0bjggY.pdf>.

⁶ Dunčikaitė, interview; Šavelė, interview; Bortkevičiūtė, interview.

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' objectives, 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

1. Establish a common framework for legislative process: The commitment introduced a unified legislative process for all ministries and subordinate bodies, strengthening the public consultation framework.

Commitment 1: Streamline the legislative decision-making process at the institutional and government levels and establish a common framework for legislative oversight

Implementers: The Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Government

Context and Objectives

Under this commitment, the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Government aimed to introduce a unified legislative process standard to all ministries, government agencies, and bodies subordinate to ministries, in accordance with the Government's Rules of Procedure. The commitment's objective was to strengthen the public consultation framework in legislative processes and built on commitments to improve public consultation in the 2016–2018 and 2018–2020 OGP action plans.¹

Early Results: Significant

This commitment is assessed as having significant early results by introducing a legally binding act that required all ministries and subordinate bodies to draft and register their legal acts in accordance with a unified procedure.² This reform standardizes how legal acts are prepared, formatted, and registered, creating a unified procedure that improves consistency, predictability, and legal clarity across the executive branch.³

Three out of four milestones were completed.⁴ Under Milestones 1 and 2, the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Government passed a resolution establishing requirements for the ministerial legislative process throughout the public sector, as well as published the legislative plan.⁵ The amended standards expand the requirement for mandatory online public announcement of consultations, strengthen obligations to follow the Office of the Government's methodological recommendations, and require all ministries and subordinate bodies to publish draft acts on the Legal Acts Information System (TAIS). The standards introduce minimum consultation timeframes: the public must have at least 10 working days to submit feedback on draft legal acts. For extensive or complex draft legal acts, this period is increased to at least 12 days.⁶ The guidelines also introduce requirements to publish the public's comments and unincorporated proposals with the latest version of the draft act on TAIS.

To ensure that public officials responsible for lawmaking are fully aware of these most recent developments, the Ministry of Justice consolidated all applicable substantive and procedural rules into a single reference document.⁷ In addition, the Ministry organized both in-person and online training sessions covering the entire decision-making cycle (Milestone 3).⁸ According to the Ministry of Justice, more than 200 representatives participated in these trainings and there has been continued demand for further sessions.⁹ Milestone 4, a communication campaign for increasing public sector awareness of legislative standards, was not implemented due to time constraints. According to the Office of the Government, this activity is planned for an undetermined later stage, depending on available resources.¹⁰

The action plan also indicated that responsible institutions would develop a monitoring indicator for measuring the proportion of legal acts prepared in accordance with the new standard. However, the indicator was not included as a commitment milestone and no responsible institution was listed. Without clear ownership, the indicator was not developed by either the Ministry of Justice or the Office of the Government.¹¹ Civil society organizations noted that lacking an indicator makes assessing the impact of the commitment challenging.¹²

Despite lacking adoption metrics, the commitment has already proven impactful. In January 2026, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania ruled that three orders issued by the Minister of Health, which introduced significant changes to healthcare financing, were adopted in breach of established lawmaking procedures.¹³ Specifically, the required interinstitutional coordination and consultation timeframes were not observed, and the mandatory *ex ante* assessment of the proposed legislation's anticipated impact was not conducted.¹⁴ The Ministry of Health said it would start an internal investigation into the causes of such breach.¹⁵

While civil society members of the Open Government Working Group (OGWG) mostly praised the importance of the commitment and did not question its need, they noted that their involvement in its implementation has been limited.¹⁶ According to one long-serving member, the OGWG received implementation updates, but were not seen as partners who could be consulted or involved in the process.¹⁷ This could be partly attributed to the fact that the commitment originated from the Ministry of Justice's 2024–2026 strategic business plan, and its implementation was already planned.¹⁸

Institutionalizing the common procedure, a challenge noted in the IRM Action Plan Review, will be key to improving public consultation in drafting legal acts. The Office of the Government and the Ministry of Justice developed methodological guidance for public officials on how to improve the quality of consultations and feedback mechanisms, but there is no strategy for long-term implementation assistance for public officials. Ensuring that public officials have sustained support for adopting the new legislative standards would significantly contribute to the commitment reaching its full impact.

Looking Ahead

It is unclear whether further commitments to improve the unified legislative process will be included in the upcoming action plan.¹⁹ However, action plan co-creation has featured workshops and discussions focusing on public consultations and on civic engagement methods in practice.²⁰

To strengthen the institutionalization of this reform, the Ministry of Justice and Office of the Government could:

- **Establish the proposed monitoring indicator with clearly defined metrics for uptake of the new legislative procedures by all relevant public bodies.** In

designing the indicator, the lead implementers could involve the nongovernmental stakeholders that tracked commitment implementation as part of the OGWG. The indicator could include all known cases of noncompliance, actions taken in response, and stakeholder feedback. Lithuania could learn from Canada’s Departmental Results Reports, publicly available reports on what each department or agency achieved compared to what it had planned.²¹

- **Organize periodic trainings on the new legislative standards for public sector employees.** Building on the ad hoc trainings already organized, the lead implementers could organize periodic trainings targeted at different public agencies to strengthen awareness and ensure unified implementation. Stakeholders could learn from Latvia, which committed to develop an e-course and organized thematic workshops for civil servants on public participation.
- **Bring together a community of practice from ministries and agencies.** This community could include officials directly involved in implementing the new standards across public bodies and could serve as a forum to discuss strategies, share issues and discuss solutions. Lithuania could learn from Portugal’s RePLAN, an interministerial network that promotes capacity building and shares good practices in strategic planning.²²
- **Ensure that upgrades to TAIS make the platform more transparent, in a user-friendly way.** This could be done by making information on TAIS available in open data formats and by including data on lobbying and other meetings and publishing a legislative footprint. It is important that all new information is published in an understandable, user-friendly way. Stakeholders could learn from Estonia, which requires state officials to disclose meetings with lobbyists at least once per quarter.²³

In the longer term, the Ministry of Justice and Office of the Government could:

- **Organize broader and more structured consultations** if future updates or revisions to the legislative standards are proposed. These consultations could include groups such as people with disabilities, the elderly, and migrant communities. Reflections from the OGWG indicate that the commitment’s implementation process was not fully inclusive.²⁴ Stakeholders could draw from Estonia’s Opinion Journey initiative (Arvamusrännak), which involved citizen consultations to update the “Estonia 2035” strategy.²⁵
- **Ensure meaningful consultation in policy areas where legislation has recently been fast-tracked.** The guidelines’ impact would be strengthened if the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Government ensure that government acts and decrees pertaining to societally important and sensitive topics influenced by geopolitical changes—such as media, defense and energy—receive proper consultation processes.

¹ The Working Group (Lithuania’s Open Government Partnership Working Group), *Lithuania National Action Plan 2016–2018*, Open Government Partnership, 1 Jul. 2016, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-national-action-plan-2016-2018/>; The Working Group (Lithuania’s Open Government Partnership Working Group), *Lithuania Action Plan 2018–2020*, Open Government Partnership, 9 Jan. 2019, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-action-plan-2018-2020/>.

² Lithuania, *Nutarimas dėl Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės 1994 m. rugpjūčio 11 d. nutarimo nr. 728 „dėl Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės darbo reglamento patvirtinimo“ pakeitimo* [Resolution on Amendment of the Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania of 11 August 1994 no. 728 “On Approval of the Work Regulations of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania”], published in Teisės aktų registras no. 305, 3 May 2024, <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/b2490eb00b7b11efbcbfb318996800a8>.

³ Darius Trinkūnas (Sen. Advisor at the Ministry of Justice), interview by IRM researcher, 22 Jan. 2026.

- ⁴ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), interview by IRM researcher, 16 Jan. 2026.
- ⁵ Lithuania, *Vyriausybės 2021–2024 metų teisėkūros planas* [Government Legislative Plan for 2021–2024], Government of the Republic of Lithuania, 2023, <https://lrv.lt/media/viesa/saugykla/2023/12/miNearIzv94.pdf>.
- ⁶ Lithuania, *Nutarimas dėl Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės 1994 m. rugpjūčio 11 d. nutarimo Nr. 728... pakeitimo*, Teisės aktų registras, no. 305, 2024.
- ⁷ Lithuania, Teisingumo ministerija (Ministry of Justice), *Teisėkūros metodinės rekomendacijos* [Methodological Recommendations for Legislative Drafting], 2023, <https://tm.lrv.lt/uploads/tm/documents/files/dokumentai/Teisėkūra/Teisėkūros%20metodinės%20rekomendacijos%202023%2009.pdf>.
- ⁸ Lithuania, Teisingumo ministerija (Ministry of Justice), emailed invitation to IRM researcher, received 23 Jan. 2026.
- ⁹ Trinkūnas, interview.
- ¹⁰ Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė, interview.
- ¹¹ *Id.*
- ¹² Ieva Dunčikaitė (Program Manager at Transparency International Lithuania), interview by IRM researcher, 20 Jan. 2026.
- ¹³ Lietuvos vyriausiasis administracinis teismas (The Supreme Administrative Court), *Sprendimas byloje EI-4-1188/2026* [Decision in Case EI-4-1188/2026], 7 Jan. 2026, <https://www.lvat.lt/data/public/uploads/2026/01/2026-01-07sprendimasbylojeei-4-1188-2026.docx>.
- ¹⁴ *Id.*
- ¹⁵ Jokūbas Naglinskas, “SAM ministrės įsakymai neteisėti, bet premjerė pasitiki, liberalai svarsto interpeliaciją [Health Minister’s orders are unlawful, but the Prime Minister trusts her; liberals consider interpellation],” LRT, 19 Jan. 2026, <https://www.lrt.lt/naujienos/sveikata/682/2810120/sam-ministres-isakymai-neteiseti-bet-premjere-pasitiki-liberalai-svarsto-interpeliacija>.
- ¹⁶ Dunčikaitė, interview; Gaja Šavelė (Dir. Gen. at Nacionalinė NVO koalicija [National NGO Coalition]), interview by IRM researcher, 22 Jan. 2026.
- ¹⁷ Šavelė, interview.
- ¹⁸ Lithuania, Teisingumo ministerija [Lithuania, Ministry of Justice], *Lietuvos Respublikos teisingumo ministro valdymo sričių 2024–2026 metų strateginis veiklos planas* [Strategic activity plan of the areas of management of the minister of justice of the Republic of Lithuania for 2024–2026], no. 23.900.0551, 2024, <https://tm.lrv.lt/media/viesa/saugykla/2024/2/2OWs0bjggY.pdf>.
- ¹⁹ Lithuania, Vyriausybės kanceliarija [Lithuania, Government Office], “2026–2027 m. Atviros Vyriausybės planas [2026–2027 Open Government Plan],” E-pilietis, 2024, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/suzinokite/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/2026-2027-m-atviros-vyriausybes-planas/>.
- ²⁰ Lithuania, Vyriausybės kanceliarija [Lithuania, Government Office], “2026–2027 m. Atviros Vyriausybės planas [2026–2027 Open Government Plan],” E-pilietis, 2024, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/suzinokite/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/2026-2027-m-atviros-vyriausybes-planas/>.
- ²¹ Canada, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, “Departmental Performance Reports,” Government of Canada, accessed 29 Mar. 2026, <https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/departmental-performance-reports.html>.
- ²² Portugal, PlanAPP: Centro de Competências de Planeamento, de Políticas e de Prospetiva da Administração Pública [Portugal, PlanAPP: Public Administration Planning, Policy, and Foresight Competence Centre], “REPLAN Presentation,” PlanAPP, accessed 29 Mar. 2026, <https://planapp.gov.pt/replan-presentation/>.
- ²³ Estonia, Justiits- ja Digiministerium [Estonia, Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Digital Affairs], “Lobistidega kohtumised [Meetings with Lobbyists],” JustDigi, accessed 29 Mar. 2026, <https://www.justdigi.ee/ministeerium-uudised-ja-kontakt/uudised/lobistidega-kohtumised>.
- ²⁴ Šavelė, interview.
- ²⁵ Estonia, Riigikantselei [Estonia, Government Office], “Arvamusrännaku strateegiapäev toob kokku poliitikakujundajad ja arutelujuhid üle Eesti [The Arvamusrännak Strategy Day Brings Together Policymakers and Discussion Leaders from Across Estonia],” originally published 14 Dec. 2022, Arvamusrännak, archived at Digar Veebiarhiiv, <https://veebiarhiiv.digar.ee/a/20230321213926/https://arvamusrannak.ee/uudised/arvamusrannaku-strategiapaev-toob-kokku-poliitikakujundajad-ja-arutelujuhid-ule-eesti>.

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation

The sixth action plan showed notable improvements in co-creation. The multistakeholder forum, the Open Government Working Group (OGWG), was broadened to new sectoral groups, and included representation from senior public sector decision-makers and diverse nongovernmental stakeholders. However, this broadened participation was not carried through into commitment implementation, where OGWG members had limited opportunities to influence implementation choices.

OGP in Lithuania

The Office of the Government continues to coordinate Lithuania's participation in OGP. Aside from OGP-related work, it assists the prime minister in implementing policies and coordinates activities of the ministries and other subordinate institutions in Lithuania. While three employees within the Office of the Government work on OGP matters, among their other duties, no dedicated funding is allocated to OGP activities.¹

In February 2023, the Office of the Government established a formal multistakeholder forum, the Open Government Working Group (OGWG). The OGWG was comprised of 24 government and nongovernment members and was tasked to co-create, approve, and monitor the implementation of the 2023–2025 action plan.² The composition of the OGWG and its powers were decided by the Office of the Government, without any involvement from nongovernmental stakeholders.³ Addressing an IRM recommendation, the OGWG included government members with decision-making powers within their institutions.⁴ During the previous cycle, the lack of involvement of senior representatives left some agencies unaware of their role in implementing commitments.⁵ The Office of the Government engaged a broader range of stakeholders, including CSOs representing young people and individuals experiencing poverty, public policy experts, and lobbying organizations, as members of the OGWG.⁶ No outreach was conducted to other underrepresented groups such as people with disabilities, migrants, or the elderly.

During implementation, the composition of the OGWG changed twice due to changes in government: in March 2025, and December 2025, specifically after end of Ingrida Šimonytė's Government's term and the resignation of the then newly appointed Prime Minister, Gintautas Paluckas.⁷ As the OGWG included high-ranking politically assigned civil servants, the Office of the Government dissolved the OGWG.⁸ It took several months to re-establish the OGWG.⁹ A government representative noted that the high-level political teams in ministries, from which the OGWG draws its membership, typically takes several months.¹⁰ The new OGWG, formed by the Office of the Government, now consisted of fewer members—11 instead of 24.¹¹ There was no public call for membership in the new OGWG as the Office of the Government sought to keep most active organisations and members without extending its scope.¹² Those who did not participate in previous sessions or were not directly involved in civic engagement or other topics directly related to open government were not invited to stay in the renewed Group.¹³ Though the decreased number of members did not impact the quality of the OGWG, civil society questioned the transparency of the decision-making process.¹⁴ A government representative noted that this concern had not been communicated to the Office of the Government.¹⁵

Action Plan Co-Creation

The drafting of the action plan started on 14 March 2023. It kicked off with a brainstorming session in the OGWG and an online public consultation, which did not produce any proposals.¹⁶ Proposals from the OGWG were discussed during three workshops and an additional workshop

to decide on the final commitments to include.¹⁷ The final list of commitments was confirmed by online vote.¹⁸ After the vote, there were various meetings with stakeholders and the OGWG to clarify the commitments, and the Office of the Government received several written comments from OGWG members. These comments were discussed with them, and the plan was amended accordingly.¹⁹ The action plan was finalized and approved by the OGWG. However, a few members refrained from the final vote, stating that the final commitment list did not fully represent workshop discussions.²⁰ For instance, the action plan mentions a lack of data utilization and evidence-based lawmaking as challenges, but no commitments directly addressed this issue. A government representative noted that the May 2023 final selection of commitments was made collectively by the OGWG members.²¹

Also, the Office of the Government and ministries largely included already planned activities in the action plan and thus limited the scope of the plan. One OGWG member noted that public sector institutions quickly started dominating the conversation by stating what commitments were possible based on their own preexisting plans.²² As a result, other members adapted their thinking based on what they could practically include in the action plan rather than what in their opinion was necessary.²³ According to the OGWG member, as long as OGP action plans largely take into account only already planned activities, OGP in Lithuania will not have substantial impact.²⁴

Participation During Implementation

The Office of the Government regularly informed OGWG members about the progress in commitment implementation. During the action plan cycle, it organized nine OGWG meetings, shared presentation materials, and provided opportunities for participants to ask questions and offer comments.²⁵ These actions contributed to transparency and ensured that OGWG members were kept aware of implementation developments.

While the interaction between the Government and the OGWG has become more open and inclusive over time, particularly during the co-creation phase, nongovernmental participation during implementation could be strengthened. Commitment implementation was largely undertaken internally by responsible institutions without engaging OGWG members.²⁶ As a result, the OGWG was primarily informed about the outcomes, with limited opportunities to discuss interim results, influence implementation choices, or propose alternative ways forward. A government representative noted that this was not communicated during implementation to the Office of the Government and that it will be taken into consideration moving forward.²⁷

Table 2. Compliance with Minimum Requirements

The IRM uses the OGP Participation and Co-Creations Standards to assess countries' participatory practices throughout the action plan cycle.²⁸ Countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the standards and to comply with the minimum requirements under each standard.²⁹ The OGP Criteria and Standards Subcommittee determines if a country has acted according to OGP process.³⁰

Minimum requirement	Co-creation	Implementation
1.1 Space for dialogue: A permanent multi-stakeholder forum, the Open Government Working Group (OGWG), was established at the start of the action plan cycle. Originally	Yes	Yes

consisting of 24 government and nongovernment members, it was later reduced to 11 members. ³¹ It met in: February, May, June, and August 2023; February and March 2024; and March, May, July, and December 2025. ³² Its basic rules were publicly available during the implementation period. ³³		
2.1 OGP website: The Office of the Government maintains a publicly accessible website that contains the latest action plan, the previous action plans, official OGP documentation, and the minutes of OGWG meetings. ³⁴	Yes	Yes
2.2 Repository: The website has a repository that is updated with information on co-creation and implementation of the action plans. However, locating the repository on the website is challenging and implementation information is brief and lacks timestamps.	Yes	Yes
3.1 Advanced notice: See the Action Plan Review. ³⁵	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 Office of the Government met with the OGWG to present implementation results in: February, May, June, and August 2023; February and March 2024; and March, May, July, and December 2025. ³⁶ The OGWG members had opportunities to comment and ask questions. However, in most cases they could not affect commitment implementation.	Not applicable	Yes

¹ Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės [Government of the Republic of Lithuania], “Vyriausybės kanceliarija [Government Chancellery],” accessed 29 Mar. 2026, <https://lrv.lt/lt/vyriausybes-kanceliarija/>.

² Lithuania, Government of the Republic, *Vyriausybės Kancleris Įsakymas Dėl Darbo Grupės Sudarymo* [Chancellor of the Government Order on the Establishment of a Working Group], no. V-25, 6 Feb. 2023, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/VK_%C4%AFsakymas_Atviros_Vyriausyb%C4%97s_darbo_grup%C4%97.docx.pdf.

³ Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės darbo grupė [Open Government Working Group],” E-pilietis, accessed 28 Mar. 2026, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/suzinokite/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/darbo-grupe/>.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Viktorija Gegznaite-Ilijina (Product Manager at the Centre of Registers), interview by IRM researcher, 26 Mar. 2024.

⁶ The IRM researcher received a list of attendees; 60 people participated in the three sessions. Office of the Government, email to IRM researcher, 31 Oct. 2023.

⁷ Lithuania, Government of the Republic, *Vyriausybės Kancleris Įsakymas Dėl Darbo Grupės Sudarymo* [Chancellor of the Government Order on the Establishment of a Working Group], no. V-168, 8 Dec. 2025, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1765197040/2432/VK+%C4%AFsakymas_Atviros+Vyriausyb%C4%97s+darbo+grup%C4%97

[97_atnaujiniimas.docx.pdf](#); Lithuania, Government of the Republic, *Vyriausybės Kancleris Įsakymas Dėl Darbo Grupės Sudarymo* [Chancellor of the Government Order on the Establishment of a Working Group], no. V-51, 26 Mar. 2025, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1743487357/2352/VK+%C4%AFsakymas+Atviros+Vyriausyb%C4%97s+darbo+grup%C4%97.docx.pdf>.

⁸ Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės darbo grupė [Open Government Working Group].”

⁹ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), email to IRM researcher, 10 Feb. 2026.

¹⁰ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

¹¹ Lithuania, Government of the Republic, *Vyriausybės Kancleris Įsakymas Dėl Darbo Grupės Sudarymo* [Chancellor of the Government Order on the Establishment of a Working Group], no. V-168; Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės darbo grupė [Open Government Working Group].”

¹² Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), interview by IRM researcher, 16 Jan. 2026.

¹³ *Id*; Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

¹⁴ Gaja Šavelė (Dir. Gen. at Nacionalinė NVO koalicija [National NGO Coalition]), interview by IRM researcher, 22 Jan. 2026.

¹⁵ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

¹⁶ Office of the Government, “Viešoji konsultacija dėl Atviros Vyriausybės veiksmų plano [Public Consultation for the New Open Government Action Plan],” accessed 29 Mar. 2026, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/konsultacijos/viesoji-konsultacija-del-atviros-vyriausybes-veiksmu-plano>.

¹⁷ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

¹⁸ Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės partnerystė,” accessed 29 Mar. 2026, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/suzinokite/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/>.

¹⁹ Information provided by the Office of the Government during the pre-publication review, 25 Jan. 2024.

²⁰ Depersonalized emails from members of the Open Government Working Group, received by the IRM researcher from the Office of the Government, 31 Oct. 2023.

²¹ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

²² Rasa Bortkevičiūtė (Lecturer at Vilnius University, the Institute of International Relations and Political Science), interview by IRM researcher, 20 Jan. 2026.

²³ *Id*,

²⁴ Šavelė, interview.

²⁵ Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės darbo grupė [Open Government Working Group],” E-pilietis, accessed 28 Mar. 2026,

<https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/suzinokite/atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste/darbo-grupe/>.

²⁶ Ieva Dunčikaitė (Program Manager at Transparency International Lithuania), interview by IRM researcher, 20 Jan. 2026.

²⁷ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), written comments received during pre-publication review, 9 April 2026.

²⁸ Open Government Partnership, “OGP Participation & Co-Creation Standards,” accessed 29 Mar. 2026,

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

²⁹ Independent Reporting Mechanism, *IRM Guidelines for the Assessment of Minimum Requirements*, 2022,

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/IRM-Guidelines-for-Assessment-of-Minimum-Requirements_20220531_EN.pdf.

³⁰ On 1 August 2025, the OGP Criteria and Standards Subcommittee adopted a resolution on Temporary Suspension of the Enforcement of Time-Bound Minimum Requirements for Participation and Co-Creation, for all members currently implementing plans delivered on or after 1 January 2024. <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/Resolution-of-CS-on-the-Temporary-Suspension-of-the-Enforcement-of-Time-Bound-Minimum-Requirements-2.pdf>; For information on the OGP Procedural Review Policy see: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/procedural-review/#IC>.

³¹ Lithuania, Government of the Republic, *Vyriausybės Kancleris Įsakymas Dėl Darbo Grupės Sudarymo* [Chancellor of the Government Order on the Establishment of a Working Group], no. V-25.

³² Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės darbo grupė [Open Government Working Group].”

³³ *Id*.

³⁴ Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės partnerystė.”

³⁵ Open Government Partnership, *Lithuania: Action Plan Review 2023–2025*, 12 Mar. 2024, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-action-plan-review-2023-2025/>.

³⁶ Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės kanceliarija (Chancellery of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania), “Atviros Vyriausybės darbo grupė [Open Government Working Group].”

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' objectives, 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, or
 - 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 Rugilė Trumpytė and was reviewed by Andy McDevitt, 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,” <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: Establish a common framework for legislative process	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Substantial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Substantial • Early results: Significant Results
This commitment is assessed in Section II above.	
Commitment 2: Building a customer-centric approach and customer-based dialogue practices in the public sector	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? No • Potential for results: Unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Substantial • Early results: No Notable Results
<p>Under this commitment, the Public Management Agency and the Office of the Government aimed to build a customer-centric approach in the public sector. The commitment entailed, among other things, training public sector staff, incentivizing innovations in customer service, developing a network of competences for service professionals, and developing a standard for exemplary customer service.</p> <p>Four e-learning courses for middle managers and agency heads (Milestone 1, Activity 1) were developed and integrated in the online platform, Mokymai.² 248 middle managers and 11 institutional leaders completed the e-courses.³ According to Public Management Agency, more participants are expected in 2026 as previously top level management and their colleagues had other training options and did not prioritize the new model.⁴ Among the remaining activities, a component on customer focus in the guidelines for well-managed institutions has been developed, the competency network for service professionals expanded to 60 members and organized 10 meetings, and a new version of the Procedure for the Preparation of Descriptions of Public and Administrative Services simplified individuals' information obligations to the state.⁵ Other activities like incentivizing innovations or practical hands-on training sessions were not implemented due to time constraints.⁶ A public service customer satisfaction index was postponed but is planned to be developed toward the end of 2026.⁷ As implementation had no measurable impact on government transparency, civic participation, or public accountability, it is assessed as having no notable results at the time of writing .</p>	
Commitment 3: Ensure the co-creation process at the national level	
<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: Substantial • Early results: Moderate Results

This commitment aimed to make government decision-making at the national level more participatory by strengthening the role of public consultations. It foresaw developing a library of best practices and piloting public consultations. Pilot public consultations were planned to serve as good examples for other institutions and create a roadmap for future engagement.

As part of Milestones 1 and 2, the Office of the Government organized six meetings with relevant ministries to identify the most used tools by public sector employees for public engagement. It also organized six meetings with CSOs and two meetings with the Open Government Working Group members to collect their input on participating in public consultations and engaging in the legislative process.⁸ These discussions helped define the topics to cover in the methodological guidelines (Milestone 2). In August 2024, the Office of the Government organized workshops to test the draft guidelines and to identify potential areas for improvement. The methodological guidelines for better public engagement were presented in March 2025 on the online portal "Learning Openness" (Milestone 2).⁹ The Office of the Government created a best practices library showcasing various public engagement initiatives; the library is on the same portal with a network for sharing civic engagement experiences (Milestone 1).¹⁰ Finally, the Office of the Government created a new learning channel for public sector employees on the same platform (Milestone 2), four co-creation sessions between August 2024 and November 2025 with over 160 participants (Milestone 3), and a new, improved co-creation platform (Milestone 4).¹¹ Only one activity was not completed: the best practice awards in co-creation.

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 Lithuania's action plan: https://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/2024-2025%20Open%20Government%20Plan_Lithuania.pdf.
3. For more information on the assessment of the commitments' design, see Lithuania's Action Plan Review: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-action-plan-review-2023-2025/>.

² The online training platform for public sector officials is available at: <https://mokymai.vva.lt/>.

³ 2024-2025 m. Atviros Vyriausybės plano įgyvendinimo ataskaita [Report on the Implementation of the Open Government Action Plan for 2024-2025], https://epilietis.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1773294602/2468/2024-2025m.%20Atviros%20Vyriausybės%20planas_galutinis%20sivertinimas.pdf.

⁴ Ana Selčinskienė (Dir. Gen. at Public Management Agency), interview by IRM researcher, 28 Jan. 2026.

⁵ 2024-2025 m. Atviros Vyriausybės plano įgyvendinimo ataskaita [Report on the Implementation of the Open Government Action Plan for 2024-2025], https://epilietis.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1773294602/2468/2024-2025m.%20Atviros%20Vyriausybės%20planas_galutinis%20sivertinimas.pdf.

⁶ Ana Selčinskienė (Dir. Gen. at Public Management Agency), interview by IRM researcher, 28 Jan. 2026.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Ieva Kimontaitė-Astrauskienė (Advisor at the Office of the Government), interview by IRM researcher, 16 Jan. 2026.

⁹ Office of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania, "Visuomenės įtraukimo praktikos: įgyvendinimo pavyzdžiai [Public engagement practices: implementation examples]," <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/mokomes-atvirumo/visuomenes-itraukimo-praktikos/>.

¹⁰ *Id.*; Office of the Government representative, email to IRM researcher, on the 23 January 2026.

¹¹ Office of the Government, email to IRM researcher on the 23 January 2026. 2026-2027 m. Atviros Vyriausybės planas Viešosios konsultacijos ataskaita [2026-2027 Open Government Action Plan: Public Consultation Report], Office of the Government, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1767162739/2448/Ataskaita_Atviros%20Vyriausyb%C4%97s%20plano%20vie%C5%A1oji%20konsultacija.pdf; Įtraukimo sesija „Piliečių dialogas: koks turi būti mūsų pilietinis pasirengimas?“ Rezultatų ataskaita [Engagement session "Citizens' Dialogue: What Should Our Civic Preparedness Look Like?" – Results Report], Study conducted by research and design agency The Critical for the Strategic Management Group of the Government of the Republic of

Lithuania, 2025, https://lrv.lt/public/canonical/1759142260/524725/Ataskaita_piliec%CC%8Ciu%CC%A8_dialogas_09_23.pdf;
Patirtys, iššūkiai ir galimybės integruojant užsienio kilmės gyventojus savivaldybėse Diskusijos ir dirbtuvių Jonavos raj.
savivaldybėje santrauka [Experiences, Challenges, and Opportunities in Integrating Foreign-Born Residents in Municipalities:
Summary of Discussions and Workshops at the Jonava District Municipality], 17 July 2025,
https://lrv.lt/public/canonical/1758779062/524708/4.%2007-17%20diskusijos%20Jonavoje%20SANTRAUKA_Patirtys,%20i%C5%A1%C5%A1%C5%ABkiai%20ir%20galimyb%C4%97s%20integruojant%20u%C5%BEsienio%20kilm%C4%97s%20gyvent.pdf. The public consultation platform is available at:
<https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/dalyvaukite/viesosios-konsultacijos/>.