

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Results Report:
Lithuania 2021-2023

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Executive Summary

Lithuania's fifth action plan resulted in the launch of a public beneficial ownership register, allowing civil society and journalists to access this information for the first time. However, data on public procurement was not published in open format.

Early Results:

Lithuania's fifth action plan had three commitments that addressed new policy areas - beneficial ownership transparency, publishing public procurement data in open data format, and standardizing how the government communicates the potential social impact of draft legislation to the public. This marked a change from the fourth action plan (2018-2020), which mostly carried forward unfinished commitments from the third plan (2016-2018).

Commitments 1 and 2 were evaluated as promising commitments in the IRM Action Plan Review. For Commitment 1, the Centre of Registers launched Lithuania's beneficial ownership register, accessible to civil society and journalists upon registration, identification, and demonstrating a "legitimate interest". Before the action plan, Lithuania was one of only three EU Member States without a beneficial ownership register. Civil society and journalists have used the register for their investigations. Commitment 2 aimed to publish procurement data using the Open Contracting Data Standard, covering the entire procurement cycle (from planning, tendering, and awarding the contract, to implementation), and all government sectors. However, the Public Procurement Office did not implement this commitment.

Completion

Out of the three commitments, two were fully implemented. The Centre of Registers launched Lithuania's beneficial ownership register, thus implementing Commitment 1. Public procurement data under Commitment 2 was not opened due to the ongoing litigation with the supplier. Commitment 3 was completed, as the Office of the Government created a sub-section on the My Government portal with the lawmaking plan, legislation to be adopted, the expected timelines, and higher-impact acts, presented in easy-to-understand language.

Participation and Co-Creation

The Office of the Government continued to coordinate Lithuania's participation in OGP. Aside from OGP-related work, it assists the Prime Minister in implementing policies and coordinates the work of the ministries. One of the three commitments was carried out by the Office of the

IMPLEMENTATION AT A GLANCE

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

2/3

Complete or substantially complete commitments

EARLY RESULTS

2/3

Commitments with early results

1/3

Commitments with significant early results

COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

Acting according to OGP process.

Government. The fifth action plan's co-creation process was more inclusive and participatory than the previous co-creation process. Participants at the public consultations voted on which proposals to prioritize, and the results were published online. During the co-creation, an initial electronic survey received 18 proposals, 14 of which came from citizens and civil society (including the three in the action plan).¹ The proposals were discussed at a consultation in May 2020, where more than 50 participants voted on which proposals to prioritize.² The Office of the Government organized four working group consultations in 2020 where participants discussed the five selected proposals in detail and decided on which to include as commitments.³ During implementation, communication with interested stakeholders continued.

Implementation in context

A 2022 decision of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) annulled the provisions of the Fifth EU Anti-Money Laundering Directive requiring public access to beneficial ownership information as means to prevent and detect money laundering.⁴ Though the IRM recommended guaranteeing full access to data on the register without administrative obstacles, CSOs were content that the registry exists in its current scope – open only for public sector institutions, journalists, and companies that provided data. If CSOs prove legitimate interest, they may also obtain beneficial ownership information, but only in machine non-readable files.⁵ As stated by the founder of investigative journalism center SIENA, the fact that Lithuania's registry is only available for journalists rather than all citizens helped keep the register functioning while other registries in Europe were closed.⁶ The Centre of Registers also admitted that limited access to data was the main reason why the CJEU decision did not have a significant impact on the commitment.⁷

¹ Government of the Republic of Lithuania, 2021-2023 Action Plan for Lithuania's Participation in the International Initiative 'Open Government Partnership', p 6, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wpcontent/uploads/2021/06/Lithuania_Action-Plan_2021-2023_EN.pdf

² Republic of Lithuania, p 10, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/Konferencijos%20ataskaita%2005_21.pdf

³ The two discarded proposals involved 1) informing NGOs operating in the areas that will be affected by the envisaged legal regulation immediately after the public announcement of the draft legal acts in the Legal Acts Information System, and 2) creating an information platform for NGO competitions. According to the action plan, these activities will be implemented outside the scope of the OGP action plan.

⁴ European Union Law, Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 22 November 2022, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62020CJ0037>

⁵ Ieva Dunčikaitė (Transparency International Lithuania), interview by the IRM, 5 January 2024.

⁶ Šarūnas Černiauskas (founder of SIENA), interview by the IRM, 20 February 2024.

⁷ Viktorija Gegznaite-Iljina (Product manager at the Centre of Registers), interview by the IRM, 26 March 2024.

Table of Contents

Section I: Key Observations	1
Section II: Implementation and Early Results	3
Section III. Participation and Co-Creation	6
Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators	8
Annex I. Commitment Data.....	10

Section I: Key Observations

Lithuania's fifth action plan was more targeted and ambitious compared to previous plans, with three commitments covering new policy areas. The co-creation process was more participatory and involved a wide range of stakeholders. However, its implementation faced barriers that the Office of the Government should aim to avoid for the sixth action plan (2023-2025).

Observation 1: Lack of awareness of the OGP process among government representatives with decision-making powers reduced the ambition of some commitments.

While the lead agencies had representatives in the Working Group meetings during the co-creation process, senior-level officials in these agencies were not made aware of their planned role in the action plan. For example, the Public Procurement Office (PPO) became aware of the action plan only after it was listed as the responsible institution for Commitment 2, and the Ministry of Justice informed the State Enterprise Centre of Registers about its responsibilities for Commitment 1 after discussions on its scope had taken place. The Office of the Government has taken steps to mitigate this risk when drafting the sixth action plan by forming a new Working Group of senior executives and by including commitments that are under its jurisdiction. In this way, the Office of the Government is fully responsible for the outcome of the action plan.

Observation 2: Commitments derived from existing laws and plans were less flexible in their ambition and implementation.

Although the policy areas in the action plan were voted by civil society, two of the three commitments were taken directly from pre-existing policies and laws. For Commitment 1, Transparency International (TI) Lithuania proposed that the beneficial ownership register provide beneficial ownership information as open data and ensure free access to information on the register. However, the commitment continued as planned according to the 2019 amendments to the Law on Prevention of Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing that mandated the creation of the register. According to the Office of the Government, taking commitments from government strategies and plans made it difficult for them to influence their implementation.⁸ The sixth action plan could mitigate this risk, as two of three commitments are closely related to ongoing initiatives of the Office of the Government, giving it more flexibility to adapt implementation of the commitments to civil society's input.

Observation 3: The proactive approach by the Centre of Registers for the beneficial ownership register led to more registration among companies.

After launching the beneficial ownership register, the Centre of Registers invited companies and interested parties to share their experience in using the register and flag any inconveniences they encountered.⁹ The State Enterprise Centre of Registers proactively approached entities that have a duty to provide information about their beneficial owners and ask about their satisfaction, awareness to declare information, and if they have not done so – why. As of March 2024, 80 percent of those that have the duty to report have already done so.¹⁰ The IRM recommends continuing to consult target groups even after implementation of commitments to guarantee the necessary updates are of higher quality.

⁸ Ieva Kimontaite (Office of the Government), interview by the IRM, 2024

⁹ Viktorija Gegznaite-Iljina (Product manager at the Centre of Registers), interview by the IRM, 26 March 2024.

¹⁰ Ibid.

Section II: Implementation and Early Results

The following section looks at the one commitment or clusters that the IRM identified as having the strongest results from implementation. To assess early results, the IRM referred to commitments or clusters identified as promising in the Action Plan Review as a starting point. After verification of completion evidence, the IRM also took into account commitments or clusters that were not determined as promising but that, as implemented, yielded predominantly positive or significant results.

Commitment 1: Ensuring public access to beneficial ownership information [State Enterprise Centre of Registers, Ministry of Justice]

Context and Objectives:

Under this commitment, the State Enterprise Centre of Registers aimed to create a register of the ultimate beneficial owners of companies in Lithuania. This commitment addressed the technical aspects of preparing the register, including designing and testing the software. The Fourth EU Anti-Money Laundering Directive (AMLD) of 2015 required all EU Member States to establish beneficial ownership registers, while the Fifth EU AMLD of 2018 required Member States to open their registers to the public. Before the action plan, Lithuania was one of only three Member States that had not established any type of beneficial ownership register.¹¹ The absence of a register hindered tax-related investigations in Lithuania.¹²

Amendments in 2019 to Lithuania's Law on Prevention of Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing mandated a public beneficial ownership register as a sub-system (JANGIS) of the Information System of Members of Legal Entities (JADIS). While it would have been created without its inclusion in the action plan, CSOs and other stakeholders prioritized this commitment during the co-creation process. Transparency International (TI) Lithuania proposed that the register provide beneficial ownership information as open data and accessible free of charge, but the Ministry of Justice rejected these suggestions.

Early Results: Significant Results

The beneficial ownership register (JANGIS) was launched in 2022.¹³ The Law obliges all private legal entities, including collective investment undertakings, to obtain, update, and provide to JANGIS accurate information on their beneficial owners – their name, surname, date of birth, personal number, the state which issued the identity document, place of residence, ownership rights held by them, and their scope or other rights of control. The Centre of Registers provides data only upon registration, identification, and if the requester can demonstrate "legitimate interest".¹⁴ According to the State Enterprise Centre of Registers, as of March 2024, 80 percent of entities with a legal obligation to report their beneficial ownership information have already done so.¹⁵

In November 2022, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) annulled the provisions of the Fifth EU AMLD requiring public access to beneficial ownership information. After the CJEU ruling, eight countries suspended public access to their registers, including to journalists and civil society.¹⁶ This decision did not significantly impact the function of Lithuania's register, which continued operating normally by remaining open for public sector institutions, CSOs, journalists, and companies that provided data.

While public access to Lithuania's register is limited to those who can prove legitimate interest, the IRM considers this commitment to have led to significant early results. EU Member States (including Lithuania) lacked clear regulations on how to prove legitimate interest, resulting in some inconsistencies in the provision of beneficial ownership information to Lithuanian CSOs.¹⁷ Nevertheless, for the first time, civil society and journalists – once their identities are screened and their requests registered – can access basic information on the beneficial owners of companies in Lithuania. The register helps journalists and civil society identify suspicious trends more easily in the ownership of companies, which was not possible before having access to this information. The investigative journalism network SIENA regularly uses the beneficial ownership data in its corruption-related investigations, including cross-border research.¹⁸ The register could also help improve public trust in Lithuania's financial sector, whose reputation was damaged by its involvement in the "Troika Laundromat" money-laundering scheme and the Panama Papers revelations.¹⁹ However, the register still includes some false information. SIENA notes that stolen identities are still reported and foreign entities are sometimes listed as beneficial owners without identifying the physical beneficiary.²⁰ The State Enterprise Centre of Registers uses foreign registries to check the accuracy of data linked to international companies registered outside Lithuania.²¹ In 2024, JANGIS will be interoperable with the EU's Beneficial Ownership Registers Interconnection System (BORIS) to exchange data with the registers of EU Member States.²²

The State Enterprise Centre of Registers also met with representatives from European countries that run beneficial ownership registries to learn the modus operandi of other registries.²³ It also held trainings for approximately 380 participants from financial institutions on how to use the register in their work.²⁴

Looking Ahead:

Currently the JANGIS is available free of charge for journalists and civil society. The IRM recommends that the Centre of Registers continue to provide free access for media representatives and introduce clear policies guaranteeing free access with no time limit. Open Ownership notes that charging a fee for every request often prevents journalists, researchers, and CSOs from accessing the data. This can negate the potential benefits of a register, such as using it to conduct thorough investigations into financial irregularities.²⁵ Moreover, CSOs currently receive beneficial ownership data as pdf files, making large-scale research difficult.²⁶ The IRM recommends providing the data in XLS format to make monitoring easier. This is in line with the latest package of laws adopted by the European Parliament to strengthen the EU's efforts to prevent tax evasion, money laundering, and terrorist financing.²⁷ The sixth AMLD, still to be adopted by the European Council, ensures that people with a legitimate interest, including journalists and CSOs, have direct and free access to beneficial ownership information held in national registries.

¹¹ Transparency International, Access Denied? Availability and Accessibility of Beneficial Ownership Data in the European Union, p 5, <https://www.transparency.org/en/publications/access-denied-availability-accessibility-beneficial-ownership-registers-data-european-union>

¹² LRT Radio, the STI interview was broadcast on public radio, <https://bit.ly/3FV7nBS>

¹³ The Center of Registers' website, <https://www.registrucentras.lt/jangis-en/>

¹⁴ Viktorija Gegznaite-Iljina (Product manager at the Centre of Registers), interview by the IRM, 26 March 2024.

¹⁵ Viktorija Gegznaite-Iljina (Product manager at the Centre of Registers), interview by the IRM, 26 March 2024.

¹⁶ Transparency International, Why are EU public registers going offline and what's next for corporate transparency? November 2022, <https://www.transparency.org/en/blog/cjeu-ruling-eu-public-beneficial-ownership-registers-what-next-for-corporate-transparency>

¹⁷ Open Ownership, European Union takes important steps towards standardised and interoperable beneficial ownership information, April 2024, <https://www.openownership.org/en/news/european-union-takes-important-steps-towards-standardised-and-interoperable-beneficial-ownership-information/>

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Šarūnas Černiauskas (founder of SIENA), interview by the IRM, 20 February 2024.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Viktorija Gegznaite-Iljina (Product manager at the Centre of Registers), interview by the IRM, 26 March 2024.

²² Ibid.

²³ Center of Registries, correspondence with the IRM, 29 March 2024.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Open Ownership, Making central beneficial ownership registers public, May 2021, <https://www.openownership.org/en/publications/making-central-beneficial-ownership-registers-public/>

²⁶ Ieva Dunčikaitė (Transparency International Lithuania), interview by the IRM, 5 January 2024.

²⁷ European Parliament, New EU rules to combat money-laundering adopted, 24 April 2024, <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20240419IPR20586/new-eu-rules-to-combat-money-laundering-adopted>

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation

The development and implementation of Lithuania's fifth action plan was more open and participatory compared to previous action plans. The commitments were chosen based on the public's vote. The lead agencies regularly updated stakeholders on the status of implementation of the commitments.

During the co-creation process of the fifth action plan, the Office of the Government launched an electronic survey to gather proposals. Of the 18 proposals, 14 came from citizens and civil society, including the three in the action plan.²⁸ The proposals were discussed at a consultation in May 2020, where more than 50 participants voted on which proposals to prioritize. Beneficial ownership and public procurement received the most votes, while Commitment 3 received the fifth most votes.²⁹ The Office of the Government organized four working group consultations in 2020 where participants discussed the five selected proposals and decided on which to include as commitments.³⁰

During implementation, the Office of the Government produced mid-term and end-of-term self-assessments on the progress of the commitments.³¹ On 25 May 2022, the Office asked the Working Group for their interest in bilateral meetings with lead agencies to discuss the scope of implementation.³² TI Lithuania met the Center of Registers to discuss the beneficial ownership registry (Commitment 1) on 21 June 2022.³³ In addition, on 8 April and 16 November 2022, the Office of the Government invited the Working Group to discuss the most recent status of the action plan.³⁴

Compliance with the Minimum Requirements

The IRM assesses whether member countries met the minimum requirements under OGP's Participation and Co-Creation Standards for the purposes of procedural review.³⁵ During co-creation, Lithuania acted according to the OGP process. The two minimum requirements listed below must achieve at least the level of 'in progress' for a country to have acted according to OGP process.

Key:

Green= Meets standard

Yellow= In progress (steps have been taken to meet this standard, but standard is not met)

Red= No evidence of action

Acted according to OGP process during the implementation period?	
The government maintained an OGP repository that is online, updated at least once during the action plan cycle, and contains evidence of development and implementation of the action plan. ³⁶	Green
The government provided the public with information on the action plan during the implementation period.	Green

²⁸ Government of the Republic of Lithuania, 2021-2023 Action Plan for Lithuania's Participation in the International Initiative 'Open Government Partnership', p 6, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Lithuania_Action-Plan_2021-2023_EN.pdf

²⁹ Republic of Lithuania, p 10, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/Konferencijos%20ataskaita%2005_21.pdf

³⁰ The two discarded proposals involved 1) informing NGOs operating in the areas that will be affected by the envisaged legal regulation immediately after the public announcement of the draft legal acts in the Legal Acts Information System, and 2) creating an information platform for NGO competitions. According to the action plan, these activities will be implemented outside the scope of the OGP action plan.

³¹ Office of the Government, The Fifth Action plan is already in its mid-term, 2022, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos/ipusejo-5-tojo-tarptautines-iniciatyvos-atviros-vyriausybes-partneryste-veiksmu-plano-igyvendinimas>

³² Office of the Government, correspondence with the IRM, 22 December 2023.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Office of the Government, End-of-term self-assessment report, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/igyvendinti-veiksmu-planai>

³⁵ Please note that future IRM assessment will focus on compliance with the updated OGP Co-Creation and Participation Standards that came into effect on 1 January 2022: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>.

³⁶ Office of the Government, The OGP repository, <https://sena-epilietis.lrv.lt/igyvendinti-veiksmu-planai>

Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators

This report supports members' accountability and learning through assessment of (i) the level of completion for commitments' implementation, (ii) early results for commitments with a high level of completion identified as promising or that yielded significant results through implementation, and (iii) participation and co-creation practices throughout the action plan cycle. The IRM commenced the research process after the first year of implementation of the action plan with the development of a research plan, preliminary desk research, and verification of evidence provided in the country's OGP repository.³⁷

In 2022, OGP launched a consultation process to co-create a new strategy for 2023–2028.³⁸ The IRM will revisit its products, process, and indicators once the strategy co-creation is complete. Until then, Results Reports continue to assess the same indicators as previous IRM reports:

Completion

The IRM assesses the level of completion for each commitment in the action plan, including commitments clustered in the Action Plan Review.³⁹ 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 results achieved from the implementation of commitments that have a clear open government lens, a high level of completion, or show evidence of achieving early results (as defined below). It considers the expected aim of the commitment prior to its implementation, the specific country context in which the commitment was implemented, the specific policy area, and the changes reported.

The early results indicator establishes three levels of results:

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

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

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

This report was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with Rugile Trumpyte and was reviewed by Brendan Halloran, IRM external expert. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products, and review process is overseen by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual⁴⁰ and in Lithuania's Action Plan 2021 – 2023. For more information, refer to the "IRM Overview" section of the OGP website.⁴¹ A glossary on IRM and OGP terms is available on the OGP website.⁴²

³⁷ Lithuania, OGP Repository, accessed 28 March 2024, <https://sena-epilietis.lrv.lt/igyvendinti-veiksmu-planai>

³⁸ See Open Government Partnership, *Creating OGP's Future Together: Strategic Planning 2023–2028*, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/creating-ogps-future-together/>

³⁹ 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 and IRM Indicators of the Action Plan Review.

⁴⁰ Independent Reporting Mechanism, *IRM Procedures Manual*, V.3, 16 September 2017, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>

⁴¹ Open Government Partnership, *IRM Overview*, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/>

⁴² Open Government Partnership, *OGP Glossary*, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/>

Annex I. Commitment Data⁴³

Commitment 1: Ensuring public access to beneficial ownership information

<p>☒ Verifiable: Yes</p> <p>☒ Does it have an open government lens? Yes</p> <p>☒ Potential for results: Substantial</p>	<p>☒ Completion: Complete</p> <p>☒ Early results: Significant Results</p>
--	---

This commitment is assessed in Section II above.

Commitment 2: Opening public procurement data

<p>☒ Verifiable: Yes</p> <p>☒ Does it have an open government lens? Yes</p> <p>☒ Potential for results: Substantial</p>	<p>☒ Completion: Limited</p> <p>☒ Early results: No early results</p>
--	---

Under this commitment, the Public Procurement Office (PPO) aimed to open all its historical procurement data in open data format. Specifically, the PPO planned to adopt the Open Contracting Partnership's Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS) to create raw public procurement datasets and metadata. The PPO maintains the Central Public Procurement Information System (CPP-IS) as a publicly accessible contract register.⁴⁴ However, information published to CPP-IS was only available in PDF and DOCX formats⁴⁵ and often missing key data on procurement plans, calls, and overall reports for certain sectors or years. The commitment was closely related to the roll-out of the "SAULĖ IS" e-procurement system, which would replace the CPP-IS by 2023.⁴⁶ SAULĖ IS would contain only data from 2023 onwards, excluding historical public procurement records. To keep historical data open during and after the transition to SAULĖ IS, this commitment entailed opening data from 2017.

Although the government's self-assessment indicates the commitment was implemented, the IRM assesses this commitment as having limited implementation.⁴⁷ The PPO did the preparation and compiled public procurement datasets (international, simplified procedure and low value procurement reports and contracts) and their metadata, as well as datasets for concessions, defense sector reports and their metadata. However, this data was not opened during the action plan period. The SAULĖ IS project has been delayed due to alleged breaches of contract by the service provider, Novian Systems.⁴⁸ In January 2024, the PPO terminated its contract with Novian Systems for the modernization of the CPP-IS.⁴⁹

Defense and national security are increasingly important areas for corruption prevention in Lithuania, due to the high knowledge asymmetry, the large amount of confidential data, and the increase in spending on defense following Russia's full-scale military invasion of Ukraine. In 2022, Lithuania purchased goods and services for defense worth 280 million euros, and half of all procurement contracts had secrecy or confidentiality tags.⁵⁰ According to TI Lithuania, it is not always clear if those tags are applied reasonably.⁵¹ For this reason, the commitment remains relevant as it foresaw opening defense procurement data for public scrutiny, with confidentiality and secrecy tags when necessary. Depending on the outcome of

the legal litigation, the IRM recommends the PPO continue opening this data. The IRM also recommends making public procurement data interoperable with beneficial ownership data and disclosures of public officials' asset declarations. The launch of the beneficial ownership registry (Commitment 1) presents an opportunity to link beneficial ownership information with public procurement data. For example, data on procurement contractors could be tied to the beneficial ownership register.

Commitment 3: Assessing the impact of draft decisions

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Moderate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Complete • Early results: Moderate Results |
|--|---|

Under this commitment, the Office of the Government aimed to develop a standard template to present to the public the potential benefits and consequences of draft legislation that could have a "greater impact" on society. It also aimed to present it in an easily understandable manner to avoid bureaucratic language. Among other deliverables, the Office of the Government created a sub-section on its website on the My Government portal, with the law-making plan, legislation to be adopted, the expected timelines, and highlighted higher-impact acts.⁵² However, it is not clear if the language is less bureaucratic and easier to understand for the public, or how extensively the portal is used by citizens and CSOs.

⁴³ 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://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/lithuania-action-plan-2021-2023/>
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-2021-2023/>

⁴⁴ Central Procurement Portal, <https://cvpp.eviesiejipirkimai.lt/>

⁴⁵ Transparency International, Open Data and Political Integrity in the Nordic Region, 2019, p 49, https://www.transparency.lt/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Open_Data_Report.pdf

⁴⁶ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/cvp-is-pakeitimais-susije-su-sudarytu-sutarciau-viesinimu/>

⁴⁷ Office of the Government, End of term self-assessment report, 2023, https://epilietis.lrv.lt/uploads/epilietis/documents/files/Final%20self-evaluation%20report_Action%20plan%205.pdf

⁴⁸ Marius Žemaitis (Head of e-Procurement), interview by the IRM, 3 January 2024.

⁴⁹ Facebook, Public Procurement Office statement, 10 January 2024, <https://www.facebook.com/ViesujuPirkimuTarnyba/posts/pfbid0EQaWt6rmxvjtcB4Xct45aA7Eew9USvHuKPEtqdpXURQaZvJHGeBRY2n9UWkGs9TYI>

⁵⁰ Public Procurement Office, Information on defence and security procurement in 2022, <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/nuorodos/kiti-duomenys/powerbi/informacija-apie-2022-m-vykdytus-viesuosius-pirkimus-gynybos-ir-saugumo-srityje/>

⁵¹ Alfa news portal, There is one reason why defence procurement is vulnerable, March

2024, <https://www.alfa.lt/aktualijos/lietuva/del-vienos-priezasties-gynybos-sritis-korupcijai-itin-palanki-kaip-to-isvengti/324644/>

⁵² Office of the Government, E-citizen sub-section, <https://epilietis.lrv.lt/vyriausybes-teisekuros-planai>