# Independent Reporting Mechanism

## Results Report: Malta 2023-2025

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary ..... 2
Section I. Key Observations ..... 5
Section II. Early Results ..... 7
Section III. Participation and Co-Creation ..... 10
Section IV. Methodology ..... 14
Annex I. Commitment Data ..... 16

# Executive Summary

**Malta's fourth action plan ended the country's inactivity in OGP and saw the establishment of a multi-stakeholder forum. However, the plan achieved limited completion and no significant early results, and there was minimal dialogue between government and civil society during implementation. Rebuilding trust and institutionalising the multi-stakeholder forum will be essential to ensure Malta's OGP process leads to results.**

### Implementation

Malta's fourth action plan lifted the country from inactivity status in OGP, after being designated inactive by the OGP Steering Committee in 2022.[1] Of the four commitments, one was substantially completed, and none achieved significant early results. While the level of completion was low, the fourth action plan represents a modest improvement compared to Malta's previous action plan, for which the IRM could not establish that any commitments achieved early results due to a lack of evidence.[2]

Commitment 2 on victims' support and Commitment 4 on youth proofing saw some progress. For Commitment 2, the Victims Support Agency improved its web portal to function as a one-stop resource to connect victims with the appropriate support services,[3] extended its National Support Line to 24/7 availability, and expanded collaboration agreements with government and non-government agencies. For Commitment 4, the National Youth Agency co-developed a youth proofing mechanism with youth organisations. The initiative contributed to the adoption of a Council of Europe (CoE) resolution on youth perspectives in policy-making during Malta's CoE Presidency in 2025.[4] At the time of writing, the youth proofing mechanism has been submitted for approval to Cabinet. Both commitments were driven by dedicated state agencies with clear sector-specific ownership, which proved to be an enabling factor. However, in the case of victims' rights, civil society organisations (CSOs) were not involved in implementation,[5] limiting the commitment's results.

## At a Glance

### LEVEL OF COMPLETION

**1/4** **Complete or substantially complete commitments**

### EARLY RESULTS

**1/4** **Commitments with early results**

**0/4** **Commitments with significant results**

### KEY OBSERVATIONS

- Commitments were defined by government institutions and lacked civil society input and buy-in.
- Limited political prioritisation of open government and an inactive MSF limited the ambition and results of the action plan.
- Longstanding distrust between government and civil society have negatively impacted the implementation of the action plan.

**Met the minimum requirements during implementation:** No



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

## Participation and Co-Creation

The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) coordinates Malta's OGP process. The MoJ established a multi-stakeholder forum (MSF) for the development of the fourth action plan.[6] This was a positive step compared to previous plans, where there was no space dedicated for dialogue between government and civil society on OGP. The process of developing the action plan was more transparent compared to previous plans, with the government publishing reasoned responses to civil society's suggestions to draft commitments.[7] However, the process was compressed to one month prior to the deadline for the government to submit the action plan to OGP. The commitments were pre-identified and drafted by the government, limiting civil society's influence over the plan's content. During implementation, the MoJ reconvened the MSF only once in February 2024, did not update the OGP webpage, and declined civil society requests for meetings.[8] These shortcomings led to the withdrawal of civil society stakeholders from the process, including the Daphne Caruana Galizia Foundation, and reflected a broader erosion of trust.[9]

## Implementation in Context

The submission of Malta's fourth action plan in December 2023 ended a prolonged period of inactivity in OGP and helped revitalise the OGP process in the country. The action plan was developed and implemented against a backdrop of longstanding challenges in the relationship between MoJ and civil society. The MoJ identified civil society polarisation as the main barrier to implementation.[10] On the other hand, civil society pointed to a lack of political prioritisation at the highest levels of government and unwillingness to engage advocacy-based CSOs on priorities related to the rule-of-law,[11] particularly the recommendations from the Daphne Caruana Galizia Public Inquiry.[12] Despite these challenges, the establishment of the MSF and the results achieved by sector-specific agencies – particularly in youth policy, where co-creation with youth organisations was meaningfully embedded – demonstrate that collaboration with certain ministries (like the MoJ) and rule-of-law advocacy CSOs is possible when there is willingness to engage. Several CSOs expressed readiness to reset the relationship should the government demonstrate renewed commitment to the OGP process.[13] This will require sustained commitment from all stakeholders to maintain dialogue throughout implementation and to build on the areas where collaboration has shown results.

---

[1] Open Government Partnership, Resolution of the OGP Steering Committee Regarding the Participation Status of Malta in OGP, 24 March 2022, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/resolution-of-the-ogp-steering-committee-regarding-the-participation-status-of-malta-in-ogp-2022/.

[2] Open Government Partnership, Malta Transitional Results Report 2018– 2020, 26 October 2021, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/malta-transitional-results-report-2018-2020/.

[3] Victims Support Agency, Collaborating Agencies, accessed 18 February 2026, https://victimsupportagency.com/collaborating-agencies/.

[4] Council of Europe, Resolution on the Council of Europe Reference Framework on a Youth Perspective, 9 October 2025, https://rm.coe.int/resolution-on-the-coe-reference-framework-on-a-youth-perspective-w-app/488028cf72.

[5] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.

[6] Open Government Malta, accessed 14 February 2026, https://opengov.gov.mt/multi-stakeholder-forum/.

[7] Open Government Partnership, IRM Action Plan Review: Malta 2023-2025, 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/malta-action-plan-review-2023-2025/.

[8] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

[9] Daphne Caruana Galizia Foundation, Why we have withdrawn from Open Government Partnership Malta, 15 April 2025, https://www.daphne.foundation/en/2025/04/15/withdrawal-from-ogp-malta.
[10] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[11] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[12] Global Freedom of Expression, Columbia University, English translation of the public inquiry report into the assassination of Daphne Caruana Galizia, December 2021, https://globalfreedomofexpression.columbia.edu/publications/english-translation-of-the-public-inquiry-report-into-the-assassination-of-daphne-caruana-galizia/.
[13] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.

# Section I. Key Observations

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

**Observation 1: Commitments were defined by government institutions and lacked civil society input and buy-in.**

According to civil society, Malta has struggled to establish a robust OGP process since joining the partnership in 2011.[14] In 2022, the OGP Steering Committee designated Malta as inactive due to delays in submitting a new action plan.[15] While the submission of the fourth action plan in December 2023 helped to revitalise OGP in Malta, the absence of a collaborative co-creation process indicates significant ongoing challenges.

Government institutions defined the policy areas and scope of Malta's fourth action plan before any consultations with civil society. The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) circulated the draft commitments to civil society on 20 December 2023 for comments by 27 December 2023, requiring stakeholders to work through the holiday period to provide feedback.[16] CSOs reported that their suggestions were largely not incorporated, both at this stage and at the next opportunity to revise the action plan in February 2024.[17] Several civil society stakeholders reported that the process reduced their interest to engage in implementation.[18] Looking ahead, collaboration earlier in the co-creation process between government and CSOs could help stakeholders identify a shared set of priorities. This could help build trust from both government and civil society in future co-creation processes.

**Observation 2: Limited political prioritisation of open government and an inactive MSF limited the ambition and results of the action plan.**

Malta's co-creation process saw the creation of the country's first multi-stakeholder forum (MSF). However, the MSF convened only once during the implementation period, in February 2024.[19] The MoJ declined civil society's requests for meetings.[20] This meant there was no mechanism for monitoring progress or building mutual accountability and trust.

According to civil society representatives, this reflects a lack of political prioritisation of open government in Malta.[21] Civil society believes that while the OGP process is managed at the administrative level (senior civil servants), the decisions that determined whether commitments would be carried out were taken at the political level – where open government did not appear to be a priority.[22] Several civil society members of the MSF expressed concern that, in the absence of regular MSF meetings or implementation updates, their participation had served primarily to maintain Malta's standing in OGP rather than to advance collaboration.[23] The MoJ attributed the lack of engagement during implementation to the challenges posed by differing expectations with civil society.

For the next action plan cycle, institutionalising the MSF – by jointly developing its remit, membership, and governance structure – could create a more productive OGP process. Political-level engagement with the process and seeking support from the OGP Support Unit could also help Malta move towards a more effective model.

**Observation 3: Longstanding distrust between government and civil society negatively impacted the implementation of the action plan.**

Malta's participation in OGP has been shaped by a lack of collaboration between government and civil society. The MoJ noted that civil society's presence in Malta (including advocacy-based

organisations and sectoral organisations) has grown significantly only in the past two decades, meaning that both sides are still developing effective ways of working together.[24]

The MoJ attributed the lack of collaboration during implementation to political polarisation, characterising some CSOs as motivated by partisan interests.[25] Civil society, in turn, maintained that this characterisation serves to delegitimise advocacy-based organisations and to avoid engaging with their priorities, including the recommendations from the Daphne Caruana Galizia Public Inquiry, a clear priority for civil society and a sensitive subject for government.[26] Several civil society representatives noted that the MoJ engages more readily with service-oriented organisations in the voluntary sector but does not pursue dialogue with advocacy-based groups working on the functioning of democracy and the rule of law.[27] This dynamic contributed to the Daphne Caruana Galizia Foundation withdrawing from the OGP process in April 2025.[28]

Looking ahead, stakeholders could consider ways to build a more productive OGP process by establishing regular dialogue and clarifying expectations of what issues can be addressed through OGP. This could include a shared understanding of OGP as a platform to discuss open government reforms, including outstanding rule-of-law recommendations alongside willingness from government to take CSO's priorities seriously, and willingness from civil society to continue working with government through the OGP process. In future OGP action plans, Malta could consider using open government approaches to further improve the country's already strong track record on e-government.

---

[14] Open Government Malta, accessed 14 February 2026, https://opengov.gov.mt/multi-stakeholder-forum/.
[15] Open Government Partnership, Resolution of the OGP Steering Committee Regarding the Participation Status of Malta in OGP, 24 March 2022, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/resolution-of-the-ogp-steering-committee-regarding-the-participation-status-of-malta-in-ogp-2022/.
[16] Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[17] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[18] Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 13 March 2024; Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 28 February 2024; Aditus Foundation, correspondence with the IRM, 7 March 2024.
[19] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026; Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[20] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[23] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[24] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026. Global Freedom of Expression, Columbia University, English translation of the public inquiry report into the assassination of Daphne Caruana Galizia, December 2021, https://globalfreedomofexpression.columbia.edu/publications/english-translation-of-the-public-inquiry-report-into-the-assassination-of-daphne-caruana-galizia/
[27] Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[28] Daphne Caruana Galizia Foundation, Why we have withdrawn from Open Government Partnership Malta, 15 April 2025, https://www.daphne.foundation/en/2025/04/15/withdrawal-from-ogp-malta.

# Section II. Early Results

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

## Table 1. Commitments with Early Results

**Commitment 2:** Increased access to information to victims' rights and support services by creating a one-stop shop repository that connects victims with the appropriate channels.

## Commitment 2: Raising public awareness in support of victims' rights and victim support services.

**Implementers:** Victims Support Agency – Ministry for Home Affairs, Security, Reforms and Equality

### Context and Objectives

This commitment, led by the Victims Support Agency (VSA), aimed to provide the right information and support tools to all victims of crime in Malta. This entailed the development of an information and educational campaign on victims' rights and support services and an online repository to access this information. Victims of crimes in Malta must consult multiple sources to access information about their rights, which discourages them from trying to obtain the information they need.[29] The repository would become a one-stop shop for information on victims' rights and contact information for NGOs who support victims. The VSA would continue to manage the repository after the end of the action plan.[30]

**Early Results:** Moderate

The commitment had moderate early results as it improved access to information to victims' rights and support services. The VSA undertook three actions as part of implementation: i) developing a repository tool of collaborating agencies on the VSA web portal, providing contact information and direct links to services;[31] ii) extending the National Support Line for Victims of Crime to 24/7 availability, accessible by both phone and chat;[32] iii) publishing Victims Support Guidelines to help victims understand their rights and legal options.[33]

The commitment ensured that citizens can access information on victims' rights and more easily contact the VSA and other support services. The VSA webpage, which existed prior to the action plan, now functions as a one-stop resource guiding victims towards the appropriate channels. The VSA noted that this has reduced duplication of services and delays in connecting victims with the support they need.[34]

To feature on the collaborating agencies page, organisations must enter into a formal collaboration agreement with the VSA. As part of the commitment's implementation, the VSA expanded the number of these agreements, bringing on board numerous government and non-government entities, including Legal Aid, Court Services, the Justice Department, Victims Support Malta, and SOS Malta. The increased number of collaborating agencies facilitated new joint initiatives and projects in the victims' support field beyond the OGP commitment.[35]



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

The IRM assesses the level of completion of this commitment as substantial. The milestones set out in the action plan differ from the activities carried out in practice. Of the planned milestones, the VSA carried out a mapping of victims' rights and support services, which informed the identification of organisations to feature on the VSA repository. However, the campaign to raise awareness of victims' rights was not carried out. Furthermore, a sub-working group for the implementation of this commitment was never formed, as the VSA carried out its implementation largely independently.

The VSA identified gaps in its collaboration with civil society – an area where, prior to the OGP process, there had been no structured engagement.[36] To better understand these gaps, the VSA commissioned a study titled "Improving Multi-Agency Collaboration for Victim Support and Wellbeing" to assess the realities of government-civil society cooperation in the victims' support field.[37] The study's findings were translated into 12 recommendations for both government and civil society[38] and integrated into a new Corporate Strategy for Victims Support Agency (2024-2027). The strategy was co-drafted with CSOs.[39]

The VSA and civil society differ in their perspectives of the commitment's progress. CSOs, including Repubblika, the Daphne Foundation, and SOS Malta, maintain that the commitment has not been taken forward,[40] while the VSA noted that it has been substantially completed.[41] This discrepancy may stem from the fact that civil society was not kept informed of implementation progress, and that organisations that engaged in bilateral discussions to establish collaboration agreements, such as SOS Malta, were not made aware that these activities formed part of the OGP commitment's implementation. The VSA acknowledged that engagement with CSOs was low but noted that delivering on the commitment required consulting stakeholders on the ground in the victims' support field which were not part of the OGP process.[42]

While the activities carried out differ from those originally defined in the commitment, the IRM considers that the actions implemented contributed to some of the milestones. For example, although a dedicated sub-working group was not established, there is evidence of engagement with organisations that signed agreements to act as partner organisations aiding victims. In addition, the publication of the guidelines contributed to milestone 3 (launching and implementation of an online toolkit).

**Looking Ahead**

According to the VSA, Malta is prioritising victims' support in light of demographic and political shifts across Europe and the emergence of new trends such as cybercrime and hate crime.[43] The VSA noted that Malta is among the first European countries to launch a one-stop shop mechanism and a dedicated support line for victims. The VSA described the reform as continuously evolving and plans to continue to strengthen relationships with collaborating agencies and expand cross-border cooperation tied to European-level initiatives.[44] Key changes from this commitment are expected to continue after the action plan, including the 24/7 support line and the repository tool with information on victims' rights and support services.

Moving forward, the VSA could consider establishing a sub-working group with the organisations listed under the commitment, hosting regular meetings to gather feedback, provide updates on implementation, and create opportunities for civil society with thematic expertise to contribute to the reform's direction. It could also help to broaden engagement by conducting targeted outreach to bring additional stakeholders from the victims' support field into the OGP process, should this policy area be prioritised in future action plan cycles. Finally, a public awareness campaign, with civil society involvement in its development and dissemination,

could ensure that victims and the wider public are aware of available services and referral pathways.

[29] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 8 February 2024.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Victims Support Agency, Collaborating Agencies, accessed 18 February 2026, https://victimsupportagency.com/collaborating-agencies/.
[32] Victims Support Agency, Contact us, accessed 18 February 2026, https://victimsupportagency.com/contact-us/.
[33] Victims Support Agency, Victims Support Guidelines, https://victimsupportagency.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Victim-Support-Guidelines-V3.pdf; Victims Support Agency, interview by the IRM, 16 February 2026.
[34] Victims Support Agency, interview by the IRM, 16 February 2026.
[35] Victims Support Agency, Hate Speech, accessed 18 February 2026, https://victimsupportagency.com/#.
[36] Victims Support Agency, interview by the IRM, 16 February 2026.
[37] Joseph Giordmaina, Improving Multi-Agency Collaboration for Victim Support and Well-Being, January 2024, https://victimsupportagency.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Final-Report-Concise-Overview-March-2024-002.pdf.
[38] Victims Support Agency, A Corporate Strategy for Victim Support Agency 2024-2027, April 2024, https://victimsupportagency.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Victim-Support-Corporate-Strategy-Booklet-compressed.pdf.
[39] Victims Support Agency, interview by the IRM, 16 February 2026.
[40] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[41] Victims Support Agency, interview by the IRM, 16 February 2026.
[42] Victims Support Agency, interview by the IRM, 16 February 2026.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

# Section III. Participation and Co-Creation

**Malta's 2023-2025 action plan helped restart the country's OGP process following years of inaction. The MoJ established a multi-stakeholder forum (MSF), a dedicated OGP webpage, and published responses to civil society feedback. However, the compressed co-creation timeline and government-defined commitments limited civil society's influence over the action plan. During implementation, the government re-convened the MSF only once and did not provide updates on progress.**

## OGP in Malta

The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) coordinates Malta's participation in OGP. In 2022, the OGP Steering Committee designated Malta as inactive in OGP due to delays in submitting a new action plan. The MoJ submitted the fourth action plan in December 2023, reactivating Malta's membership in line with the recommendations of the Steering Committee.[45]

In September 2023, the MoJ issued a call inviting CSOs to join a multi-stakeholder forum (MSF) to co-create the action plan. Twelve CSOs responded to the call and participated in the forum, which was presided over by two Co-Chairs representing government and civil society. The MSF's Terms of Reference (ToR) were made available on Malta's OGP webpage. However, they were not developed in collaboration with civil society.[46]

The Open Government Malta webpage is the primary source of information on the OGP process in Malta. It contains information on Malta's history in OGP, the latest action plan, the co-creation process, the Terms of Reference of the MSF, a repository of older action plans and IRM reports of previous action plans.[47] The Ministry of Justice maintained the website during co-creation of the fourth action plan but has not updated it since the action plan was adopted on 27 December 2023.

## Action Plan Co-Creation

The MoJ started the co-creation for the fourth action plan with a call for interest in September 2023 inviting CSOs to participate in an MSF and choose up to two from five pre-identified commitment themes. The call was posted on the MoJ's Facebook page on 5 September 2023,[48] and on its website.[49] Advertisements to participate in the OGP process were posted in print and online media.[50] The commitments' themes were chosen by the MoJ with other ministries and government entities based on government priorities and areas where they could include civil society's expertise.[51] Several civil society representatives expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of opportunities to influence the selection of commitments and their scope and milestones.[52]

The MoJ organised the first MSF meeting on 30 November 2023, one month before the deadline to submit the action plan to OGP. Members of the MSF were divided into workshops to discuss the selected themes and gather feedback.[53] After the meeting, the MoJ prepared draft commitments and circulated them to the MSF on 20 December 2023 for comments until 27 December 2023.[54]

According to civil society stakeholders, the co-creation process did not offer sufficient time or opportunities to influence the commitments. The comment period coincided with the December holiday season, placing an additional burden on those wishing to contribute substantive feedback within the deadline.[55] According to the MoJ, to meet the 31 December 2023 deadline for delivering the action plan, a longer co-creation process could not be carried out.[56]



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

The next MSF meeting took place on 20 February 2024 to discuss amendments to the action plan in response to civil society's suggestions.[57] After the meeting, the MoJ published on the Open Government Malta webpage the feedback from the MSF members on the commitments, with the reasons why each suggestion was accepted or rejected.[58] Civil society stakeholders criticised the minimal changes made to the final commitments and the limited inclusion of the amendments that civil society had put forward.[59]

The MoJ took some positive steps in restarting Malta's OGP process, namely forming an MSF, creating an OGP webpage, and publishing responses to stakeholders' feedback on the draft commitments. The MSF, although formed close to the deadline to submit the action plan, was an improvement compared to past action plan cycles, which had no space for dialogue between government and civil society.[60] However, the lack of opportunities for civil society to shape commitments, and the limited incorporation of their input into the final plan, point to ongoing challenges. For future co-creation processes, the IRM recommends early involvement of civil society in identifying the themes and priorities to include in the action plan.

**Participation during Implementation**

There were no opportunities for civil society monitoring of the action plan's implementation within the MSF. Following the 20 February 2024 meeting to discuss amendments to the action plan, the MSF did not meet again during the implementation period.[61] Civil society stakeholders reported that the MoJ did not offer opportunities for CSOs to comment on implementation progress, ask questions, or suggest a way forward.[62] Furthermore, as the Open Government Malta webpage has not been updated since the publication of the fourth action plan, non-government stakeholders beyond the MSF were not able to monitor implementation progress.

Dialogue between government and civil society during implementation did not meet OGP's minimum requirements for participation, which include regular MSF meetings (at least every six months) throughout the implementation period and updating the OGP website at least twice a year with evidence of the commitments' implementation (see Table 2).[63]

Requests from civil society members of the MSF for meetings with the MoJ were declined during the implementation period.[64] After multiple attempts, in June 2024 the civil society co-chair of the MSF, a representative from the organisation Repubblika, issued a letter to Malta's Prime Minister also on behalf of Aditus Foundation, Daphne Caruana Galizia Foundation, and SOS Malta. The letter called for civil society's concerns and priorities to be taken into account, including incorporation in the action plan of outstanding international and domestic rule-of-law recommendations for Malta, and requested a meeting with the Prime Minister or a political representative to discuss the implementation of the action plan.[65] However, the MoJ did not respond to the letter. Following this, the Daphne Foundation announced their withdrawal from the OGP process.[66] Civil society attempts to contact the MoJ continued without success until June 2025.[67]

The MoJ cited Malta's ongoing political polarisation as the main challenge to implementation of the action plan. On the other hand, Repubblika maintained that government delegitimises CSOs working on democracy and the rule-of-law by characterising them as motivated by partisan interests to reject dialogue with them.[68] Moving forward, collaboration could be strengthened through regular dialogue during implementation, sustained follow-through on agreed commitments, and openness from all stakeholders to engage across a broad range of policy areas. In addition, collaboration could be strengthened by diversifying the government agencies and CSO partners involved in the OGP process and also diversifying the topics to include ones where progress is being made outside of OGP (such as e-government).



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

The IRM uses the OGP Participation and Co-Creations Standards to assess countries' participatory practices throughout the action plan cycle.[69] Countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the standards and to comply with the minimum requirements under each standard.[70]

## Table 2. Compliance with Minimum Requirements

| Minimum requirement | Co-creation | Implementation |
|---|---|---|
| **1.1 Space for dialogue**: The multi-stakeholder forum (MSF) did not meet at least every six months during the implementation phase of Malta's fourth action plan. The last MSF meeting was on 20 February 2024, to discuss amendments to the action plan.[71] | Yes | No |
| **2.1 OGP website:** The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) created a publicly accessible "Open Government Malta" website detailing Malta's participation to OGP. It contains links to Malta's latest action plan, co-creation process, the Terms of Reference of the MSF, and a repository of older action plans.[72] | Yes | Yes |
| **2.2 Repository:** The MoJ has not updated the Open Government Malta webpage since the publication of the fourth action plan. The website does not contain information on the action plan's implementation.[73] | Yes | No |
| **3.1 Advanced notice:** See the Action Plan Review[74] | Yes | Not applicable |
| **3.2 Outreach:** See the Action Plan Review | Yes | Not applicable |
| **3.3 Feedback mechanism:** See the Action Plan Review | Yes | Not applicable |
| **4.1 Reasoned response:** See the Action Plan Review | Yes | Not applicable |
| **5.1 Open implementation:** The MSF met once during the implementation of the fourth action plan, in February 2024. The MoJ did not present civil society stakeholders with implementation updates, and there was no opportunity available for civil society to comment on implementation.[75] | Not applicable | No |

[45] Open Government Malta, accessed 14 February 2026, https://opengov.gov.mt/multi-stakeholder-forum/.
[46] Open Government Partnership, IRM Action Plan Review: Malta 2023-2025, 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/malta-action-plan-review-2023-2025/.
[47] Open Government Malta, accessed 14 February 2026, https://opengov.gov.mt/multi-stakeholder-forum/.
[48] Facebook, Open Government Malta, https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=615408617438050&set=a.163177592661157.
[49] Open Government Malta, accessed 14 February 2026, https://opengov.gov.mt/multi-stakeholder-forum/.
[50] Files shared with the IRM by the Ministry of Justice. Advertisements were published in Il-Mument, It-Torca, The Malta Independent, The Sunday Times of Malta, Malta Today, and Kullħadd.
[51] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[52] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[53] Open Government Malta, Multi-Stakeholder Forum Meeting - Development of Malta's 4th National Action Plan on Open Government, November 2023, https://opengov.gov.mt/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/OGP-Multi-Stakeholder-Forum-Minutes-30.11.2023-.pdf
[54] Open Government Partnership, IRM Action Plan Review: Malta 2023-2025, 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/malta-action-plan-review-2023-2025/.
[55] Aditus Foundation, correspondence with the IRM, 7 March 2024; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 13 March 2024.



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

[56] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 8 February 2024.
[57] Open Government Malta, Malta's 4th National Action Plan, 2024, https://opengov.gov.mt/.
[58] Open Government Partnership, IRM Action Plan Review: Malta 2023-2025, 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/malta-action-plan-review-2023-2025/.
[59] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[60] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026; Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[61] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[62] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[63] Open Government Partnership, OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards, 2021, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/.
[64] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[65] Daphne Foundation, correspondence with the IRM, copy of the letter, 20 January 2026; Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[66] Daphne Caruana Galizia Foundation, Why we have withdrawn from Open Government Partnership Malta, 15 April 2025, https://www.daphne.foundation/en/2025/04/15/withdrawal-from-ogp-malta.
[67] SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026.
[68] Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026.
[69] Open Government Partnership, OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards, 2021, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/.
[70] Open Government Partnership, 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.
[71] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026; Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[72] Open Government Malta, accessed 14 February 2026, https://opengov.gov.mt/multi-stakeholder-forum/.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Open Government Partnership, IRM Action Plan Review: Malta 2023-2025, 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/malta-action-plan-review-2023-2025/.
[75] Daphne Foundation, interview by the IRM, 19 January 2026; SOS Malta and Aditus, interview by the IRM, 20 January 2026; Repubblika, interview by the IRM, 21 January 2026; Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.

# 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.[76]

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.[77] The level of completion for all commitments is assessed as one of the following:

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

### Early Results

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

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



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

- **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 Laura Farci and was reviewed by German Emanuele, IRM external expert. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products and review process is overseen by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).[78] For more information, refer to IRM webpage[79] or the glossary of IRM and OGP terms.[80]

[76] For definitions of OGP terms, such as co-creation and promising commitments, see OGP Glossary, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/.
[77] 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.
[78] Open Government Partnership, Independent Reporting Mechanism, International Experts Panel, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/who-we-are/international-experts-panel/.
[79] Open Government Partnership, IRM Overview, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/.
[80] Open Government Partnership, OGP Glossary, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/.

# Annex I. Commitment Data[81]

**Commitment 1: Creation of a Justice Forum.**

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

- ∉ **Completion:** Not Started
- ∉ **Early results:** No Notable Results

This commitment aimed to establish a Justice Forum as a designated space for government and civil society to discuss justice-related reforms in Malta. The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) planned to i) co-create the forum's Terms of Reference and Standard Operating Procedures with all stakeholders; ii) define the consultative process and the channels of communication adopted by the forum; and iii) carry out a pilot to evaluate the forum's operation.[82]

The MoJ confirmed that no milestones under the commitment have been carried out.[83] According to the MoJ, implementation did not start due to different expectations between government and civil society on the Justice Forum's scope.[84] The MoJ stated that the forum was intended to facilitate dialogue on new legislation from the MoJ before submission to Cabinet.[85] Civil society, on the other hand, advocated for the forum to take stock of international and domestic rule-of-law recommendations for Malta, particularly those related to the Daphne Caruana Galizia Public Inquiry.[86] According to the MoJ, discussing these recommendations is outside the MoJ's remit and what could be discussed in a consultative forum on draft legislation, and went beyond the scope of OGP.[87] The MoJ stated that these differing expectations prevented progress on the commitment and contributed to the resignation from the Justice Forum of key civil society stakeholders.[88]

The IRM found no evidence that the Justice Forum was established. The IRM also found no evidence of meetings to discuss a way forward for implementation. As a result, this commitment has not had notable results in opening government at the time of assessment.

**Commitment 2: Raising public awareness in support of victims' rights and victim support services.**

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

- ∉ **Completion:** Substantial
- ∉ **Early results:** Moderate Results

This commitment is assessed in Section II: Early Results, above.

**Commitment 3: Access to justice for minors.**

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

- ∉ **Completion:** Not Started
- ∉ **Early results:** No Notable Results



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

This commitment sought to enhance access to justice-related information for children and define a five-year action plan for disseminating this information. The activities included defining, together with CSOs, the type of content to be disseminated and setting up the digital infrastructure to host the information.[89]

The MoJ was supposed to lead this commitment, in collaboration with the Ministry for Social Policy & Children's Rights and civil society stakeholders in the field. According to the MoJ, no milestones have been carried out.[90] The MoJ stated that implementation did not start due to the breakdown in collaboration with civil society (see Commitment 1).[91] The IRM found no evidence that the digital platform to host child-friendly justice-related information was launched. The IRM also found no evidence of meetings to discuss a way forward for implementation. As a result, this commitment has not had notable results in opening government at the time of assessment.

The MoJ reports that several activities were carried out to improve awareness and understanding of children's rights within the justice system.[92] Although not in line with the original activities planned under Commitment 3, these initiatives support the goal of enhancing access to justice for children by providing accessible, age-appropriate, and rights-based digital tools. An educational platform "TEMI" was developed, which will offer structured online courses that focus on children's rights and child-friendly justice. This platform is expected to be launched for the public in Q2/Q3 of 2026. In parallel, Legal Aid Malta, in collaboration with the Commissioner for Children, has created child-friendly informational content and educational videos to empower children with knowledge about their rights and help them understand justice processes.[93] This content is available on the website of Legal Aid Malta and will also be accessible through the TEMI platform. Moreover, a toolkit for professionals have been developed with tutorial materials on child-friendly justice, available both on the Legal Aid Agency's website and on the Commissioner for Children's Rights website.[94] The corresponding videos are expected to be launched in May 2026 as part of the TEMI platform.

**Commitment 4: Youth proofing mechanism.**

- ∉ **Verifiable:** Yes
- ∉ **Does it have an open government lens?** Yes
- ∉ **Potential for results:** Unclear
- ∉ **Completion:** Limited
- ∉ **Early results:** No notable results

The commitment envisioned the creation of a Youth Proofing Mechanism, a framework to engage young people in policy- and decision-making. It was suggested by the National Youth Agency (Aġenzija Żgħażagħ), in collaboration with youth representatives.[95] According to the action plan, the commitment aimed to address an underrepresentation and insufficient consideration of the perspectives and interests of young people in Malta's decision-making processes. The commitment sought to build on the National Youth Policy: Towards 2030[96] – a national strategy to address the needs of young people in governance – and previous legislative reforms in 2014 which regulated the youth work profession and the introduction of voting rights for 16-year-olds.[97]

The IRM assesses the level of completion of this commitment as limited. The National Youth Agency issued an open call for youth organisations to design the youth proofing mechanism.



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

The organisations that expressed interest were umbrella groups in the youth policy field in Malta. The National Youth Agency and the youth organisations held six in-person meetings and three online meetings between 2024 and 2025 to discuss the set-up of the mechanism. The National Youth Agency stressed that it regarded youth organisations as equal partners in the development of the mechanism, with their feedback and suggestions implemented throughout (i.e., a checklist of the main qualities of youth proofing was entirely proposed by the youth groups involved).[98] The National Youth Agency's willingness to engage with civil society in designing the mechanism is notable. Nonetheless, the IRM researcher was unable to reach the National Youth Council,[99] the umbrella CSO representing youth in Malta and key stakeholder of this commitment, to comment on the assessment of this commitment.

The National Youth Agency began the process by mapping existing public consultation frameworks at national and European levels, based on which the implementers formed a proposal tailored to young people.[100] A Youth Task Force was established to gather input from youth organisations. The mechanism was submitted to the Ministry for Education, Sport, Youth, Research and Innovation for approval, and following ministerial approval, a proposal was sent to the Cabinet.[101] The outstanding milestones –a public consultation on the mechanism and its operationalisation – are contingent on the Cabinet's approval, which at the time of writing is pending. The categories of legislation and policies expected to be subject to youth proofing are primary legislation and any policy document or strategy uploaded on the government's public consultation portal.[102] As the Cabinet has yet to approve the mechanism, the commitment has had no notable results in opening government as of this writing.

Several activities ran in parallel to the commitment's implementation, creating synergies that strengthened youth engagement.[103] In 2025, Malta held the Presidency of the Council of Europe (CoE), under which the 10th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth took place[104] – the first such conference in a decade. During the conference, a resolution was adopted establishing a Reference Framework on Youth Perspective as a guiding document for policy advancement in this area within the CoE and across EU Member States.[105] The resolution drew from the learnings of the youth proofing mechanism, which was presented in the conference by the National Youth Council.[106] Another initiative that emerged from the commitment's implementation is the Youth Information Ambassadors programme, launched in January 2026 and open to all young people.[107] The National Youth Agency and the National Youth Council run the programme, with the aim of improving and disseminating youth information services.[108]

The National Youth Agency considers the resolution at the Council of Europe Ministerial Conference a sign that the initiative will be sustained into the future, and sees the resolution as strengthening the Cabinet proposal.[109] However, the longevity of the reform will ultimately depend on whether the Cabinet approves the mechanism and on whether the mechanism is used effectively by youth once operational.

The National Youth Agency did not collect meeting minutes, written responses, or evidence of how it considered feedback during the mechanism's development. To increase transparency and accountability, the implementers could create a portal for policy co-creation as part of the youth proofing mechanism, where youth organisations can access edit histories, meeting records, and government responses to feedback related to policies.



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism

[81] Editorial notes:
1. Commitments' short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see Malta's action plan: https://opengov.gov.mt/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Malta_Action-Plan_2023-2025-December.pdf.
2. For more information on the assessment of the commitments' design, see Malta's Action Plan Review: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/malta-action-plan-review-2023-2025/.

[82] Open Government Malta, Malta's 4th National Action Plan, 2024, https://opengov.gov.mt/.
[83] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Global Freedom of Expression, Columbia University, English translation of the public inquiry report into the assassination of Daphne Caruana Galizia, December 2021, https://globalfreedomofexpression.columbia.edu/publications/english-translation-of-the-public-inquiry-report-into-the-assassination-of-daphne-caruana-galizia/.
[87] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026; Open Government Partnership, IRM Action Plan Review: Malta 2023-2025, 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/malta-action-plan-review-2023-2025/.
[88] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[89] Open Government Malta, Malta's 4th National Action Plan, 2024, https://opengov.gov.mt/.
[90] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[91] Ministry of Justice, interview by the IRM, 12 February 2026.
[92] Information provided to the IRM by the MoJ during the pre-publication review of this report, 13 April 2026.
[93] Legal Aid Malta website, https://legalaidmalta.gov.mt/infographics
[94] Legal Aid Malta website, https://legalaidmalta.gov.mt/sites/default/files/2025-11/Lesson%20Plan%201.PDF, Commissioner for Children's Rights website, https://tfal.gov.mt/professionals/?lang=en/#document
[95] Open Government Malta, Malta's 4th National Action Plan, 2024, https://opengov.gov.mt/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Malta_Action-Plan_2023-2025-December.pdf.
[96] Aġenzija Żgħażagħ, National Youth Policy: Towards 2030, 2021, https://youth.gov.mt/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/National-Youth-Policy-2021-30.pdf.
[97] Open Government Malta, Malta's 4th National Action Plan, 2024, https://opengov.gov.mt/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Malta_Action-Plan_2023-2025-December.pdf.
[98] National Youth Agency, interview by the IRM, 5 February 2026.
[99] The IRM researcher requested an interview with the National Youth Council by email on 16 February 2026, and 19 February 2026, but could not get in touch.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid.
[102] National Youth Agency, interview by the IRM, 5 February 2026.
[103] Victims Support Agency, interview by the IRM, 16 February 2026.
[104] Council of Europe, 10th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth, 8-9 October 2025, https://www.coe.int/en/web/youth/10th-ministerial-conference-2025.
[105] Council of Europe, Resolution on the Council of Europe Reference Framework on a Youth Perspective, 9 October 2025, https://rm.coe.int/resolution-on-the-coe-reference-framework-on-a-youth-perspective-w-app/488028cf72.
[106] National Youth Agency, interview by the IRM, 5 February 2026.
[107] National Youth Agency and National Youth Council, Youth Information Ambassadors, January 2026, https://online.fliphtml5.com/rqmms/Youth-Info-Ambassadors-Guidelines/#p=1.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Ibid.



Open Government Partnership
Independent Reporting Mechanism