

LITHUANIAN CONTRIBUTION TO THE 2026 RULE OF LAW REPORT

23 JANUARY 2026

Lithuanian contribution to the Rule of Law Mechanism is compiled by the Ministry of Foreign affairs of Lithuania from the inputs made by:

- Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania;
- Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania;
- Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania;
- Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Lithuania;
- Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania;
- National Courts Administration;
- The Seimas Ombudspersons' Office;
- Public Procurement Office;
- Chief Official Ethics Commission.

Table of Contents

General feedback on Commission's recommendations.....	3
I. Justice System.....	4
A. Independence	4
B. Quality of justice	14
10. Accessibility of courts (e.g. court/legal fees, legal aid, language)	14
C. Efficiency of the justice system:.....	25
II. Anti-corruption framework.....	29
A. The institutional framework capacity to fight against corruption (prevention and investigation / prosecution)	30
B. Prevention.....	32
C. Repression	43
III. Media pluralism and media freedom	46
A. Media authorities and bodies	46
B. Safeguards against government or political interference and transparency and concentration of media ownership.....	47
C. Framework for journalists' protection, transparency and access to documents.....	48
IV. Other institutional issues related to checks and balances	50
A. The process for preparing and enacting laws	51
B. Independent authorities.....	53
C. Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions.....	56
D. The enabling framework for civil society.....	58
E. Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture	58

General feedback on Commission's recommendations

Ministry of Justice

Finalise the reform of the legal aid system, in particular by ensuring adequate conditions for the participation of legal aid providers, taking into account European standards on legal aid.

Due to financial constraints, additional budget to increase remuneration for lawyers providing state-guaranteed legal aid was not approved, given the need to prioritize other areas, particularly national defense.

Following the entry into force of the amendments to the Law on State-Guaranteed Legal Aid in 2024, specialized training is organised for lawyers providing secondary legal aid in sensitive court cases. In 2025, approximately 90 000 Eur was allocated for the implementation of special training programmes, and approximately 150 lawyers were trained. These lawyers receive double remuneration (50 Eur per hour) for services provided in such cases.

In 2026, development of the Legal Aid Information System (TEISIS) is planned in order to reduce the administrative burden for lawyers providing state-guaranteed legal aid (for example, improvements of the functionality for submitting remuneration requests).

Step up efforts to improve the transparency of the system of appointments to judicial positions, notably to the Supreme Court, taking into account European standards on judicial appointments.

An improvement of the procedures for the selection of judges with a view to further facilitate formation of the judicial corps is envisaged in the Program of the 20th Government of the Republic of Lithuania¹ (hereinafter – the Program). Although the Implementation Plan of the Program² does not include specific actions aimed at implementing this measure, discussions regarding the transparency and efficiency of the selection process of candidates to judicial posts have been ongoing since January 2025. The Judicial Council composed a working group of representatives of the Office of the President of the Republic and of the Judicial Council for improving the selection procedures for judges and judicial candidates. The deadline for the working group to prepare and submit possible proposals to the Judicial Council is 28 February 2026.

Constitutional Court

Recommendations addressed to Lithuania in the 2025 Rule of Law Report concerned such spheres as finalising the reform of legal aid, in particular by ensuring adequate conditions for the participation of legal aid providers and improving the transparency of the system of appointments to judicial positions, notably to the Supreme Court.

As to the activities of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania, the Constitutional Court's ruling of 26 November 2025 on assessing the individual situation of the applicant when providing state-guaranteed legal aid created conditions for improving the provision of this aid. The ruling obligates the legislature to modify the unconstitutional provisions of the Law on State-Guaranteed Legal Aid insofar as they did not establish that the State-Guaranteed Legal Aid Service has the right, in exceptional cases, taking into account the applicant's request and having assessed the individual situation of a particular applicant, to provide secondary legal aid where there is a ground for not providing secondary legal aid (when the applicant refuses to pay the established part of the costs of secondary legal aid). By this ruling, the Constitutional Court ensured the effective secondary legal aid for socially sensitive (vulnerable) persons, for whom it is particularly difficult to access it for financial reasons, as well as in other cases where it is necessary in the interests of justice. At the same time, the Constitutional Court ensured the right of these persons to apply to a court. In the context of accessibility issues, including non-judicial settlement of disputes, the Constitutional Court adopted the ruling of 23 October 2025 on the reimbursement of costs incurred by parties to disputes before labour dispute commissions. Also, there are in the Constitutional Court two pending constitutional justice cases concerning the constitutionality

¹ [Dėl Dvidešimtosios Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės programos](#)

² [Dėl Dvidešimtosios Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės programos nuostatų įgyvendinimo plano patvirtinimo](#)

of the legal regulation on the reopening of a criminal case and the reopening of civil proceedings.

Concerning the appointments to the Constitutional Court, in October–November 2025, the Seimas appointed three new justices of the Constitutional Court to replace three justices whose term of office will expire in March 2026. The new appointed justices should swear and begin their work on 19 March 2026. However, the Constitutional Court examined a petition from a group of members of the Seimas concerning one of the appointed justices. The petitioner argued that the appointed justice in question had not completed a 10-year length of service in the field of law or in a branch of science and education as a lawyer as it is required by Article 103(3) of the Constitution and Article 5(1) of the Law on the Constitutional Court. On this issue, in its ruling of 15 January 2026, the Constitutional Court confirmed the doubts of the petitioner. This and other aforementioned constitutional justice cases will be described in more detail in the section “Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents (incl. judicial review)” (A “Independence”) and the section “Accessibility of courts” (B “Quality of justice”) accordingly.

Taking into account the public debate on the qualification requirements for candidates for justices of the Constitutional Court, regarding the requirement of service in the field of law as a lawyer and legal education for the justice of the Constitutional Court, the members of the Seimas registered a draft law on amending the Law on the Constitutional Court to clarify the requirements to the position of a justice. The draft law and other related issues will be described in more detail in section A “Independence” “Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents (incl. judicial review)”.

I. Justice System

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2024 Report regarding the justice system (if applicable):

A. Independence

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to the independence of justice, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

1. *Appointment and selection of judges³, prosecutors and court presidents (incl. judicial review)*

National Courts Administration

In 2025, the Selection Commission of Candidates to Judicial Office carried out the total of 13 selections for higher courts and leadership positions (11 for leadership positions, 2 for higher courts).

In 2025, the following number of candidates were assessed and entered into the ranking lists according to the respective court level: 43 candidates for the post of a judge of district courts, 21 candidates for the post of a judge of regional courts, and 4 candidates for the post of a judge of administrative courts.

In 2025, the President of the Republic appointed 32 judges to the posts of judges of district courts (of which 6 judges were transferred to the same level of courts, 1 judge was reassigned, 23 judges were appointed to the posts of judges of higher instance courts, 1 judge was appointed to the post of court presidents, and 5 judges were appointed to the posts of vice-presidents).

Constitutional Court

Concerning the appointments to the Constitutional Court, under paragraph 1 of Article 103 of the

³ The reference to ‘judges’ concerns judges at all level and types of courts as well as judges at constitutional courts.

Lithuanian Constitution⁴, every three years, one-third of the Constitutional Court is renewed: three justices whose nine-year term of office has expired are replaced by three newly appointed justices. On this basis, in October–November 2025, the Seimas appointed three new justices of the Constitutional Court: Mr Artūras Driukas (the Seimas resolution No XV-501⁵), Mr Julius Sabatauskas (the Seimas resolution No XV-502⁶), and Mr Haroldas Šinkūnas (the Seimas resolution No XV-619⁷) to replace the three justices whose term of office will expire in March 2026.

The new appointed justices should swear and begin their work in the Constitutional Court on 19 March 2026. However, on 11 November 2025, the Constitutional Court accepted for consideration⁸ a petition from a group of members of the Seimas concerning one of the appointed justices, Julius Sabatauskas (petition No 1B-15/2025 (case No 15/2025)⁹. The petitioner challenged the Seimas resolution on his appointment as a justice of the Constitutional Court. Relying on Article 103(3) of the Constitution and Article 5(1) of the Law on the Constitutional Court¹⁰, the members of the Seimas argued that Julius Sabatauskas, who was appointed to the position of a justice, does not meet the requirement “with ... a 10-year length of service in the field of law or in a branch of science and education as a lawyer”, which is laid down in Article 103(3) of the Constitution and Article 5(1) of the Law on the Constitutional Court. After obtaining a university degree in law in 2003, Julius Sabatauskas has served only as a member of the Seimas and has not completed the required length of service in the field of law as a lawyer to the position of a justice of the Constitutional Court.

In its ruling of 15 January 2026¹¹, the Constitutional Court confirmed the doubts of the petitioner and acknowledged the unconstitutionality of the aforementioned resolution of the Seimas. The Court held that the Seimas failed to comply with the requirement, set forth in Article 103(3) of the Constitution, to appoint to the office of a justice of the Constitutional Court only such a person who has the professional experience necessary for these duties. The similar argument applies as regards the non-compliance of the said resolution of the Seimas with Article 5 (1) of the Law on the Constitutional Court. Taking into account the public debate on the qualification requirements for candidates for justices of the Constitutional Court, regarding the requirement of service in the field of law as a lawyer and legal education for the justice of the Constitutional Court, the members of the Seimas on 17 September 2025 registered a draft Law Amending Article 5 of the Law on the Constitutional Court (No XVP-746)¹². Specifically, the draft law clarifies that a citizen, inter alia, with higher legal education may be appointed as a justice of the Constitutional Court if he or she has completed at least a ten-year length of service in the field of law requiring higher education in law. In addition, it must be also added that, on 3 December 2025, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania (administrative case No eAS-1421-624/2025)¹³ refused to accept a complaint regarding the legality of the order of the Speaker of the Seimas nominating this candidate for a justice of the Constitutional Court. Certain members of the Seimas requested that the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania revoke the order of the Speaker of Seimas of 18 September 2025¹⁴ and that another candidate who meets the requirements of Article 103(3) of the Constitution be nominated. The Supreme Administrative Court, inter alia, emphasised that the constitutional review of the related issue had already been initiated in the Constitutional Court which accepted for review the petition regarding the constitutionality of the Seimas resolution appointing the candidate in question as a justice of the Constitutional Court.

⁴ <https://lrkt.lt/en/about-the-court/legal-information/the-constitution/192>.

⁵ <https://eseimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/b92be042ae8111f0b28af49e6544ad31>.

⁶ <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/1aa7c732ae8211f0b28af49e6544ad31>.

⁷ <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/9e9372e0cb9e11f0a842b0e89767e3dc?jfwid=628h4mnsnp>.

⁸ <https://lrkt.lt/lt/teismoaktai/paieska/135/ta3181/content>.

⁹ https://lrkt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/11/15_2025.pdf.

¹⁰ the Law on the Constitutional Court is available in English at <https://lrkt.lt/en/about-the-court/legal-information/the-law-on-the-constitutional-court/193>.

¹¹ available in Lithuanian at <https://lrkt.lt/lt/teismo-aktai/paieska/135/ta3208/content>.

¹² <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAP/cf68488093bf11f0bb51b0620d4bdb93>.

¹³ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/c4b38143d5e911f08918e1adc7c5b1ec>.

¹⁴ <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/ba7348f2949911f0bb51b0620d4bdb93?jfwid=mkck5o57e>.

2. *Irremovability of judges; including transfers (incl. as part of judicial map reform), dismissal and retirement regime of judges, court presidents and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)*

National Courts Administration

Taking into account the workload, operational efficiency and other assessed criteria of the district courts and their chambers, as of 1 January 2025 the divisions of district courts were merged, with some chambers being discontinued, and the territorial jurisdictions of certain district courts were also revised. As a result of the merger of district court chambers and their territorial jurisdictions, 27 chambers in district courts continue operations instead of the former 43 chambers, but the buildings of the former chambers have been retained in their respective residential areas, i.e. a single post-reform court chamber consists of 2 or more buildings located in different areas, where hearings are held and where court services are accessible to the residents.

A preliminary initial assessment of the changes brought about by the district court reform found that the most significant positive change was the provision of more opportunities for judges to specialise in specific categories of cases. Following the district court reform, judges' specialisation was established at all district courts.

Following the implementation of the district courts reform and the entry into force of amendments to the Code of Civil Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania relating to the allocation of cases among district courts, it was also observed that the reform had a positive impact on the more even distribution of workloads across the courts (see the response to Question No. 4).

During the district courts reform, at the Kaunas City District Court, two divisions with the highest workloads – where judges had already been assigned specific specialisations prior to the reform – were merged with two chambers that had lighter workloads. As a result, the overall situation in the Court's territorial jurisdiction has not changed substantially and the judges' workload remains uneven.

The district court reform has not substantially affected the accessibility of court services for individuals, enabling them to have access to justice and guaranteeing their right to judicial protection.

3. *Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)*
4. *Allocation of cases in courts*

National Courts Administration

In 2025, the allocation of civil cases in district and regional courts continued in line with the legislative amendments in force since 1 July 2024, which aim to balance the workload of courts. Under the new procedure, certain cases¹⁵ conducted under the written procedure, as well as appeals and separate appeals are allocated between courts by means of a computer software, taking into account their workload and the rules adopted by the Judicial Council. Statistics show that the system this system effectively balances the flows of cases and helps to ensure an equitable distribution of workloads across the courts.

In 2025, resources within the judiciary system were consolidated and directed towards activities related to the completion of the modernisation of the case allocation module of the Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) (hereinafter referred to as the "Module"). In order to properly prepare for the launch of the modernised Lithuanian Courts Information System (hereinafter referred to as the "LITEKOII") and following the assessment of the functionalities of the LITEKOII developed by applying the new technological solution, in 2025, considerable attention was paid to the drafting and harmonisation of the legal acts related to the assignment of cases, the determination of case groups and complexity scores, the numbering of cases, and the calculation of workload. The above-mentioned legal

¹⁵ The following categories of cases that may be heard by written procedure were identified in accordance with Article 62² of the Code of Civil Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania (hereinafter referred to as the "CCP"): documentary proceedings (Article 427(2) of the CCP), proceedings for the issuance of a court order (Article 431 of the CCP), and disputes concerning the award of small amounts (Article 441(2) of the CCP).

acts were adopted by the Judicial Council at its meeting of 29 August 2025:

1) *Resolution No. 13P-115-(7.1.2.E) of 29 August 2025 “On the approval of the description of the Rules on the Allocation of Cases to Judges and the composition of Panels of Judges”*¹⁶.

This legal act establishes the basic operational principles of the new case allocation model, the formula for the judge selection coefficient and its components, the components of the judge selection coefficient formula in LITEKOII, the coefficients for general specialisation, detailed specialisation, and absence of specialisation, the judge (rapporteur) and the Panel member’s coefficients, etc.

The key changes to the components of the judge selection coefficient in the modernised Module are related to the fact that not only the number of cases assigned to a judge during the reporting period within a specific allocation group will be taken into account, but also all the judge’s pending cases at the time of allocation, as well as ongoing and unfinished judicial mediation processes. Another significant change is that, when calculating the judge selection coefficient, both cases assigned to the judge and cases being examined by the judge will be counted across all case types (i.e. not limited to the allocation group), multiplying them by the case complexity score. In addition, cases in which the judge participates as a panel member (not as the rapporteur) will also be taken into account, but will be given a lower weight. Furthermore, when allocating cases to judges, priority will be given to the principle of randomness.

2) *Resolution No. 13P-116-(7.1.2.E) of 29 August 2025 “On the approval of case groups and complexity scores”*¹⁷.

In order to assess the actual workload of a judge, the above-mentioned legal act approved new case groups and complexity scores for the district courts, regional courts, the Court of Appeal of Lithuania, the Supreme Court of Lithuania and the administrative courts. In addition, a complexity score for judicial mediation was established, which will be uniform across all types of cases and all instances of courts, and it was provided that the newly established case complexity scores will be applied both when allocating cases and when calculating workload.

3) *Resolution No. 13P-118-(7.1.2.E) of 29 August 2025 “On the Amendment of the Description of the Procedure for Calculating Workload in Courts, approved by the Resolution of the Judicial Council No. 13P-79-(7.1.2) of 29 May 2015 “On the approval of the Description of the Procedure for Calculating Workload in Courts”*¹⁸.

By the above-mentioned legal act, the Description of the Procedure for Calculating Workload in Courts was amended, taking into account that the complexity scores of the newly approved case groups will be applied not only when allocating cases, but also when calculating workload.

At its meeting on 31 October 2025, the Judicial Council, having regard to the newly envisaged launch date of the modernised Lithuanian Courts Information System – 1 June 2026 (the change of date was essentially determined by a change of service provider) – adopted resolutions amending the entry into force dates of the legal acts approved on 29 August 2025 relating to case allocation, numbering and workload calculation, postponing them from 3 November 2025 to 1 June 2026.¹⁹

Constitutional Court

There are no changes in the allocation of constitutional justice cases in the Constitutional Court in 2025: the cases are attributed to the judges taking into account the alphabetical order and personal workload. In 2025, the Constitutional Court did not adopt rulings dealing with allocation of cases in courts.

¹⁶ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/0a9893b184d411f0a8bbd1e98310677d>

¹⁷ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/20e754d084d411f0a8bbd1e98310677d>

¹⁸ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/5d3bf8f084d411f0a8bbd1e98310677d>

¹⁹ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/6513e251b65611f092fda1fd0c194cc5>

<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/75acffc0b65611f092fda1fd0c194cc5>

<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/8851cbb0b65611f092fda1fd0c194cc5>

<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/99645ee0b65611f092fda1fd0c194cc5>

<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/a77d8831b65611f092fda1fd0c194cc5>

5. *Independence (including composition and nomination and dismissal of its members), and powers of the body tasked with safeguarding the independence of the judiciary (e.g. Council for the Judiciary)*

National Court Administration

In order to strengthen the authority of the courts, improve the quality of the services provided, and increase public trust, by Resolution No. 13P-64-(7.1.2.E) of 21 March 2025, the Judicial Council approved the Strategic Directions of Activity 2025–2028 and the measures for their implementation²⁰. The Judicial Council's strategic directions of activity are: ensuring the authority and financial independence of the courts; improving operational processes of the courts and the quality of services provided; strengthening human resources; and strengthening court communications.

Strengthening the authority and financial independence of the courts. One of the strategic directions of the Lithuanian judiciary is to ensure the stability and independence of court funding. To implement this, measures are envisaged which include the development and establishment of a judiciary system funding model based on objective criteria, seeking increased funding that reflects the needs of the courts, updating the criteria for the allocation of budget appropriations, and strengthening dialogue with strategic partners. It is sought that the Law on Courts of the Republic of Lithuania should provide for greater involvement of representatives of the Judicial Council in the preparation of the state budget. During the period envisaged in the plan, it is also planned to seek the right of the Judicial Council to apply to the Constitutional Court on the constitutionality of laws, decrees and other legal acts adopted by the Seimas, decrees of the President of the Republic, and resolutions of the Government.

Improving operational processes of the courts and the quality of services provided. Another key strategic direction is the improvement of the quality of court operational processes and services. The quality of court processes and services directly affects participants in proceedings. Efficient court functioning results not only in faster and clearer judicial decisions, but also in meeting public expectations. In order to implement the objectives of this strategic direction, it is planned to review and discontinue non-procedural functions performed by judges, and to improve the judges' workload model, ensuring rational allocation of cases. To meet modern standards, it is important to develop a strategy for the introduction of information technologies and artificial intelligence, which would enable the digitalisation of processes and increase the efficiency of court operations. The plans also include establishing the institute of mediation in criminal cases and improving the conditions for the work of court mediators.

Strengthening human resources. Significant attention is paid to the well-being of court staff and to working conditions. The issue of security in courts, which has become particularly prominent recently, has led to the pursuit of implementation of security measures. Attention has been drawn not only to the physical, but also to the psychological safety of court staff. Therefore, it will be sought to implement additional protective measures in Lithuanian courts; however, the implementation of these measures may become a very complex (and possibly even impossible) challenge due to the fact that the 2026–2028 budget does not provide for the allocation of state budget funds, with the exception of the Norway Grants. It is planned to improve the criteria and procedures for the selection of judges, develop a new judge induction programme, assess the system for developing judges' competences, and prepare a modernisation concept for the Training Centre of the National Courts Administration (hereinafter the "NCA"). Attention has also been drawn to courts located in the regions, and it is planned to increase their attractiveness so that judges more actively choose to work in the regions.

Strengthening court communications. Trust in the legal system increases when the public sees competent and open courts. Regular and open provision of information strengthens public confidence that court decisions are well-founded and that the system itself is clear and comprehensible; therefore, significant attention will be devoted to innovative and timely communication. Effective internal communication enables smoother organisation of work, ensures clear information dissemination, and

²⁰

<https://www.teismai.lt/lt/teismu-savivalda/teisejutyba/nutarimai/173/results?sqid=c8e2d13afe0439c7fce8e207be26eb2aec1f5e4b>

strengthens links within the court community. This is one of the most important tools for listening to staff opinion, identifying existing internal issues and selecting possible ways to address them.

Although the implementation of the strategic directions will require overcoming a number of challenges, the Lithuanian judicial system is ready for innovation and seeks to create a more efficient, more modern and more publicly attractive service of administration of justice.

By Resolution No. 13P-79-(7.1.2.E) of 25 April 2025, the Judicial Council approved the External Communication Strategy of the Lithuanian judicial system and its implementation action plan for 2025–2028²¹. The Strategy sets long-term communication directions, priority target audiences and key messages aimed at strengthening public trust in the courts and increasing the openness and comprehensibility of the courts. The Strategy places particular emphasis on more active dialogue with the public and coordinated communication across the entire judicial system.

The Judicial Council places great emphasis on cooperation with constitutional and institutional partners. Regular meetings are organised with the aim of finding solutions to the issues related to the funding of the judiciary system. However, so far this remains a painful and sensitive area. Solutions ensuring the independence of the courts have not yet been found.

On 10 January 2025, members of the Judicial Council met with representatives of the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Lithuania. During the meeting, the key issues of inter-institutional cooperation were discussed, with the aim of ensuring efficient and high-quality administration of justice. One of the key issues of the meeting was the quality of work. During the discussion, the importance of a consistent practice and ensuring accountability for decisions taken was emphasised. The meeting also touched upon the issues of examination of cases by electronic means and the compatibility of the information systems of the Lithuanian courts and the prosecutor's office. This is particularly important in order to avoid distortion of documents and ensure smooth process management. Another important aspect of the discussion was the prosecutors' remote participation in hearings. Members of the Judicial Council drew attention to the benefits of in-person participation in hearings and emphasised that, in criminal cases at first instance, all participants in the proceedings should attend in person, as this allows the court and the parties to assess more effectively the known circumstances of the case. It was decided that resolution of emerging issues through inter-institutional cooperation, and holding more frequent face-to-face meetings to discuss arising issues, are essential in order to ensure smooth process management, consistent practice, and more effective administration of justice.

On 12 February 2025, the Judicial Council met with the Speaker of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania. During the meeting, the Judicial Council presented the decision adopted by the General Meeting of Judges, "On the Judicial Council's Right to Apply to the Constitutional Court"²² and the resolution "On Closer Cooperation between State Authorities on Matters Concerning Judicial Activities"²³. The parties also discussed the judicial system funding model, the security situation in courts, and court staff remuneration issues. The importance of cooperation with constitutional partners, particularly with institutions of the legislative branch, was emphasised, and the expectation was expressed that such meetings should take place regularly, as this would enable more prompt resolution of key issues facing the judicial system. During the meeting, the expectation was reiterated regarding the decision adopted by the General Meeting of Judges – namely, the Judicial Council's right to apply to the Constitutional Court on matters within the Council's remit. Attention was also drawn to funding matters: the judicial system will not be treated as an equal branch of state authority until a cooperation model has been properly discussed and agreed. Low salaries of judicial assistants, psychologists and court hearing secretaries were highlighted as an issue requiring review, taking into account working environment conditions. The infrastructure and security of court buildings were also discussed. It was emphasised that court buildings must reflect the status of the institutions they house; however, this is not something that can be said at present. In addition, the Judicial Council expressed the aim of ensuring that court security is provided by police officers and that additional screening measures are introduced in courts.

²¹

<https://www.teismai.lt/lt/teismu-savivalda/teisejutyba/nutarimai/173/results?sqid=ff78fbf91b621ab556db93121bd07ce3a49e0605>

²² <https://www.teismai.lt/lt/teismu-savivalda/visuotinis-teiseju-susirinkimas/sprendimai/168/2024-10>

²³ <https://www.teismai.lt/lt/teismu-savivalda/visuotinis-teiseju-susirinkimas/sprendimai/168/2024-10>

The Judicial Council hopes that this meeting will mark the beginning of a stronger dialogue and will help strengthen cooperation between state authorities, in order to ensure the effective and independent functioning of the judicial system.

On 21 February 2025, the Judicial Council met with the Lithuanian Bar Association. During the meeting, in addition to discussing cooperation and the organisation of more frequent meetings, the issue of security within the justice system was addressed. The parties discussed the possibility for advocates to inform judges about potential threats and individuals who might pose a risk during legal proceedings. The topic of professional solidarity was also discussed, as well as closer cooperation between existing committees. The meeting also considered the possibility of organising joint training sessions or discussions, and addressed the interoperability of information systems. The topic of work efficiency was examined in the context of protracted proceedings, considering the extent to which the role of advocates may influence this process. The meeting also considered the grounds for the recusal of judges from hearing cases, the quality of cassation appeals, and the psychological preparedness of judges and advocates. The principles of anonymisation of high-profile cases and aspects of communication with the media were also discussed.

On 25 February 2025, the leadership of the Judicial Council met with the Prime Minister. The meeting emphasised important issues of cooperation and court funding. Representatives of the institutions discussed possibilities for the modernisation of court buildings, aspects of the physical safety of participants in court proceedings, and the need for sustainable systemic funding required both to ensure competitive remuneration for court staff and the attraction of qualified specialists, as well as to provide appropriate working conditions in courts regardless of whether they are located in major centres or in the regions.

On 21 March 2025, the Judicial Council met with the Association of Judges of the Republic of Lithuania (LRTA). The LRTA presented possible areas of partnership and cooperation with the Judicial Council. It was agreed to further expand the involvement of the LRTA members in working groups established by the Judicial Council to address matters relevant to judges and courts, and to involve the LRTA members as broadly as possible in legislative processes when considering issues related to the work of courts and judges. Both institutions emphasised the need to unite efforts to strengthen judicial independence, both through monitoring the public domain and through creating systemic mechanisms to safeguard independence. In order to ensure consistent and long-term cooperation, the Judicial Council and the LRTA agreed to organise regular meetings at least once or twice per year. This will help to further strengthen the partnership and ensure the effective service of administration of justice.

On 1 April 2025, the leadership of the Judicial Council met with the Minister of Justice. The discussion addressed opportunities for inter-institutional cooperation in examining issues related to judges' workload, team formation, the required number of judicial assistants, and the remuneration of court staff. The implementation of comprehensive solutions would make a significant contribution to the smooth functioning of the courts. In order for the judicial system and the quality of justice administration services to meet public expectations, it is necessary to address issues in a comprehensive manner, including, *inter alia*, matters relating to the remuneration of court staff and ensuring security in courts. Consistent and sustainable modernisation and renewal of court buildings would undoubtedly contribute to ensuring that every recipient of justice administration services in courts feels respected and safe.

On 26 May 2025, a meeting took place between representatives of the Judicial Council and the Minister of Finance. The meeting discussed important matters concerning the funding of the judicial system – from competitive remuneration for court staff and the attraction of qualified specialists, to the long-term modernisation of court infrastructure and sustainable planning of the courts' budget. Systemic solutions in the area of public finance are an essential condition for ensuring the smooth functioning of the courts and a high quality of justice services. Strengthening the judicial system is in the interest not only of the rule of law but of society as a whole; therefore, greater inter-institutional cooperation will be pursued in addressing pressing issues related to ensuring the functioning of the courts.

Following changes in the composition of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania, meetings were again organised and matters relevant to the court community were discussed anew.

On 6 October 2025, the leaders of the Judicial Council met with the Minister of Justice to discuss current issues affecting the judicial system and opportunities for further cooperation. The meeting focused primarily on the working conditions and remuneration of judges and judicial assistants, as well as ongoing measures to ensure court security. The leaders of the Judicial Council pointed out that funding for court staff, staff safety and the modernisation of court buildings remain among the most important challenges. The Ministry of Justice stated that it was prepared to seek solutions to ensure that the judicial system operates efficiently and that the quality of justice administration meets public expectations.

On 20 October 2025, the leaders of the Judicial Council met with the Prime Minister of the Republic of Lithuania to discuss issues relating to the funding of the judicial system and priorities for the coming years. The discussion focused mainly on competitive remuneration for court and NCA staff, the modernisation of old court buildings, the upgrading of information technologies and cybersecurity, and ensuring physical and psychological security in courts. The leaders of the Judicial Council stressed that the quality of justice is inseparable from the working conditions of those who administer it. Decent pay, appropriate infrastructure and a safe environment are essential conditions for courts to remain an attractive employer and to ensure high-quality administration of justice throughout the country. It was agreed during the meeting that the Government and judicial self-governance bodies would continue to cooperate in order to address judicial system funding issues in a consistent manner, ensure sustainable infrastructure, and strengthen public trust in justice institutions.

On 12 December 2025, members of the Judicial Council met with the President of the Republic of Lithuania and discussed the most strategically important issues for the judicial system, including cooperation, communication, court funding and security. During the meeting, the Head of State emphasised that joint work with the Judicial Council was proceeding smoothly, that the number of legal professionals taking the judicial oath and joining the judiciary was increasing, as was the number of judges pursuing career advancement. The results of court reform in the regions were also discussed separately, as were Lithuania's achievements mentioned in the 2025 Rule of Law Report published by the European Commission. Meetings with the President of the Republic of Lithuania are becoming a tradition, providing an opportunity to share insights into achievements made over the year and the challenges ahead. The Judicial Council appreciates the constructive dialogue with the Head of State and the opportunity to express its position on key strategic issues, which, among other things, directly contribute to ensuring that the administration of justice is in line with the expectations and trust of the public in the courts.

The Judicial Council continues to cooperate actively with constitutional and institutional partners in order to address issues relevant to the judicial community.

6. *Accountability of judges and prosecutors, including disciplinary regime and bodies and ethical rules, judicial immunity and criminal/civil (where applicable) liability of judges (incl. judicial review)*

National Courts Administration

The Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission operates effectively within the Lithuanian judicial system. This judicial self-governance body is responsible not only for examining applications submitted by individuals requesting the opening of disciplinary proceedings, adopting decisions on whether to initiate disciplinary proceedings, and providing consultations to the judicial community, but also for promoting compliance with judicial ethical standards.

Instances of abuse of ethics procedures occur fairly often, where the Commission on Judicial Ethics and Discipline is approached not because of an alleged breach of judicial ethics, but in pursuit of entirely different aims, including attempts to exert influence on a judge. In 2025, the Commission on Judicial Ethics and Discipline received 187 submissions from individuals seeking the initiation of disciplinary proceedings (210 submissions in 2024); however, only two disciplinary cases were initiated and referred to the Judicial Court of Honour for examination.

In one disciplinary case, a decision has already entered into force: it was found that, when

communicating with other judges and court staff, the judge acted inappropriately and rudely, failed to respect others, insulted them, belittled colleagues' work, and, through the manner of speech and communication at two meetings of judges, displayed superiority and disrespect for other judges' opinions, and did not encourage professional, constructive discussion. The other initiated disciplinary case will be examined by the Judicial Court of Honour in 2026.

On 21 November 2025, an international conference entitled "Judicial Ethics as a Value in the Modern World" took place in Vilnius, bringing together legal experts from Lithuanian and European institutions. The conference was also attended by José Igreja Matos, President of the Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE). The event examined current issues in judicial professional ethics, the challenges posed by artificial intelligence, and strengthening public trust in the justice system.

7. *Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service*
8. *Independence of the Bar (chamber/association of lawyers) and of lawyers*
9. *Significant developments capable of affecting the perception that the general public has of the independence of the judiciary*

Constitutional Court

There is one initiative that could to some extent influence the perception of the general public on the Constitutional Court and its independence, as this initiative, according to its author, is oriented to depoliticize the Constitutional Court. On 6 March 2025, the members of the Seimas registered a draft Law on Amending Articles 4, 5, 37, 48, 53, 53-1, 55, and 56 of the Law (No I-67) on the Constitutional Court and Repealing Article 61 (No XVP-180)²⁴. Besides the aim to depoliticise the Constitutional Court, the draft law also aims at strengthening the principles of independence and competitiveness in the process of examining constitutional cases²⁵. The draft law comprises various proposals, including those which are related to the reduction of the competence of the Constitutional Court (for example, eliminating its competence to interpret its rulings, conclusions, or decisions). The authors of the draft law think that the adoption of the draft will increase transparency, independence, and trust in the Constitutional Court. However, the Legal Department of the Seimas which assesses the draft laws before their adoption provided the Seimas with a negative conclusion on this draft law including a note that the proposal to abolish the power of the interpretation of Constitutional Court rulings and its other final acts is inconsistent with the constitutional purpose of the Constitutional Court to administer constitutional justice, to guarantee the supremacy of the Constitution in the legal system and constitutional legality, and the powers of this Court to interpret its final acts when necessary to ensure their proper implementation and compliance, as implied by this purpose and thus arising from the Constitution itself²⁶.

National Courts Administration

In 2025, the Lithuanian judicial system consistently strengthened a strategic, long-term approach to increasing public trust in the courts, paying particular attention to clear, well-reasoned and unified communication about the role of the courts in a democratic state, judicial independence, and the courts' day-to-day work.

In implementing the Judicial Council's strategic directions, in 2025, the NCA initiated the development of a social advertising campaign aimed at dispelling myths about the courts that are widespread in society, and began collecting the necessary material for that purpose. The public launch of the campaign is planned for February 2026. The campaign communicates, in a clear and accessible way, how the courts operate, who makes decisions, how long the examination of cases actually takes, and what safeguards

²⁴

<https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAP/c5252c00fa7511efb8a9e7d5b6ea8569?positionInSearchResults=76&searchModelUUID=cea349d8-6879-4736-a118-43c16d75930d>.

²⁵ <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAK/5d2b2bd0fa7611efb8a9e7d5b6ea8569?jfwid=oxw0mtand>.

²⁶ <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAK/2204fc6008aa11f0a1c6f244a8c21f99?jfwid=oxw0mtand>.

ensure judicial independence. The social advertising campaign will be disseminated through various channels and will represent an important step in moving from reactive to proactive court communication.

In 2025, Lithuanian courts took part in the discussion festival “Būtent!” (“*Exactly*”), where court representatives engaged in open discussions with the public about judicial mediation and the role of a judge in the mediation process. This event enabled the courts to step beyond institutional boundaries and interact directly with the public in an accessible format, strengthening the image of the courts as open institutions ready for dialogue.

On 16 April 2025, an event entitled “Kava su teisėju” (“*Coffee with a Judge*”) was organised, during which representatives of the Lithuanian media met, in an informal setting, with the leaders of the Judicial Council and the Communications Committee of the Judicial Council. The meeting discussed cooperation between the courts and the media, public communication of court activities, and other issues relevant to the judicial system. Following this meeting, in order to achieve the objectives set out in the External Communication Strategy of the Lithuanian judicial system and its implementation action plan for 2025–2028, and to strengthen media reporting on court activities, the Judicial Council established a working group and tasked it, by 27 February 2026, with carrying out a systematic assessment of the legal regulation governing the provision of information about cases to the media (in the context of the principles of open justice, public proceedings, personal data protection, media freedom, etc.) and, where the need for amendments is identified, preparing draft amendments to laws and other legal acts²⁷.

In 2025, the Courts Day initiative was further developed in a targeted manner. Across the country, it presented the public with various aspects of court activity, the work of judges and court staff, the history of the courts, and their significance for the democratic order. The Courts Day activities were aimed not only at raising public awareness, but also at building trust, highlighting the importance of judicial independence and the value of justice.

In 2025, important national anniversaries were also marked: the 35th anniversary of the restoration of independence and the 30th anniversary of the Court of Appeal and the regional courts. Considerable public attention was drawn to the exhibition of judicial robes from European countries, prepared and displayed by the Supreme Court of Lithuania, which revealed shared European legal traditions and emphasised the role of courts in a democratic society. To mark the 30th anniversary of the Court of Appeal and the regional courts, open days, discussions with judges, and guided tours of court premises were organised in Lithuania. All of this contributed significantly to a broader public understanding of court activity.

In 2025, consistent work was also continued to strengthen coordinated external communication across the entire judicial system: common positions were prepared on topical issues, court decisions were explained, and responses were provided to public debates and sensitive topics related to court activity. Particular attention was paid to clear, non-formalised language, so that court communication would be understandable not only to lawyers but also to the wider public. Since 2025, the website *teismai.lt* has provided the public with information in accessible, easy-to-read language about legislation, court activity, judicial proceedings and the core principles of the administration of justice.

In 2025, 565 court press releases were prepared and published regarding cases of public interest²⁸ (in

²⁷ Resolution of the Judicial Council of 29 August 2025 No. 13P-121-(7.1.2.E) “On the Establishment of a Working Group”
(<https://www.teismai.lt/lt/teismu-savivalda/teisejutyryba/nutarimai/173/results?sqid=e0d95074d3a846ff3463deb36a26c88f3fbd53f1>)

²⁸ According to the Rules on the Provision of Information about Court Activities and Cases to Producers and Disseminators of Public Information, a “case of public interest” is a case being heard or already concluded in court that meets at least one of the following criteria:

- the progress of the case is followed by producers and/or disseminators of public information;
- the case involves a public figure and there is a public interest in being informed about the course and outcome of the proceedings;
- the case concerns issues of significance to society or a substantial part of it.

2024, 650 court press releases on such cases).

The initiatives implemented in 2025 contributed to the consistent strengthening of the image of the courts as an independent, professional institution that is open to the public, and laid the foundation for long-term changes, the effect of which on public trust in the courts will be assessed in the coming years.

B. Quality of justice²⁹

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to the quality of justice, please specify which, regarding in particular topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

10. *Accessibility of courts (e.g. court/legal fees, legal aid, language)*

Constitutional Court

Recommendations addressed to Lithuania in the 2024 Rule of Law Report concerned finalising the reform of legal aid, in particular by ensuring adequate conditions for the participation of legal aid providers. The Constitutional Court's ruling of 26 November 2025 on assessing the individual situation of the applicant when providing state-guaranteed legal aid created conditions for improving the provision of legal aid. The ruling³⁰ obligates the legislature to modify the provisions of paragraphs 10 and 11 of Article 11 of the Law on State-Guaranteed Legal Aid which were declared unconstitutional insofar as they did not establish that the State-Guaranteed Legal Aid Service has the right, in exceptional cases, taking into account the applicant's request and having assessed the individual situation of a particular applicant, to provide secondary legal aid where there is a ground for not providing secondary legal aid laid down in item 9 of paragraph 7 of this article, i.e. where the applicant refuses to pay the established part of the costs of secondary legal aid.

The Constitutional Court noted that the impugned legal regulation also creates preconditions for situations where effective secondary legal aid for socially sensitive (vulnerable) persons, for whom it is particularly difficult to access it for financial reasons, is not ensured, as well as in other cases where it is necessary in the interests of justice, thus also denying the right of a person to apply to a court, which is consolidated in paragraph 1 of Article 30 of the Constitution and is an integral element of the constitutional principle of a state under the rule of law.

In the context of accessibility issues, including non-judicial settlement of disputes, the Constitutional Court's ruling of 23 October 2025³¹ could be mentioned. This ruling is related to the legal regulation, established in the Labour Code, under which labour disputes between employees and employers on rights are considered by a special institution – a labour disputes commission – free of charge and the costs incurred by the parties to the dispute are not recoverable. The petitioner raised doubts as to the constitutionality of that legal regulation because of its failure to grant a court the right to award the party that has won a labour dispute before a labour disputes commission the costs (inter alia, the costs of the assistance of an advocate) incurred during that dispute, when taking into account the individual circumstances of the case (reasonableness and necessity of the costs incurred, good faith of the party, etc.). According to the Constitution, in the petitioner's opinion, damage caused to a person, including

²⁹ Under this topic, Member States are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined under section 2.

³⁰ available in Lithuanian at <https://lrkt.lt/lt/teismo-aktai/paieska/135/ta3191/content>.

³¹ available in English at <https://lrkt.lt/en/court-acts/search/170/ta3180/content>.

procedural losses related to the defence of violated rights, should be fairly compensated.

By its ruling of 23 October 2025, the Constitutional Court recognised that the impugned legal regulation was not in conflict with the Constitution. It noted that, by means of the legal regulation on settlements in labour disputes on rights, as established by the Labour Code, the legislature created the preconditions for a free, effective, impartial, and non-judicial settlement of labour disputes on rights which is based on the principle of cooperation between social partners and which aims, among others, to ensure that the parties to the dispute do not incur unnecessary financial losses, such as costs for the services of advocates; the legislature has the discretion to determine how and to what extent the costs incurred in settling disputes under prelitigation procedure are reimbursed, especially in order to protect the interests of employees, and to encourage them to defend their violated rights more actively and thus make the consideration of labour disputes more accessible.

In addition, regarding accessibility issues two petitions based on the individual constitutional complaints pending in the Constitutional Court could be mentioned: (1) petition No 1A-15/2025 (case No 8-A/2025) on the time limit for submitting a request to reopen a criminal case; the petition was received on 12 May 2025³² and (2) petition No 1A-18/2025 (case No 9-A/2025) on the reopening of civil proceedings where the Constitutional Court has not declared a legal act in conflict with the Constitution, but has provided its interpretation of essential importance for the civil case concerned; the petition was received on 4 June 2025³³.

Although the number of applications received in 2025 in the Constitutional Court was lower than in 2024, they became more accurate.

Ministry of Justice

As presented at the follow-up meeting in October 2025, the draft order of the Minister of Justice on workload distribution for legal aid providers was tested informally in 2025 to assess the necessity and suitability of the mechanism and to identify any deficiencies. On 1 July 2025, the results of this informal application were presented to the State-Guaranteed Legal Aid Coordination Council, an advisory body composed of representatives of relevant stakeholders. It was agreed that the legal aid case allocation method used in practice requires fewer resources and balances the workload of legal aid lawyers relatively well; therefore, there is no need to adopt a proposed legal act at this stage. It was suggested to monitor the status quo and, should legal aid providers indicate that case allocation becomes an issue, to resume discussions on adopting a legal act (Protocol No. 27R-45 of 15 July 2025). To date, no such indications have been received from members of the Bar Association.

11. Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material³⁴), remuneration/bonuses/rewards for judges and prosecutors, including observed changes (significant and targeted increase or decrease over the past year),

National Courts Administration

In 2025, the human, financial and material resources of the Lithuanian judicial system remain insufficient, and the appropriations allocated ensure only the minimal continuity of the system's operations, but do not create the conditions for addressing structural issues related to understaffing, uncompetitive remuneration, physical security in courts, or the deterioration of infrastructure. In 2025, the ratio of funding for the Lithuanian judicial system to gross domestic product (GDP) continued to decrease and stood at approximately 0.16%, whereas in 2024 it amounted to 0.18%. It should be noted that, under the adopted state budget for 2026–2028, this ratio will remain at around 0.16% of projected GDP in 2026, will decline to 0.15% in 2027, and to 0.14% in 2028, thereby further entrenching the lag

³² available in Lithuanian at https://lrkt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/05/1484_001_.pdf.

³³ available in Lithuanian at https://lrkt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/06/prasymas-1a-18_2025.pdf.

³⁴ Material resources refer e.g. to court buildings and other facilities. Financial resources include salaries of staff in courts and prosecution offices.

in judicial system funding in comparison with the country's economic growth.

In 2025, courts continued to face a significant shortage of human resources, particularly in forming judge's team, and this issue has been consistently deepening over the past five years. More than 10% of approved posts remained vacant, the majority of them being posts of judicial assistants and court hearing secretaries: the share of vacant judicial assistant posts increased from 5.3% in 2021 to 10.9% in 2025, and the share of vacant court hearing secretary posts increased from 4.6% to 10.4%. Despite the fact that most judicial assistants possessed high legal qualifications, staff turnover remained extremely high, and the largest share of those leaving employment are specialists with less than five years' work experience. Competitions for vacant posts often fail due to a lack of candidates or insufficient interest in the working conditions offered. As a result, courts continually face the need to train new staff, which negatively affects the stability of court operations, the efficiency of processes, and the duration of proceedings.

Insufficient funding for remuneration also contributed to this situation. In 2025, funding for remuneration in the courts amounted to only around 89.9% of actual needs (a need of EUR 122.4 million, with EUR 110 million allocated in the budget). Although in 2025 the wage fund increased by approximately 1.9%, the additional funding was allocated only to judicial assistants and amounted, on average, to about additional EUR 106 per month per FTE (gross, before tax). Overall growth in the wage fund remained limited and was largely linked to horizontal decisions in the public sector; therefore, the pay of court staff continues to lag behind national and public sector averages. In the medium term, no fundamental change is foreseen either, as in the 2026–2028 budget, remuneration growth is planned essentially only as a result of horizontal decisions, which does not create the conditions for addressing structural issues related to attracting and retaining qualified employees.

Average wage in the country is growing rapidly – by around 70% since 2020. Due to insufficient funding, court staff remuneration is falling behind the national average wage (both in the private and public sectors): the average salary of judicial assistants amounts to about 0.85 of the public sector average wage, while that of court secretaries does not even reach 0.7 of the public sector average wage.

Further uncertainty for wage planning in the judiciary system was created by amendments to the legal regulation governing the setting of the basic amount of the official salary, adopted at the end of 2025 while the state budget was already under consideration. Instead of the previous model, under which wage growth could be linked to indexation of the total wage fund, the new regulation establishes a uniform increase in the basic amount of the official salary for all employees. Such a decision removes flexibility to differentiate pay increases according to the specifics of posts, competences or performance results, and limits the ability of heads of institutions to address pay disproportions in a targeted manner.

According to the adopted decisions, the basic amount of the official salary in 2026 is to increase by only around 0.7%, while at the same time the statutory minimum monthly wage is to increase by more than 10%. As a result, the gap between unskilled and highly skilled work continues to narrow, and the existing structural issues of remuneration in the judicial system are not only not being resolved, but are deepening. It should be noted that judges' salaries were last amended and increased in July 2023, and from January 2026 they are to increase by only 0.7%, whereas inflation from July 2023 to November 2025 has amounted to 5.5%. Thus, judges' salaries are in practice consistently decreasing (due to the depreciation of money as a result of inflation), which raises the risk of a breach of the principle of judicial independence.

It should also be noted that, notwithstanding the commitments set out in clause 521 of the Government programme “to ensure the professionalism and independence of the courts by strengthening the corps of judicial assistants”, these objectives are not reflected in the adopted state budget for 2026–2028. The appropriations allocated are limited to horizontal decisions in the public sector, and no targeted funding aimed at strengthening the corps of judicial assistants and increasing the professionalism of the courts was provided for; therefore, this restricts the implementation of this Government programme objective and may have a negative impact on the stability and independence of the judicial system.

In the area of material resources, funding is also lacking: although in 2025 certain modernisation and renovation projects for court buildings continued, the overall level of infrastructure funding remained insufficient. Some court buildings are outdated and require major repairs and security measures;

however, limited appropriations do not allow these issues to be addressed in a timely manner. This affects both staff working conditions and access to court services, as well as the safety of participants in proceedings.

Funding was also not allocated to courts for the implementation of new cybersecurity requirements under Directive (EU) 2022/2555 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 December 2022 on measures for a high common level of cybersecurity across the Union, amending Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 and Directive (EU) 2018/1972, and repealing Directive (EU) 2016/1148 (NIS 2 Directive).

In summary, it should be noted that in 2025 the changes implemented in the area of judicial system resources were limited and largely horizontal in nature. They did not resolve structural issues related to shortages of human resources, uncompetitive remuneration, and the deterioration of infrastructure. Insufficient and insufficiently predictable funding continues to pose risks to the efficiency, quality and long-term stability of the judicial system.

Reforms of the remuneration system in the judicial system have been implemented in stages since 2023. In 2023, the legal regulation governing judges' salaries was amended and judges' salaries were increased – they were recalculated under a new model for the basic amount of the official salary. In 2024, new legal regulation on remuneration for civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions entered into force, under which the coefficients of official salaries for court staff were also recalculated. In 2025, the basic amount of the official salary was not changed.

It should be noted that at the end of 2025, a new initiative was also launched to amend the Law on the Civil Service, under which the remuneration regulation for civil servants, including employees of the judicial system, is being reviewed. These amendments are expected to enter into force from 1 July 2026; however, following the coordination procedures, the revised version of the draft law has not yet been registered in the Legal Acts Information System. No additional appropriations were provided for in the 2026 state budget for the implementation of these proposed amendments. In view of this, no additional targeted decisions were adopted in the 2026 state budget that could be regarded as a continuation of the implementation of remuneration reforms in respect of the judicial system.

Ministry of Justice

In 2025 Lithuania made further steps aimed at facilitating and improving the work of courts. The Program also establishes the goal of ensuring the professionalism and independence of the courts and strengthening the corps of judicial assistants. According to the Implementation Plan of the Program, in order to make the functioning of the justice system more efficient and to increase the attractiveness of working in courts, by 2027 the Ministry of Justice, together with representatives of the Judicial Council, the Ministry of Finance and other institutions, will have to assess the need for human resources to implement the functions assigned to the judicial system and develop measures to help form the judicial team (judicial assistants, meeting secretaries, court psychologists) more effectively, as well as to assess the possibilities for reviewing the remuneration of the judicial team. To achieve this, the Minister of Justice has set up a working group, focusing on improving the efficiency of the justice system, and on developing measures to facilitate the formation of a judicial team more effectively. Broad participation of various stakeholders ensures opportunities to achieve sustainable and long-term solutions.

It is important to note that the budgetary allocations for the courts have been increasing annually. In 2026, the allocations for the courts increased from 122,595 to 123,959 million euro.

Prosecutor General's Office

On January 1, 2024, amendments to the Law on the Prosecutor's Office came into force, eliminating the possibility of paying prosecutors a bonus for length of service to the Lithuanian state. Under the current law, the salary for both new prosecutors and those with several years of experience in the prosecutor's office is the same and does not depend on professional experience. In 2025, a draft amendment to the

Prosecutor's Office Act was registered in the Seimas, proposing to pay prosecutors a bonus for length of service, but the Seimas did not approve this proposal.

On January 1, 2025, amendments to the Law on the Prosecutor's Office came into force, eliminating the possibility of awarding a prosecutor a one-time salary bonus.

In 2025, no additional funding was received to increase the salaries of prosecution staff, so this issue remains relevant, as the huge gap in salaries that has arisen since the reform of prosecutors' salaries has led to lower staff motivation and made working in the prosecutor's office less attractive to young lawyers.

12. Training of justice professionals (including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, court staff, clerks/trainees)

Constitutional Court

In 2025, the Constitutional Court justices shared experience through a few national and international conferences and meetings while cooperating with other national courts and other national institutions, as well as constitutional justice institutions of other states, and international courts.

In January 2025, one justice of the Constitutional Court participated in Strasbourg in the international judicial seminar organised by the European Court of Human Rights on "Protecting human rights in a world of Artificial Intelligence, algorithms, and big data" and delivered the presentation titled "Artificial Intelligence and the right to a fair trial".

In June 2025, the Constitutional Court of Lithuania organised the XVIII bilateral conference of the Constitutional Courts of Lithuania and Latvia in Vilnius (Republic of Lithuania). The justices of the Constitutional Court delivered their presentations on such topics as "Interpretation of freedom of expression and information in constitutional jurisprudence"; "Protection of human rights in the criminal justice system", and an overview of the recent jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court of Lithuania.

In September 2025, the justices of the Constitutional Court participated in the conference "EUnited in Diversity III: The Role of Constitutional Justice in the EU Common Legal Order" in Sofia (Republic of Bulgaria). In September 2025, the president, justices and the staff of the Constitutional Court participated in the 12th international scientific-practical constitutional law conference on "The Role of Independent Oversight Institutions in the Constitutional System" in Vilnius. The conference was dedicated to mark the Day of the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania. The conference commemorated the 30th anniversary of the Office of the Seimas Ombudspersons, established under Article 73(1) of the Constitution. The president of the Constitutional Court delivered the presentation titled "The Pillars of Democracy: The Constitutional Status and Role of Independent Oversight Institutions".

In September–November 2025, the president and two justices of the Constitutional Court participated in Madrid (Kingdom of Spain), in the meeting of the Conference of European Constitutional Courts and the 6th Congress of the World Conference on Constitutional Justice on the topic "Human Rights of Future Generations".

In November–December 2025, the justices and staff of the Constitutional Court also had trainings on the prevention of mobbing, as well on hybrid threats and informational safety.

In addition, on 24 September 2025, the national contact point in the Superior Courts Network participated in online trainings on the HUDOC database of ECtHR and Knowledge Sharing platform for members of Superior Courts Network, as well in the online trainings "Impact and Challenges of AI in the Judiciary" organised by the European Judicial Training Network on 12, 19, and 26 February 2025.

Ministry of Justice

As usual, the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania suggested training topics reflecting the most relevant legal issues for the consideration of judicial self-governance bodies. For example, for 2026

the Ministry of Justice suggested training programs regarding topics as “Protection of family ties in accordance with the case law of the Constitutional Court, the Court of Justice of the European Union and the European Court of Human Rights” and “The current case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union in personal data protection”, to name a few.

National Courts Administration

In 2025, the NCA delivered 51 seminars for judges and 55 training sessions for court staff, and organised 4 working meetings. In total, 110 training events took place. As part of these initiatives, 10,092 representatives of the judiciary system were trained, of whom 2,219 were judges and 7,873 were judicial assistants, other court staff and NCA staff (the statistics are not based on unique participants). In 2025, 36 professional development programmes for judges were implemented, on the basis of which 51 training seminars were organised (44 in-person and 7 remote). Training was differentiated by levels of courts and areas of specialisation, covering judges of the district courts, the regional courts, the Supreme Court of Lithuania, the Court of Appeal of Lithuania and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.

The greatest focus was placed on improving the quality of court decisions, the examination of complex cases, relevant national and international case-law, the potential application of artificial intelligence, personal data protection, judicial ethics, and the anti-corruption environment. Strengthening of the judges’ general competences, including psychological safety, stress management, mediation, and communication with the public and the media, was also held.

In addition, 55 training sessions for court staff were organised (including 2 in a hybrid format), as well as 4 working meetings focusing on psychological safety at work, the quality of administrative language and drafting of documents, cybersecurity, the use of artificial intelligence, and the prevention of violence and harassment at work, taking into account applicable legal requirements.

In response to geopolitical challenges, training was organised on maintaining the continuity of court operations during mobilisation and/or martial law, thereby strengthening the resilience and preparedness of the entire judicial system for emergencies.

Purposeful training planning and wide thematic coverage make it possible to consistently strengthen the competences of judges, judicial assistants and court staff, ensuring the quality, resilience and public trust in the administration of justice.

Prosecutor General’s Office

While implementing the recommendations in the area of training of prosecutors outlined in the report of 2024 state audit, in 2025 considerable attention was given to improving training programs. In 2025, long-term (5-year) training programs were developed, and training programs on cybercrime, financial and economic crime investigation, and juvenile justice were designed. Joint training programmes for prosecutors, judges and pre-trial investigation officers were also being developed, which will be further improved through the implementation of a project funded by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism.

13. Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, including electronic communication and AI tools, within the justice system and with court users, procedural rules, access to judgments online)³⁵

National Courts Administration

Digitalisation is one example of progress within the Lithuanian judicial system. The judicial community

³⁵ Factual information presented in Commission Staff Working Document of 2 December 2020, SWD(2020) 540 final, accompanying the Communication on Digitalization of justice in the European Union, COM(2020) 710 final and Figures 40 to 48 of the 2024 EU Justice Scoreboard, does not need to be repeated.

has ideas for the further development of digitalisation; however, organisational aspects require substantial resources and time.

In 2025, the modernisation of LITEKO was still ongoing. It is planned that the modernisation of LITEKO II will be completed and that LITEKO II will become fully operational once all development stages have been completed by quarter III of 2026. It should be noted that such modernisation timelines do not meet the expectations of the judicial community; the timelines are determined by the capacities of the service provider and, in some cases, by the inadequate fulfilment of the service provider's commitments.

Opportunities for the data and document exchange between the courts and the prosecutor's office during the examination of criminal cases are being analysed and include implementation of integration between LITEKO and the Integrated Criminal Procedure Information System (IBPS).

In 2025, modernisation of the integration between LITEKO and the Tax Accounting Information System managed by the State Tax Inspectorate under the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania, was started with the aim of consolidating into a single framework the information exchange processes relating to stamp duties and obligations imposed by courts of all instances (fines imposed under criminal, administrative and civil procedure, litigation costs, fines as criminal penalties, postal costs, etc.). Under the new data exchange process, data transfer between the systems and its use in relevant internal processes would be ensured (e.g. matching payments, stamp duty refund procedures, etc.).

In 2025, the NCA received funding to implement a Technical Support Instrument (TSI) project entitled "Automation of Routine Tasks in Court Proceedings". The project aims to reduce the duration of court proceedings by introducing automated solutions into routine court processes, and by enabling the use of knowledge-sharing solutions. The project will focus on improving the following key areas in Lithuania:

- 1) automated assistance in completing templates to support routine tasks and reduce the volume of manual work and the number of errors;
- 2) automated proposals for hearing schedules, automatically suggesting hearing times and optimising time management;
- 3) automated management of case-related processes.

The project is planned to commence in quarter I of 2026. Project duration: 24 months.

By Resolution No. 13P-122-(7.1.2.E) of the Judicial Council of 29 August 2025³⁶, the Procedure for Making Procedural Court Decisions and Decisions Adopted in Judicial Disciplinary Cases Publicly Available (hereinafter referred to as the "Procedure") was reissued in a revised version. The most important amendments to the Procedure, relating to the preparation and publication of anonymised versions of procedural court decisions, are as follows:

- the list of procedural court decisions for which an anonymised version is not prepared for publication was expanded; following proposals submitted by the courts, it was supplemented to include court penal orders and procedural court decisions adopted in criminal and administrative offence cases which address matters at the enforcement stage;
- it was established that, by decision of the court president, a procedural court decision may not be made publicly available where its publication would not correspond to the purpose set out in clause 2 of the Procedure³⁷ (for example, in administrative cases concerning the payment, refund or recovery of fees; in individual homogeneous cases where a court decision has been adopted in a model case; in civil cases involving disputes concerning the recovery of small amounts, etc.);
- it was established that, where the entire case file, including data relating to the parties to the case, has been classified as non-public by law or by a court decision, an anonymised version of a procedural court decision may be dispensed with only in exceptional cases where, after

³⁶ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/93fb6000870011f0a8bbd1e98310677d>

³⁷ The purpose of publication of decisions is to inform the public about the practice of interpretation and application of the law in the courts of the Republic of Lithuania and thereby ensure the openness, transparency and public accessibility of court activity.

removing all information that may not be disclosed publicly, the publication of such a decision would no longer correspond to the purpose of publication set out in clause 2 of the Procedure, or where it would no longer be possible to understand the substance of the decision;

- the obligation to report a personal data security breach to the State Data Protection Inspectorate was removed; i.e. it was established that oversight of anonymised versions of procedural court decisions is carried out by court presidents rather than by the State Data Protection Inspectorate.

From 1 August 2025, the Judges and Judicial Candidates Information System (hereinafter referred to as the “TERIS”) became operational. The NCA developed this system in order to improve the quality of data processing relating to judges and judicial candidates, increase the efficiency of procedures for the examination, selection of judicial candidates, performance appraisal, and the organisation of training for judges and court staff, and to partially automate these processes. TERIS is intended for judges and individuals seeking to become judges, all persons seeking judicial career, and members of the judicial system community – judges and court staff – who wish to participate in training organised by the NCA. TERIS enables:

1) judicial candidates and judges to electronically complete and submit applications and documents to the NCA where a person seeks appointment as a judge or seeks a judicial career (e.g. to apply for appointment to higher-level courts or to a court leadership position);

2) view/review documents held by the NCA relating to the personal file of a judicial candidate or a judge;

3) judicial candidates to register for the judge examination, review examination-related information, and view one’s own examination results;

4) monitor and review information about one’s own judicial performance appraisal, selection procedures for higher-level judicial positions (Supreme Court of Lithuania, Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, Court of Appeal of Lithuania), and positions as presidents of these and other courts; as well as to review documents from selection procedures in which the person participated and the assessment scores awarded to the person;

5) review information about training courses for court staff and judges organised by the NCA, register for them, review information about training attended, and access training materials.

The use of TERIS for the submission of documents by individuals seeking appointment as judges or judicial career advancement, as well as for the implementation of NCA-organised training processes for judges and court staff, was established by resolutions of the Judicial Council³⁸.

14. Use of assessment tools and standards (e.g. ICT systems, including AI-based systems, for case management, court statistics and their transparency, monitoring, evaluation, surveys among court users or legal professionals)

National Courts Administration

In 2025, a LITEKO statistical subsystem was being developed, with its launch of operation planned for 2026. See also the response to Question No. 4.

Clause 19¹ of the Regulations on Court Administration approved by Judicial Council Resolution No. 13P-157-(7.1.2) of 18 December 2015³⁹ (hereinafter referred to as the “Regulations”) provides that the entities responsible for the supervision of organisational and administrative activities of the district courts, the regional courts and the Regional Administrative Court periodically assess whether there is a significant difference in workload between courts (court chambers) which would warrant the application of measures provided for in the Code of Civil Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania, the Code of

³⁸ Judicial Council Resolution of 30 May 2025 No. 13P-87-(7.1.2.E) “On the Approval of the Description of the Procedure for Entering Persons in the List of Candidates for Vacant District Court Judge Positions, the Register of Persons Seeking Judicial Career, and the Database of Judges Seeking Career within Courts of the Same Level”, and Judicial Council Resolution of 27 June 2025 No. 13P-93-(7.1.2.E) “On the Approval of the Rules for Organising Judicial Training”.

³⁹ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/50eb0d40a8a511e5be7fbc3f919a1ebe/asr>

Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania, or the Law on Courts of the Republic of Lithuania.

In order to ensure consistency of practice in addressing matters of courts' organisational or administrative activities, i.e. in collecting and assessing data relevant to the detection of a significant difference in workload, as provided for in the Regulations, an interactive workload calculation tool has been developed, which manages the following data for the previous half-year of the calendar year:

1. workload data based on the number of cases received by a court, calculated by multiplying the number of cases received by the court (court chamber) by the case complexity coefficient set out in the annex to the Description of the Procedure for Calculating Workload in Courts, approved by the Resolution of the Judicial Council No. 13P-79-(7.1.2) of 29 May 2015⁴⁰.

2. the number of judges and their assistants, and changes in this number (trends);

3. the number of days worked by judges and their assistants during the assessment period;

4. data on judges' reduced workload (due to court administration activities, participation in judicial self-governance activities, etc.);

5. workloads of cases received, calculated on the basis of the data referred to in items 1–4, both according to the total number of days worked by judges and their assistants, and according to the number of days worked by judges of the relevant general specialisation and the assistants supporting them;

6. other data relevant to determining a significant difference in workload are also assessed, as appropriate:

- 6.1. the number of cases completed;

- 6.2. the number of pending cases (backlog);

- 6.3. the average duration of proceedings;

- 6.4. other objective circumstances that may have had a significant impact on judges' workload during the assessment period (e.g. reasons for the formation of a backlog, the number of suspended cases, long-term temporary incapacity for work (lasting more than 1 month), long-term leave (lasting more than 56 calendar days), and other similar cases that may have had a significant impact on judges' workload during the assessment period, etc.).

It should be noted that the Regulations are continuously being improved, taking into account comments and proposals submitted by the courts regarding the application of the Regulations and the calculation tool.

In 2013, a Customer Service Standard in Courts was introduced in the judicial system (updated in 2015 and 2019) with the purpose of ensuring the quality of service for persons applying to the courts and their satisfaction with the services provided by the courts.

In order to ensure a high quality of customer service in courts, by Resolution No. 13P-91-(7.1.2) of 31 May 2019, the Judicial Council approved the Description of the Procedure for the Assessment of Control and Monitoring of the Quality of Customer Service in Courts, which regulates the procedures for carrying out control and monitoring of customer service quality in Lithuanian courts through periodic assessments. According to the data from the annual monitoring, the court customer service quality indicator has consistently remained high.

Illustrative data: monitoring methodologies were established for groups of courts, under which the minimum level of customer service quality was set at 4.3 points on a five-point scale. The level of customer service quality in courts was assessed by means of questionnaires for persons who visited the court, contacted the court by telephone and/or e-mail and/or post; the questionnaire was made available online on courts' websites.

Group I courts (the Supreme Court of Lithuania, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, the Court of Appeal of Lithuania). An analysis of the survey reports for Group I courts shows that in 2024 the overall average level of customer service quality in this group increased and was very high, i.e. 4.87 points (4.63 points in 2023 and 4.63 points in 2022).

Group II courts (the regional courts and the Regional Administrative Court). An analysis of the survey reports for Group II courts shows that the overall average level of customer service quality in this group was very high – 4.78 points – and had been rising consistently each year (4.71 points in 2023 and

⁴⁰ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/5d3bf8f084d411f0a8bbd1e98310677d>

4.62 points in 2022).

Group III courts (the district courts). An analysis of the survey reports for Group III courts shows that the overall average level of customer service quality in this group had increased in recent years and was very high, i.e. 4.84 points, which was 0.06 points higher than in 2023 (4.79 points) and 2022 (4.77 points).

Lithuanian judges participated in the survey on the “Independence of the Judiciary”⁴¹, organised in quarter I of 2025 by the European Network of Councils for the Judiciary (ENCJ) under the ENCJ project “Independence and Accountability”.

15. Geographical distribution and number of courts/jurisdictions (“judicial map”) and their specialisation, in particular specific courts or chambers within courts to deal with fraud and corruption cases.

National Courts Administration

Within the Lithuanian judicial system, there are no specialised courts examining cases involving corruption-related offences or fraud; such cases fall within the general specialisation in criminal cases and are heard by judges specialising in criminal cases.

16. Specialisation (of judges/specific courts/chambers within courts) and training for the judiciary to deal with commercial cases, as well as alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and mediation as regards commercial cases.

National Courts Administration

On judges’ specialisations and training in the context of dealing with commercial cases

As was indicated when providing information for the 2024 Rule of Law Report, there are no specialised courts within the Lithuanian judicial system that specifically deal with commercial disputes; judges of courts of general jurisdiction deal with civil cases, including commercial cases, i.e. those assigned to their jurisdiction by law.

An important positive development is that, following the court reform implemented as of 1 January 2025, it has become possible to assign judicial specialisations in all district courts of the Republic of Lithuania.

Under the applicable legal framework, the Supreme Court of Lithuania, the Court of Appeal of Lithuania and the regional courts have Civil Divisions:

1) In 2025, the following judicial specialisations⁴² were established within the Civil Division of the Supreme Court of Lithuania: cases relating to public procurement; cases relating to legal relationships in bankruptcy and restructuring; cases relating to banking activities and investment services; cases relating to rights in rem; cases relating to employment legal relationships; cases relating to intellectual property; cases relating to family legal relationships and inheritance; cases relating to insurance legal relationships; and cases relating to private international law, international civil procedure and alternative private dispute resolution.

2) In 2025, according to LITEKO data, the following judicial specialisations were established in the Civil Division of the Court of Appeal of Lithuania: insolvency and restructuring cases; public procurement cases; cases relating to the protection of non-pecuniary rights and intellectual property; and cases relating to the recognition of judgments of foreign courts (and arbitral tribunals), as well as appeals under the Law on Commercial Arbitration of the Republic of Lithuania.

⁴¹ https://pgwrk-websitemedia.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/production/pwk-web-encj2017-p/Report%20ENCJ%20Survey%20on%20Independence-compressed_0.pdf

⁴² <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/90053cd0920b11eb9fecb5ecd3bd711c/asr>

3) In the divisions of the regional courts, judicial specialisations are usually established in cases relating to employment legal relationships, public procurement, intellectual property and copyright.

4) In the district courts, general specialisations are usually established (criminal and civil specialisations); however, in some district courts not only a general civil specialisation but also a more detailed one is established (e.g. relating to employment legal relationships, etc.)

In 2025, under the judicial training programmes approved by the Judicial Council, the following training courses in the field of commercial law were organised for judges:

- the latest cassation court case-law on joint venture agreements;
- current issues in the protection of intellectual property in court proceedings;
- current issues in disputes arising from construction contracts;
- specific aspects of dealing with insolvency cases and relevant case-law;
- specific features of applying substantive and procedural law provisions governing the assignment of claims, novation, transfer of debt and set-off (in insolvency proceedings, business contracts, enforcement proceedings, etc.);
- procedural specifics of dealing with public procurement cases; relevant case-law.

On alternative dispute resolution and mediation

On 29 August 2025, at the discussion festival “Būtent!” (“*Exactly!*”), Lithuanian courts held a discussion entitled “Judicial Mediation – from Dispute to a Meaningful Agreement”. The wide-spread assumption is a court judgment is the only way to resolve a conflict. However, increasing attention is now being paid to alternative, amicable means of dispute resolution. One of those is judicial mediation, which allows parties to reach an agreement without lengthy litigation and with lower emotional and financial costs. The discussion addressed what judicial mediation is, how it works, in which cases it is applied, and what benefits it can bring to each of us.

On 17 October 2025, a conference entitled “The Architecture of Dialogue: 20 Years of Judicial Mediation” was held to mark twenty years of the judicial mediation institute in Lithuania. The event was organised by the Judicial Mediation Commission together with the NCA and the Judicial Council. The conference was attended by judges, mediators and representatives of the judicial system.

It presented the key stages of the development of judicial mediation – from the 2003 pilot project to today’s mature system. Today, around 19% of Lithuanian judges are court mediators, and mediation has become an essential tool for achieving not only effective dispute resolution but also the preservation of relationships between the parties. At the end of the event, judges with mediator status who make a significant contribution to the promotion of mediation within Lithuanian courts were honoured⁴³.

At the end of 2025, 145 judges held mediator status. The largest proportion of judges with mediator status work in the district courts – 66%, and in the regional courts – 23%.

In 2025, the following training was organised for judges holding mediator status:

- Introductory training programme (2025) for judges wishing to carry out mediators’ activities;
- Training programme for judges who are mediators: “Workshop on Developing the Mediator’s Practical Skills”.

Data on judicial mediation and its effectiveness over the past 4 years:

	2022	2023	2024	2025 ⁴⁴

⁴³ <https://www.teismai.lt/lt/teismines-mediacijos-20-mecio-konferencijoje-izvalgos-apie-nueita-kelia-ir-ateities-kryptis/13761>

⁴⁴ Data entered into LITEKO for the period from 1 January 2025 to 30 September 2025. Courts are still entering data into LITEKO, so the statistics for 2025 are subject to change.

Number of completed judicial mediation proceedings	534	689	834	745
Number of peace agreements concluded	244	317	402	382

Statistics show that, in recent years, the number of mediation proceedings in courts has been steadily increasing, and the effectiveness of judicial mediation stands at around 50% – a fairly good indicator. This points to a mature and strengthening system, the operation of which continues to be reinforced by the Judicial Mediation Commission. The Commission is seeking solutions regarding the accounting of judges' workload, improving the quality assessment system, and the new case allocation formula treats mediation as a distinct component of a judge's professional activity.

The electronic court services portal *e.teismas.lt* provides parties to a dispute with the possibility to submit mediation requests electronically, monitor the progress of proceedings, and communicate with mediators.

C. Efficiency of the justice system⁴⁵:

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to efforts to improve the efficiency of the justice system (e.g. as regards length of proceedings), please specify: ...

Ministry of Justice

Measures as regards length of proceedings

The Implementation Plan of the Program includes actions aimed at accelerating the processing of administrative disputes and reducing the workload of administrative courts, as well as increasing the accessibility of pre-trial administrative dispute resolution to applicants. In implementing these actions, the draft legal acts were prepared by the Ministry of Justice and submitted for consultation in December 2025. The main goals of this legislative initiative are to extend the deadlines for appealing administrative decisions and decisions of administrative courts, to provide for additional categories of cases that would be subject to mandatory pre-trial proceedings, to make the procedure for pre-trial administrative dispute resolution more efficient, e.g. by creating the conditions for examining disputes closer to the applicants' place of residence (domicile).

National Courts Administration

Concerning the revision of the optimal workload methodology

By Resolution No. 13P-173-(7.1.2.) of 1 December 2023, the Judicial Council approved *the Methodology for Determining the Optimal Workload of a District Court Judge (hereinafter referred to as the "Methodology")*⁴⁶, which establishes the criteria for a district court judge's optimal workload and its calculation procedure. In order to assess how the Methodology would function in practice, 3 courts were selected for its pilot application, and it was planned that the Methodology would be applied in other district courts from 1 July 2024. However, due to the postponement of the court reform date (to 1 January 2025) and the need to further refine the Methodology, the application of the optimal workload calculation procedure in all district courts was deferred; in practice, the Methodology was not implemented.

Having taken into account comments arising in practice regarding the application of the Methodology,

⁴⁵ Under this topic, Member States are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined under section 2.

⁴⁶ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/ebb4c530950211eea5a28c81c82193a8>

when approving the Judicial Council's Strategic Directions of Activity 2025–2028 by Resolution No. 13P-64-(7.1.2.E) of 21 March 2025⁴⁷, the Judicial Council provided, as one of the measures, for a review and assessment of the model for determining a judge's optimal workload. Accordingly, by a resolution of 25 April 2025⁴⁸ the Judicial Council established a working group and tasked it, by 30 April 2026, with reviewing the model of the Methodology for Determining the Optimal Workload of a District Court Judge approved by Judicial Council Resolution of 1 December 2023, carrying out a comprehensive assessment of the possibility of applying it across the entire judicial system and of its links with other legal acts (the Regulations on Court Administration, the Procedure for Calculating Workload in Courts, etc.

At its meeting of 26 June 2025, the working group decided to fundamentally review the model of the Methodology, as it considered that:

- the established formula is not suitable for assessing whether a particular judge is in fact working at an optimal workload; i.e. the current formula is intended to calculate not the actual, but a theoretical optimal judicial workload;
- the case groups set out in the annex to the Methodology should be assessed not by complexity scores, but by working hours;
- when calculating the time that can be allocated to a judge's judicial functions, the full amount of time required for other activities was not taken into account (for example, participation in internal administration, meetings, discussions, familiarisation with legislation, etc.), among other factors.

In carrying out the Judicial Council's mandate and having decided to fundamentally review the model of the Methodology, the working group analysed the data collection methods used in foreign case complexity systems, their advantages and disadvantages, and selected a data collection method for determining the final complexity of a case. It also decided for what purposes the Methodology would be used, on determining the list of cases and other relevant aspects, and continues its work on revising the Methodology.

Concerning the assessment of non-procedural functions assigned to the courts

By Resolution No. 13P-64-(7.1.2.E) of 21 March 2025 "On the Approval of the Judicial Council's Strategic Directions of Activity 2025–2028", the Judicial Council approved its strategic activity directions for 2025–2028 and established the measures for their implementation, one of which is the *assessment of non-procedural functions assigned to courts*.

This measure was established in view of the fact that courts perform certain non-procedural functions that are not directly related to the administration of justice, but are rather technical administrative procedures. The performance of such procedures is time-consuming; therefore, it is difficult to ensure efficient use of human resources, and the already heavy workload of judges, judicial assistants and other court staff increases further, while no additional funding or resources are allocated for this purpose. Moreover, when new legal acts are adopted, expanding administrative functions assigned to courts, the provision of funding and necessary resources is most often not taken into account.

In implementing this measure, the courts of the Republic of Lithuania were approached with a request to submit specific proposals regarding non-procedural functions assigned to courts and the possibility of discontinuing them. In addition, since one of the issues to be analysed in implementing this measure is a summary of foreign practice, an inquiry requesting information was disseminated through the ENCJ network.

Members of the Judicial Council's Court Administration Committee (hereinafter referred to as the

⁴⁷

<https://www.teismai.lt/lt/teismu-savivalda/teisejutyba/nutarimai/173/results?sqid=c8e2d13afe0439c7fce8e207be26eb2aec1f5e4b>

⁴⁸

<https://www.teismai.lt/lt/teismu-savivalda/teisejutyba/nutarimai/173/results?sqid=3cb4caf2ea48afed8b9d5cf77f249770bfd652c8>

“CAC”), having assessed the opinions and proposals submitted by the courts of the Republic of Lithuania, identified and refined several key non-procedural functions that impose the greatest administrative burden and the expediency of assigning which to courts should be assessed systematically, for example, in relation to provision of data to registers; postal services; transmission of a conviction for enforcement and monitoring its enforcement in criminal cases, etc. With regard to these identified non-procedural functions, the following solutions should be considered: 1) whether it is possible to discontinue certain functions altogether; 2) if it is not possible to discontinue certain functions, to seek official recognition that courts are performing functions not inherent to them, the performance of which requires the allocation of additional resources. Consideration of this matter will continue within the Judicial Council in 2026.

Concerning the updating of the recommended quality standards for procedural court decisions

On the CAC’s instruction, in order to systematically assess all practical observations regarding the need to amend the Recommended Quality Standards for Procedural Court Decisions approved by Judicial Council Resolution No. 13P-65-(7.1.2) of 27 May 2016 “On the Approval of the Recommended Quality Standards for Procedural Court Decisions” (hereinafter referred to as the “Standards”), the NCA contacted the courts requesting specific proposals for amending/refining the Standards by letter No. 4R-1801-(1.13.Mr) of 27 December 2024 entitled “On the Refinement of the Recommended Quality Standards for Procedural Court Decisions”.

Having summarised the opinions and proposals submitted by the courts, the CAC members supported the courts’ proposal to establish a working group to review and update the Standards on the basis of the proposals received from the courts and the recommendations set out in the 2019 Study on the Application of Standards for the Quality of Procedural Court Decisions.

In view of the above, the Judicial Council, by Resolution No. 13P-44-(7.1.2.E) of 21 February 2025 “On the Establishment of a Working Group on the Updating of the Recommended Standards for the Quality of Procedural Court Decisions”, set up a working group on the updating of the Standards and instructed it to review the Standards by 30 September 2025, taking into account the proposals of the courts, the recommendations made in the 2019 Study on the Application of Standards for the Quality of Procedural Court Decisions, and to prepare a draft on the amendment of the Standards.

By Judicial Council Resolution No. 13P-137-(7.1.2.E) of 26 September 2025 “On the Extension of the Term of Activity of the Working Group to Update the Recommended Quality Standards for Procedural Court Decisions”, the term of the working group was extended until 19 December 2025. The draft prepared by the working group, together with comments submitted by the courts, will be considered by the CAC in February 2026.

Constitutional Court

In 2025, the length of the proceedings in the Constitutional Court became shorter comparing to 2024 and the examination of a case takes less than one year (i.e. approximately 281 days).

Other – please specify

National Courts Administration

In order to address the issues relating to the security of courts and judges and the implementation of the provisions of Article 130 of the Law on Courts of the Republic of Lithuania concerning the maintenance of order and proper conduct in courts and ensuring court protection in practice, a working group was established by Order No. 1R-15 of the Minister of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania of 22 January 2025 “On the Establishment of a Working Group”, comprising representatives of the Ministry of Justice,

the Ministry of the Interior, the Police Department under the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Finance, the Association of Judges of the Republic of Lithuania, the Judicial Council, the Supreme Court of Lithuania, and the NCA. The working group was tasked with preparing and submitting to the Minister of Justice proposals on measures for maintaining order and proper conduct in courts and for ensuring adequate protection of courts.

In addition, by Judicial Council Resolution No. 13P-31-(7.1.2.E) of 31 January 2025 “On the Establishment of a Working Group to Strengthen Security in Courts”, a working group was established consisting of representatives of the Judicial Council, the Association of Judges, courts, the NCA, as well as partners and consultants (hereinafter referred to as the “Working Group”). The Working Group was tasked with preparing and submitting to the Judicial Council proposals on measures to strengthen security in courts. It should be noted that members of the Working Group also participated in the activities of the working group established by the Minister of Justice.

In carrying out the mandate of the Judicial Council, the Working Group:

1) cooperated with police representatives: inter-institutional meetings were held with the Police Department and the Public Security Service regarding measures to strengthen court security. Regular meetings with police representatives were also organised. According to the assessment by the police, if all technical measures were implemented in courts, or at least a minimum set, it would then be possible to discuss police human resources and their assignment to courts;

2) carried out an analysis of the legal regulation of physical and psychological security in Lithuanian courts;

3) analysed foreign practice in the area of psychological security in courts and identified categories of psychological security measures to be applied in courts:

- preventive measures (physical security measures; methodologies for recognising and assessing threat levels; practical skills training; psychological assessment of court staff; public information and education);

- intervention measures (psychological assistance to persons who have suffered trauma and witnesses and other involved persons, and other practical/instrumental support – medical, social, legal);

- postvention measures (individual assistance; systemic measures);

4) in cooperation with the Police Department, carried out monitoring of the physical court security infrastructure currently installed and used in courts;

5) identified the need for physical court security measures that need to be purchased and/or installed without delay and calculated the amount of funding required for that need. Following the monitoring results, it was concluded that, due to the lack of funding for technical security measures over many years, the security infrastructure of many court buildings and the security measures available in courts are insufficient to ensure effective physical protection of court buildings; therefore, the issue of acquiring missing equipment and services must be addressed without delay. It was recommended that the Judicial Council include the funding need required to ensure currently missing security infrastructure in court buildings in the needs to be formed for the 2026–2028 budget appropriations as one of the priorities;

6) prepared a draft model for the physical protection of Lithuanian courts;

7) prepared a draft model for psychological security in Lithuanian courts;

8) prepared a draft Action Plan for the implementation of psychological security in courts, including actions to be carried out, measures, responsibilities, timelines, and the planned budget.

By letter No. 4R-1498-(7.6.6.Mr.) of 28 October 2025, the Working Group together with the Police Department submitted to the Ministry of Justice proposals on short-term and long-term measures for maintaining order and proper conduct in courts and ensuring adequate court protection, requesting that the activity of the working group established by ministerial order be resumed.

By Judicial Council Resolution No. 13P-65-(7.1.2.E) of 21 March 2025 “On the Establishment of a Working Group to Develop a Methodology (Model) for Managing Risks of Unlawful Influence and to Submit Proposals on New Anti-Corruption Measures in Courts”, a working group was established and tasked, by 28 February 2026, with preparing a methodology (model) for managing risks of unlawful influence in Lithuanian courts, reviewing the anti-corruption prevention system in Lithuanian courts, and submitting proposals for improving this system and for applying anti-corruption prevention measures in Lithuanian courts in the upcoming period.

The working group has not yet completed its activities and has not submitted final results; however, one of the more significant proposals is decentralisation of corruption manifestation risks and their management measures, incorporating them into the internal control policy of each court, taking into account the specifics and functions of each court and the areas in which risks may arise. In addition, the NCA, representing the court community, participates in the activities of the Working Group preparing the draft plan for 2026–2029 under the National Anti-Corruption Agenda for 2022–2033. The draft 2026–2029 plan for the implementation of the National Anti-Corruption Agenda for 2022–2033 provides that one of the measures is the organisation of continuous introductory training for judges on the topics of strengthening the anti-corruption environment.

Lithuania is entering a new 2021–2028 funding period under the European Economic Area (EEA) and Norway Grants. By memoranda of understanding signed on 2 December 2025, Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein allocated nearly EUR 118 million to Lithuania for two priority areas – strengthening civil protection and strengthening and developing the system of justice.

Under this funding period, EUR 43.7 million is allocated to the Justice Programme, of which EUR 8.65 million is earmarked for Lithuanian courts. This is the third EEA and Norway Grants period, with investment in the judicial system being EUR 1 million higher than in the previous period.

In implementing the Justice Programme, Lithuanian courts plan to implement activities aimed at strengthening court resilience and communication, improving the competences of judges and other representatives of the judiciary, and further developing the digitalisation of courts. Another important area is strengthening court security and upgrading of public spaces. The Programme provides for the equipping of courts with technical security measures, strengthening of psychological security, and developing a concept for a psychological security and support system. It is also planned to modernise public spaces of two court buildings: courtrooms, witness waiting areas, premises for journalists, and other key areas. The programme will be implemented by the NCA together with its long-term partner – the Norwegian Courts Administration.

The new funding period reaffirms the strong partnership between Lithuania and Norway and a shared commitment to reducing social and economic disparities, and strengthening democracy, human rights, and the principles of the rule of law.

II. Anti-corruption framework⁴⁹

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2024

⁴⁹ Where previous specific reports, published in the framework of the review under the UN Convention against Corruption, of GRECO, and of the OECD address the issues below, please make a reference to the points you

Report regarding the anti-corruption framework (if applicable):

**A. The institutional framework capacity to fight against corruption
(prevention and investigation / prosecution)**

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to the institutional framework capacity to fight corruption, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

17. List any changes as regards relevant authorities (e.g. national agencies, bodies) in charge of prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of corruption and the resources allocated to each of these authorities (the human, financial, legal, and technical resources as relevant), including the cooperation among domestic and with foreign authorities. Indicate any relevant measures taken to effectively and timely cooperate with OLAF and EPPO.

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

Financial resources:

According to the STT statistical data of 31 December, 2025, 291 officers and employees work in the STT. In the year 2025, STT's dismissals amounted to 17 officers and 5 employees who were working on a contractual basis, and new hires included 28 officers and 2 additional employees who were hired on a contractual basis, total 30 new employees.

According to Article 14 part 1 of the Law on Special Investigations Service (hereinafter – the Law), the STT is financed from the state budget of Lithuania. For the year of 2025, the STT was allocated a total of EUR 19,014,000 from the state budget, and additionally EUR 473,000 was allocated to finance 11 additional positions. It is important to note that all positions were filled.

The STT may have other funds to ensure criminal intelligence activities.

STT can also participate in EU-funded or similar projects.

Projects for which STT receive funding

Internal Security Fund project:

The project “Prevention and detection of corruption, including bribery, in international business transactions” is being implemented in 2024–2027. Project value – EUR 494,330.17. In 2025, the STT, together with its partners, organised five good-practice exchange visits to institutions in Switzerland, Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, and Norway, as well as four seminars for pre-trial investigation officers, prosecutors, and judges.

European Commission’s Technical Support Instrument (TSI) project:

In 2025, the STT together with the OECD continued the implementation of the Technical Support Instrument project aimed at enhancing the data governance of the STT and to develop a proof-of-concept machine learning model to identify corruption risks in public procurement. The project is set to be finalized in March 2026. STT did not receive any financial support, as it was a beneficiary country.

Twinning project:

In 2025 STT continued implementation of the European Union Twinning project in Bosnia and Herzegovina “Strengthening capacities of the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption and Coordination of Fight Against Corruption” (APIK). Project implementation period – 2 years (2024–2026). Project value – EUR 1,000,000. STT’s share of the project – 45 percent.

wish to bring to the Commission’s attention in these documents, indicating any relevant updates, changes or measures introduced that have occurred since these documents were published.

Union Anti-Fraud Fund projects:

“Strengthening capacities of the STT to investigate digital evidence” (SCIDE). Implementation period is 2 years (covers the years 2024–2025). Project value – EUR 210,703. OLAF’s share – EUR 168,562.40. On 11 December, 2023, OLAF transferred an advance payment to STT – EUR 84,281.20, the majority of which, i.e. EUR 79,794.82, was used in 2024. Following a project completion cost assessment, OLAF will subsequently transfer its remaining share.

International cooperation

STT representatives continued to actively participate in the work of anti-corruption working groups of the European Union, the OECD, the Council of Europe, and the United Nations, including: the OECD Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions (4 meetings); meetings of law enforcement officials under the OECD Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions (3 meetings); the OECD Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (ACN) — the Steering Group and the Law Enforcement Network (LEN) (2 meetings); the EU Network against Corruption (1 meeting); Europol’s analysis project on corruption, Analysis Project Corruption (AP Corruption) (1 conference and 1 meeting); the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC CoSP) and meetings of its working groups (4 meetings); the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) of the Council of Europe (3 meetings); the World Economic Forum Partnering Against Corruption Initiative (WEF PACI) (1 meeting); the International Corruption Hunters Alliance (ICHA) of the World Bank Group (1 meeting), etc.

STT continues to develop active and effective relationships with counterpart institutions in foreign countries, especially with the institutions of Latvia, Poland, Estonia, and Ukraine. 28-30 April 2025, a high-level meeting of Baltic anti-corruption institutions took place in Kaunas, organised by the STT. This was the eighth meeting of this kind between the heads of the anti-corruption institutions of Lithuania, Poland, Latvia, and Estonia. This year, delegations from Ukraine’s anti-corruption institutions were also invited as guests. During the meeting, participants not only discussed how the Baltic States can continue to support Ukraine by sharing experience and expertise and by strengthening cooperation, but also debated issues related to enhancing security and integrity across the entire region. Considerable attention was also devoted to cooperation within international networks (such as EPAC/EACN and the OECD Anti-Corruption Network (ACN)), the search for innovative solutions, the discussion of corruption prevention, and strategic agreements.

11 July 2025 a memorandum of understanding⁵⁰ by the Anti-Corruption Agency of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the STT was signed in Vilnius. The purpose of this memorandum of understanding is to cooperate, support and strengthen collaboration in the field of preventing and combating corruption.

In total, in 2025, the STT’s officers shared their good practices or otherwise cooperated with representatives of institutions from 26 foreign states, and the STT hosted delegations from 10 states.

On 24–25 November 2025, the 24th Annual Conference and General Assembly of the European Partners Against Corruption (EPAC) and the European contact-point network against corruption (EACN) was held in The Hague, the Netherlands. This year, the conference was organised by the STT, which performs the functions of the EPAC/EACN Secretariat, in close cooperation with the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (Eurojust). During the event, the Director of the Special Investigation Service (STT), Linas Pervanas, was elected EPAC/EACN President for a second two-year term. The General Assembly also elected a new Board composed of representatives from Lithuania, France, Portugal, Austria and Romania, and adopted the Hague Declaration.

On 23 July 2025 at the annual meeting held in Paris, Lithuania officially assumed the role of the newly designated Country Chair of the Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (ACN) under the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). During the 30th meeting of the ACN Steering Group, Lithuania took up its role of newly designated country Chair, with Egidijus

⁵⁰ <https://www.stt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/07/8-234-lietuvos-stt-ir-uzbekistano-kovos-su-korupcija-agenturos-susitarimo-memorandumas-2025-07-11.pdf>

Radzevičius, Deputy Director of the Special Investigation Service of Lithuania (STT), representing the country.

The new position will reinforce the ACN's current leadership and support the further development of its activities. The Chair's role is expected to include:

- shaping the strategic direction of the ACN and supporting its Secretariat;
- promoting member engagement and mobilizing resources;
- coordinating the activities of the Network;
- representing the ACN in international and regional forums.

Lithuania's nomination as country Chair was based on its long-standing valuable experience within the OECD Working Group on Bribery, Mr Radzevičius' active participation in previous ACN Steering Group meetings, and significant contributions to ACN initiatives.

The ACN is a regional initiative of the OECD Working Group on Bribery. Established in 1998, the Network currently supports 24 member countries in enhancing their anti-corruption efforts and prevention measures. It operates through the implementation of the Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan (IAP), the Law Enforcement Network (LEN) for anti-corruption investigators and prosecutors, the Business Integrity Group, as well as tailored country-specific projects.

18. *Safeguards for the functional independence of the authorities tasked with the prevention and detection of corruption.*

19. *Information on the implementation of measures foreseen in the strategic anti-corruption framework (if applicable). If available, please provide relevant objectives and indicators.*

B. Prevention

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to the prevention of corruption, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

20. *Measures to enhance integrity in the public sector (including as regards incompatibility rules, revolving doors, codes of conduct, ethics).*

Constitutional Court

Neither the programme of the Government which was adopted by the Seimas on 25 September 2025⁵¹ nor the plan which implements the programme of the Government⁵² envisage any provisions on the Constitutional Court and appointments of its justices.

The issue of "revolving doors" in the Constitutional Court appointments was raised in the Seimas when considering the candidacy of Julius Sabatauskas as a justice to the Constitutional Court⁵³. The members of the Seimas mentioned the possibility of the politicisation of the Constitutional Court if a politician is appointed to the Constitutional Court as its justice. Julius Sabatauskas during his appointment procedure explained that he had withdrawn from the Social Democratic Party before his candidacy was submitted to the position of a justice of the Constitutional Court.

⁵¹ available in Lithuanian at <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/568b271299f611f0a8bbd1e98310677d>.

⁵² available in Lithuanian at <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/01c09b12d97b11f08918e1adc7c5b1ec>.

⁵³ the transcript of the meeting of the Seimas of 30 September 2025 is available in Lithuanian at <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAK/b9d5f3c09dea11f0b2bd840de86d953b>.

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

Implementation of the National Anti-corruption Agenda for the period of 2022-2033 (Agenda)

During the second year of the first plan for the implementation of Agenda for 2023–2025⁵⁴, STT issued second monitoring report⁵⁵ with tendencies of implementation, areas which need continuous improvement and monitoring of activities⁵⁶. The report is issued along with information for the public to engage the society in monitoring of the national strategies⁵⁷.

After two years of implementation 86 percent of all the activities planned for the period of two years 2023-2024 are implemented and other are ongoing. Among implemented measures there are also measures:

- from high-risk sectors (please see answer to question 24);
- for prevention of conflicts of interest and undue lobbying (methodology for assessing risks of conflict of interest; distance learning materials for prevention of conflicts of interests and undue lobbying);
- for whistle-blowers (information campaign and practical guidance).

According to the horizontal impact indicators stated in the Agenda, and after 2 years of implementation positive changes were indicated:

Corruption Perception Index +3, Control of Corruption Index +3, Lithuanian Map of Corruption (Population who believe that bribery helps solve problems) – 6 percent.

On 19 June 2025 a working group established by the order of the Minister of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania No. 1R-195 for the preparation of the draft new plan for the period of 2026–2029 was established. The draft plan is being finalised and prepared for approval. The draft plan for the period of 2026–2029 also focuses on the high-risk areas.

Additionally, in 2025 all newly appointed ministers⁵⁸, including Prime Minister, each received Strategic anti-corruption guidelines (SAG) for STT. The main aim of this STT initiative is to manage corruption risks in the whole area of the responsibility of the minister by providing timely information on the corruption risks in the policy areas of the ministers ensuring that anti-corruption file is in the schedule of the minister, as well as to discuss possible recommendations or solutions. SAG mark the synergy of the four branches of the STT activities, as include information on existing corruption risks from investigation, analytics, corruption prevention, anti-corruption awareness raising functions of the STT. Each SAG includes general topics that are important and common to the public sector entities (e.g., public procurement risk management, management of digitalisation projects, sustainable legislation, strengthening anti-corruption environment in the ministry and subordinate institution etc.), as well as individual information about corruption risks in the area of the responsibility of the minister.

The sub-national level remains important for promoting transparency and corruption prevention and is set as one of the priority areas for the activities of the STT. During upcoming several years STT is going to deliver Individual anti-corruption guidelines for municipalities. These guidelines will also include information on existing corruption risks in each municipality based on outputs of investigation, analytics,

⁵⁴ According to the Agenda, the Agenda (for 12 years) is implemented by 3 plans, each for the period of 4 years.

⁵⁵ The report is issued during the period of the next 6 months after closing the auditing year, i.e. in 2025 report includes information about activities implemented during the year 2024.

⁵⁶ <https://stt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/06/darbotvarkes-ataskaita-uz-2024-m-galutine.pdf>

⁵⁷ <https://stt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/07/pazyma-apie-pazanga-projektas-07.01-galutine-kpv.pdf>

⁵⁸ New Government was appointed in December 2024

corruption prevention, anti-corruption awareness raising functions of the STT. The concept of common corruption risks and individual risks for each municipality will remain, as introduced in SAG. In 2025 first guidelines were introduced the Mayor of the Plungė r. municipality⁵⁹.

To enhance integrity in public and private sectors 6 workshops were organised, including specialised workshops for corruption prevention specialists in municipalities (3).

In order to strengthen resilience to possible illegal actions abroad and ensure a transparent development direction of Lithuanian businesses, the STT has developed Guidelines for the Detection and Prevention of Bribery of Foreign Officials for companies developing activities and/or operating abroad⁶⁰, as well as conducted the workshop about their application.

21. *Measures to enhance general transparency of public decision-making (including rules on lobbying, asset and interest disclosure rules, gifts policy, transparency of political party financing).*

Constitutional Court

In its ruling of 3 July 2025 on considering an opinion on lawmaking expressed by legal persons representing the business interests of other legal persons to be lobbying⁶¹, the Constitutional Court declared certain provisions of the Law on Lobbying Activities to be not in conflict with the Constitution, insofar as they provide that, among others, the expression of an opinion on lawmaking by a legal person is not considered lobbying activity, except where an opinion on lawmaking is expressed by a legal person that represents and/or unites legal persons pursuing business objectives or associations uniting such legal persons. The Constitutional Court also based its ruling on the provisions of the relevant acts of the Council of Europe and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development concerning the fundamental principles governing the regulation of lobbying.

The petitioner had doubts as to whether, in a democratic society, the legal regulation laid down in the impugned provisions of the Law is necessary and proportionate to the pursued objective of ensuring the publicity and transparency of lobbying activities and preventing unlawful lobbying activities, given that, under this legal regulation, when expressing opinions on lawmaking, legal persons that represent and/or unite legal persons pursuing business objectives or associations uniting such legal persons are subject to such additional duties as registration in the register of lobbyists and the declaration of lobbying activities. The petitioner also noted that the expression of opinions on lawmaking may be necessary in order for the said legal persons, when representing the interests of the members of an association before state authorities, to carry out the activities for which they were established.

The petitioner based its doubts regarding the compliance of the impugned legal regulation with Article 29 of the Constitution and with the constitutional principle of a state under the rule of law on the fact that legal persons with significant influence within a particular market, on the one hand, and legal persons that represent and/or unite legal persons pursuing business objectives or associations uniting such legal persons, on the other hand, essentially exert the same influence on the law-making process. In the opinion of the petitioner, in terms of the expression of opinions on lawmaking, there are, likewise, no differences that would justify unequal treatment between, on the one hand, those public legal persons directly specified in special laws whose activities serve the public interest and, on the other hand, legal persons that represent and/or unite legal persons pursuing business objectives or associations uniting such legal persons, since the fields in which the said legal persons may exert influence on lawmaking are made public in advance.

The Constitutional Court noted that the constitutionally consolidated principles of a state under the rule

⁵⁹ The Mayor of the Plungė r. municipality is the President of the Lithuanian Municipality Association.

⁶⁰ <https://stt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/12/uzsienio-pareigunu-papirkimo-nustatymo-ir-prevencijos-gaires-imonems-pletojancioms-veikla-ir-ar-veikiancioms-uzsienyje.pdf>

⁶¹ the ruling is available in English at <https://lrkt.lt/en/courtacts/search/170/ta3172/content>.

of law, responsible governance, and the responsibility of the authorities to society, as well as, inter alia, the requirement of the publicity and transparency of law-making procedures, which is implied by these constitutional principles, give rise to the discretion of the legislature to choose and establish in a law a particular model for the regulation of lobbying, as an inseparable element of democracy, which is related to participation by the public in the law-making process and the involvement of interested persons in the process of making public (state) decisions. In regulating the relationships connected with lobbying activities, the legislature must, among others, clearly determine what activities are considered to be lobbying, the rights and duties of persons engaged in such activities, their responsibility, as well as the mechanism for the control of lobbying activities. Seeking to ensure public and transparent law-making procedure and to prevent corruption, inter alia, to avoid the possible abuses of lobbying activities, the legislature, in setting requirements for lobbying activities, must observe the Constitution and, inter alia, may not create the preconditions for violating other constitutional values, among others, the constitutional freedom of information and that of convictions and their expression, freedom of association, as well as the constitutional principles of a state under the rule of law and the equality of the rights of persons.

In the ruling, the Constitutional Court also held that the impugned legal regulation pursues constitutionally important objectives – to ensure open and transparent law-making procedure, to prevent corruption, and, inter alia, to avoid possible abuse of lobbying activities, also that such a legal regulation does not impose a disproportionate restriction on constitutional freedoms and is proportionate, and does not violate the equality.

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

The STT has conducted an analytical anti-corruption intelligence investigation on the regulation of lobbying activities and its implementation in Lithuania. The results showed gaps and exceptions in the regulation that allow a wide range of actors to influence legislative processes without having to submit to transparency requirements. Also, the implementation of the regulation and its oversight proved to be deficient and under resourced. Based on the findings of the investigation, the STT has informed the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) and the Chief Official Ethics Commission (COEC) (which is responsible for the oversight of lobbying activities) on the risks and issues related to the Law on Lobbying Activities and suggested amendment guidelines. In 2026, the STT will follow-up with the on the possible improvements to the regulations on lobbying activities.

The STT has conducted an analytical anti-corruption intelligence investigation on the political organisation and political campaign financing, which focused on the 2023 municipal election and the 2024 parliamentary election campaign funds. The investigation showed that despite strict regulations, some corruption risks related to campaign finance and its use still occur (e.g., suspicious extensive use of campaign finance for transportation, possible attempts circumvent donation limitations, donations related to lobbyists). The findings of the investigation will be used in following targeted analyses and investigations, as well as to improve the oversight system for the upcoming 2027 municipal elections.

22. *Measures to prevent conflicts of interest in the public sector. Please specify the features and scope of their application (e.g. categories of officials concerned, types of checks and corrective measures depending on the category of officials concerned).*

Chief Official Ethics Commission

The Commission has prepared interpretative guidelines for the Principles of Code of Conduct for State Politicians, covering impartiality, selflessness, integrity, exemplary behaviour, transparency, and openness. The purpose of these guidelines is to provide clear and practical explanations on how each principle must be implemented in practice, thereby ensuring transparency, accountability, respect for democratic values, and appropriate conduct by state politicians across all relevant domains.

The Commission has organised conferences dedicated to conflict-of-interest management and lobbying

activities. During these events, the heads of state and municipal institutions, together with compliance officers, shared insights on managing conflict-of-interest situations, presented observed trends in lobbying practices, and provided their perspectives and examples of effective implementation.

The Commission has introduced a digital solution integrating the gift-registration function into the Register of Private Interests. This tool offers a centralised digital platform accessible to compliance officers and public-sector officials, ensuring uniform standards, traceability, and effective oversight of reporting obligations.

The Commission has designed and launched a new decentralised oversight model based on cooperation agreements with public-sector institutions. Key elements of the model include:

Access requirements: only institutions that have appointed qualified compliance officers and meet the minimum maturity criteria are granted access;

Institution-level control: institutions may independently review their officials' declarations of private interests, compare them with national-register data, and manage conflict-of-interest risks. This model enables continuous, institution-level control of key declarations of private interests, strengthening prevention efforts through decentralised accountability and digital tools.

The Commission carries out regular monthly checks targeting the highest-risk positions, including former ministers, vice-ministers, and political civil servants, to ensure compliance with the post-public-service restrictions established under the Law on the Adjustment of Public and Private Interests. Where initial analysis raises concerns regarding a potential breach, the Commission conducts an in-depth assessment, gathers additional information, and consults other institutions where necessary. In 2025, the Commission conducted detailed assessments in two cases; however, after obtaining further information, no grounds were identified to initiate investigations for possible violations of the Law.

The Commission has conducted independent assessments (audits) of the Ministry of National Defence and the Defence Resources Agency. Following these assessments, the Commission issued recommendations to both institutions aimed at further strengthening the management of conflict-of-interest risks.

To support organisations in managing conflict-of-interest risks, the Commission has prepared guidance on the identification and assessment of such risks. The guidance defines various levels of likelihood and intensity of conflict-of-interest risks and sets out detailed criteria applicable to each level. It describes risk categories and their core indicators, identifies circumstances that may give rise to each type of risk, and provides practical examples of how such risks may be detected.

In 2025, the Chief Official Ethics Commission conducted 23 investigations under the Law on the Adjustment of Public and Private Interests (because of these procedures, four fines were imposed) and 13 investigations under the Law on Lobbying Activities. Also, the Commission carried out 50 investigations under the early dispute-resolution procedure following the Code of Conduct for State Politicians.

→ For the three previous points, ***please also provide information and figures on their application/enforcement***, such as number of detected breaches/irregularities of the various rules in place and the follow-up given (investigations, sanctions, etc.).

23. *Measures to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption, including their application (i.e. number of reports received, and the follow-up given).*

Prosecutor General's Office

Whistleblower consultation hotline.

Prosecutor General's Office provides consultations to whistleblowers and representatives of internal channels through the whistleblower consultation hotline. In 2022, 286 consultations were provided; in

2023, 259 consultations; in 2024, 258 consultations; and in 2025, 280 consultations.

The data of 2025 shows an increase in the use and need of the whistleblower consultation hotline. This trend suggests a growing demand for consultations, as well as increasing awareness of whistleblower protection mechanisms and greater trust in the whistleblower protection system.

Tailored training sessions.

In 2025, a total of 7,120 participants took part in training on the whistleblower protection framework and internal reporting channels, representing a broad range of public and private sector activities.

The participants included employees from the healthcare sector (hospitals, public health centres and bureaux), social care institutions, municipalities, and other public authorities, as well as representatives of the finance, economy, and environment sectors, ministries, their subordinate institutions, and statutory bodies. In addition, the trainings reached employees of state-owned enterprises and other joint-stock companies, private limited liability companies operating in the services and healthcare sectors, as well as supervisory and control authorities, including the State Tax Inspectorate, the Chamber of Auditors, EPSO-G, the Bank of Lithuania, and other institutions performing supervisory functions.

2025 Evaluation/Survey on Whistleblower Protection in Healthcare Institutions

Prosecutor General's Office has organized the survey to assess implementation of whistleblower protection requirements and establishment of internal channel at 100 largest healthcare institutions in Lithuania.

The survey identified main gaps and areas for improving internal reporting channel. The majority of institutions evaluated represent public sector (86.2%).

The survey identified clear differences between the public and private healthcare sectors. Public institutions mostly established internal reporting channels in a timely manner (2019–2020), but implementation in the private sector accelerated only in 2023–2025, resulting in delayed compliance. The conclusion is that despite high awareness of the obligation to establish internal channels, gaps remain, particularly in the private sector.

Significant gaps have been identified in the public access to channels and published information about internal reporting channels, the designation and training of designated persons, and data protection and retention practices. These gaps risk undermining the effective functioning of whistleblower protection mechanisms and employee's trust in the system.

The final outcomes of the survey were presented at the Whistleblower Protection Forum 2025. As a result, the Prosecutor General's Office, the Ministry of Health, and the Vilnius Municipality have agreed to strengthen cooperation, coordination, awareness raising and implement measures to improve whistleblower protection in healthcare institutions.

Awareness-raising campaign

A targeted awareness-raising campaign has continued in 2025 to educate the public and relevant stakeholders about the importance of whistleblowing and the protections granted under the Whistleblower Protection Law (WPL). The awareness-raising campaign has yielded measurable results, demonstrating a positive impact on the number of whistleblower reports submitted.

In 2023, the number of reports increased from 53 (in 2022) to 76, marking a 43.4% rise compared to the previous year. Notably, 60% of all reports in 2023 (46 out of 76) were received between September and December, coinciding with the launch of the whistleblower protection awareness campaign.

In 2024, the number of reports further increased to 80, reflecting a 5.3% growth compared to 2023. In 2025, 97 reports were received, representing a 21.3% increase compared to 2024, and an 83.0% increase compared to 2022.

These statistics highlight the effectiveness of awareness initiatives in encouraging more individuals to come forward and report violations. The consistent increase in whistleblower reports suggests growing public confidence in the protection mechanisms provided by the Whistleblower Protection Law.

Follow-up actions

The final 2025 figures are currently being calculated; therefore, the follow-up actions provided will be confirmed and presented at a later stage in February.

24. *Specific measures to enhance transparency, integrity and accountability in sectors with high risks of corruption, with a view to monitor and prevent corruption and conflict of interests, and where applicable measures to prevent and address corruption committed by organised crime groups.*

- *Such high-risk sectors could include: public procurement, including construction, transport/infrastructure, defence, cohesion, agriculture, environment, healthcare, citizen/residence investor schemes, large-scale investments of national interest and the spending of EU funds, urban planning.*
- *In particular, measures to mitigate high risks of corruption in the area of public procurement, such as enhancing transparency and oversight (for example through digital technologies) and promoting fair competition and accountability in public procurement (e.g. targeted actions to address the high share of single bids) and measures to guarantee the effective and independent functioning of the public procurement review bodies.*

Public Procurement Office

The Public Procurement Office (hereinafter – PPO) consistently places strong emphasis on ensuring the transparency of procurement procedures and strengthening competition, giving particular priority to procedures in which only one tenderer participates. This targeted institutional focus is driven by the persistently high “single tenderer” indicator within the Lithuanian public procurement system, which reflects underlying issues of limited competition. In order to systematically monitor and reduce this indicator, the **PPO applies a coherent set of preventive, analytical and coordination measures, including preventive audits, awareness-raising activities, inter-institutional cooperation and targeted supplementary initiatives:**

- Lithuania has fully implemented the recommendations of the OECD Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions (Working Group) relating to the deprivation of the right to participate in public procurement. These are reflected in **“OECD Anti-Bribery Convention**

Phase 3 Follow-Up Report on Lithuania. Implementing the Convention and Related Legal Instruments⁶², subsection “Regarding public advantages”, paragraphs 44, 46 and 47⁶³.

- In 2025, the PPO organised **training on grounds for exclusion of economic operators**, including exclusion from procurement procedures due to corruption-related criminal offences such as bribery, trading in influence and related offences. Three in-person training sessions were held, attended by 90 participants. These trainings played a significant role in strengthening contracting authorities’ understanding of the practical application of exclusion grounds, particularly in the context of corruption-related crimes. Participants deepened their knowledge of legal interpretation, common errors and relevant case law, and gained greater confidence in adopting well-reasoned decisions in public procurement procedures. The primary objective was achieved – enhancing transparency, ensuring uniform application of legal provisions and contributing to the strengthening of corruption prevention within the public procurement system.

⁶² https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2025/12/oecd-anti-bribery-convention-phase-3-follow-up-report-on-lithuania_abe96239/1699ba63-en.pdf

⁶³ As the completion date of the new electronic public procurement system SAULE IS has been postponed until the fourth quarter of 2027, recommendations 15(b) and 15(e) related to the functionalities of this information system have not yet been implemented; however, the Public Procurement Office is undertaking preparatory actions for the acquisition of a new Central Public Procurement Information System.

- In order to inform contracting authorities about debarment lists of international financial institutions as an additional risk assessment tool, the PPO published, in 2025, an information notice entitled **Debarred Suppliers Lists in International Financial Institutions**⁶⁴.

- In 2025, the PPO updated a significant part of the **Commentary to the Law on Public Procurement of the Republic of Lithuania**⁶⁵ (hereinafter – the LPP), taking into account amendments to the legal framework and the latest case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union and Lithuanian courts. Through the same **communication notice**⁶⁶, the PPO additionally drew attention on its website to information related to bribery of foreign public officials.

- In 2025, the PPO organised the **conference “Suppliers’ Path to Public Procurement: Are the Doors Really Open?”**⁶⁷ as a targeted preventive measure aimed at promoting competition, transparent conduct of suppliers and contracting authorities, and reducing corruption risks (including participation of a representative of the Special Investigation Service).

- During the first half of 2025, the PPO implemented a **public awareness campaign “Your Business Is Worth More – Opportunities in Public Procurement”**. The campaign sought to attract new suppliers to participate in public procurement, encourage registration in the Central Public Procurement Information System (hereinafter – CPPIS), promote competitiveness in public procurement and increase transparency.

One of the campaign objectives was to inform suppliers about opportunities and benefits of participating in public procurement via CPPIS, to shape a positive attitude towards participation and to encourage engagement by emphasising transparency, efficiency and business value. To achieve this, the PPO prepared a business-oriented article⁶⁸, published it on the PPO website and promoted it via Facebook. As a result, 5,021 users were directed to the website from Facebook, and the advertisement was viewed 182,336 times. Accordingly, the article was read by more than 5,000 interested persons.

Transparency in procurement was also emphasised through another campaign objective: an article published on the PPO website on competitiveness and transparency in procurement, including tools for assessing sectors with higher opportunities and those with lower levels of competition. This article attracted 2,131 website visitors, while the related Facebook post reached 1,600 views.

Considering that 3,596 suppliers registered in CPPIS during the 12 months of 2025, it is concluded that the campaign was effective, increased awareness of public procurement opportunities, improved understanding of public procurement, enhanced perceptions of transparency and encouraged new suppliers to register in CPPIS.

- From September 2025 until the end of December, the PPO carried out a **social campaign titled “Do You Care About How Your Child Is Fed?”**. During the campaign, it reviewed catering service contracts in 40 Lithuanian educational institutions and issued recommendations and mandatory instructions to eliminate the identified violations.

As part of an awareness-raising campaign on the social network Facebook, the news portal Delfi and other channels, the PPO invited parents of children attending educational institutions to join the initiative, to monitor the meals their children receive at schools, and to report potential violations in the performance of catering contracts to municipal representatives. During the campaign, an additional 40 complaints from parents of schoolchildren were received. These were analysed by specialists, solutions were sought, and schools were provided with recommendations on how to address the identified problems. In order to increase transparency in this area and prevent corruption, the public was informed and educated via the social network Facebook.

During the advertising campaign carried out on Facebook, 8 communication tasks were implemented

⁶⁴ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/nepatikimu-tiekiju-sarasai-tarptautinese-finansu-institucijose-dMp/>

⁶⁵ <https://klausk.vpt.lt/hc/lt/sections/360004647199-Vie%C5%A1%C5%B3j%C5%B3-pirkim%C5%B3-%C4%AFstatymo-komentaras>

⁶⁶ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/kvieciame-naudotis-atnaujinta-vpi-komentaro-dalimi-CeB/>

⁶⁷ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tHTYIHdbRo0>

⁶⁸ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/jusu-verslas-vertas-daugiau-cvp-is-ir-viesuju-pirkimu-galimybes/>

(posts, advertisements, links to articles⁶⁹). Through this Facebook communication and reach and traffic advertising on the META platform, 292,524 users were reached, and 17,455 visitors were directed to the website from Facebook. The PPO management organized meetings on these issues with representatives of municipalities (Kaunas, Vilnius, Šilutė, Tauragė). The social campaign will be continued in 2026.

- In implementation of the 2024–2026 Action Plan for Attracting Suppliers to Public Procurement, the PPO organised **seven training sessions in 2025 entitled “Public Procurement Made Simple”**. Seven in-person trainings were held in six cities, attended by 270 participants. The trainings introduced public procurement newcomers to business opportunities, benefits of participation and general information on procurement procedures. These activities promote competition, which plays a decisive role in preventing corruption risks and contributes to improved identification of such risks.

- In order to improve public procurement processes and promote business competition, the PPO is implementing the **2024–2026 Action Plan for Attracting New Suppliers**, in particular micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (SME), to public procurement. Accordingly, the PPO conducts annual analyses of SME participation in procurement. In 2025, the **Analysis of SME Participation in Public Procurement in 2024**⁷⁰ was prepared and published.

- Within the framework of the same action plan, the PPO developed and published the **Supplier Guide**⁷¹ – a concise overview of the key steps for beginner suppliers, explaining how to start offering goods, services or works and generate profit, from registration in CPPIS to submission of a tender.

- In 2025, the PPO, together with consultants engaged under a contract with the European Commission, prepared and published an **assessment tool for determining contracting authority status**⁷². This tool enhances legal and practical certainty by enabling organisations to assess in advance and systematically whether public procurement rules apply to them. It reduces the risk of conducting procurements without applying statutory procedures, thereby strengthening transparency. The tool serves a preventive function by helping avoid errors and intentional misinterpretations of status that could create conditions for corruption risks. Clear determination of status ensures compliance with the principles of transparency, non-discrimination and equal treatment, increases supplier confidence and fosters effective competition.

- In 2025, the PPO published a training recording entitled **“Conduct of Oral Public Procurement”**⁷³. The training clarifies when and under what conditions oral procurements may be conducted, what actions must be documented and how decision traceability is ensured. It contributes to transparency, reduces corruption risks, limits discretion in decision-making and promotes consistent, justified and verifiable practices, particularly in low-value procurements, which are more susceptible to abuse.

- On 10 December 2025, amendments to the **Procedure Description for Low-Value Procurements**⁷⁴ entered into force, establishing legal conditions for systematic and objective assessment of supplier reliability in low-value procurements based on external data on suppliers’ economic and financial standing. Clearly predefined indicators, data sources and threshold values in procurement documents reduce subjective decision-making, selective assessment and potential favouritism, enhance transparency and verifiability, and contribute to corruption prevention. The amendments were directly coordinated with six business associations.

- In 2025, the PPO prepared and published the **Recommendations on the establishment of environmental protection criteria as contract performance conditions**⁷⁵. These recommendations assist contracting authorities in applying environmental requirements in a manner that does not unduly restrict competition and ensures verifiability at the contract execution stage.

⁶⁹ e.g. <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/kiek-kainuoja-jusu-vaiko-pietu-lekste-XKz/>(<https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/kiek-kainuoja-jusu-vaiko-pietu-lekste-XKz/>)

⁷⁰ https://vpt.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1767010882/20404/2024_tiek%C4%97j%C5%B3_dalyvavimoVP_analiz%C4%97.pdf

⁷¹ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1747390826/19370/VPT-Tiekejogidas-.pdf>

⁷² https://vpt.lrv.lt/public/canonical/1762502091/20171/PO_statuso_vertinimo_priemone.xlsx

⁷³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W8j9u5fp9XU>

⁷⁴ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/a0f25f005ca411e79198ffdb108a3753/asr>

⁷⁵ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/media/viesa/saugykla/2025/5/5VW6xHmX4b8.pdf>

- In 2025, the PPO carried out 11 **audits of public procurement contract management** and two **audits of overall procurement governance**. Six contracting authorities were selected based on the highest values of road maintenance and repair contracts concluded in 2024, five based on the highest values of school catering service contracts, and two based on identified high corruption risk. The primary focus was on developing recommendations to improve procurement contract management practices.

- In 2025, PPO representatives **delivered presentations** at the Ministry of the Interior (“Audit of Procurement Contract Management”), at the Assembly of Central Purchasing Bodies (“Procurement Governance of Municipal Central Purchasing Bodies”), and at the Conference of the Association of Municipal Auditors (two presentations: “When Control Becomes Assistance: A New Approach to Procurement Governance” and “Centralisation – More Than a Structure: Do CPBs Fulfil Their Role?”), as well as at trainings “Public Procurement Contract Governance: Requirements and Good Practice” organised by the Tauragė Regional Waste Management Centre.

- In 2025, the PPO enhanced the publicly available **analytical tool “Procurement Map – Dashboard”**⁷⁶ by adding indicators related to procurements subject to supplier complaints and judicial disputes, thereby strengthening transparency and data-driven monitoring.

- In 2025, the PPO updated the **Recommendations on Public Procurement and Procurement Organisation and Internal Control**⁷⁷, including a model internal procedure for procurement organisation and control, assisting contracting authorities in establishing or improving internal control systems. Among other things, the above-mentioned guidelines were supplemented with criteria (including the appearance of a conflict of interest, etc.) that contracting authorities are recommended to apply when selecting suppliers for procurement procedures without prior publication.

- In 2025, contracting authorities included 67 suppliers in the **List of Unreliable Suppliers**⁷⁸ and 21 suppliers in the **List of Suppliers Who Provided False Information**⁷⁹. Downloadable Excel versions of both lists were made publicly available, and two informational notices were published by the PPO.

- Having observed that contracting authorities often enter data incorrectly when including suppliers in the **Lists of Unreliable Suppliers and Suppliers that Provided Misleading Information**, and that such data are published later than required by the Law on Public Procurement, and also seeking to assist contracting authorities in completing these questionnaires correctly, the PPO published a notice⁸⁰ in 2025 aimed at encouraging the timely submission of the specified information to the PPO and other procurement operators, thereby contributing to more transparent public procurement.

In addition, responding to the existing demand from the market (procurement authorities, suppliers, and the media) for open data, the PPO enabled the lists of Unreliable Suppliers and of suppliers that have provided false information to be downloaded in Excel format⁸¹. This measure is intended to promote increased competition, as it has become easier to access and use the information contained in these lists. In December 2025, the PPO published an **information notice** intended to inform stakeholders about changes in the legal regulation of fuel procurement. These changes aim to enable purchasing authorities, from 1 January 2026, to prepare and publish fuel procurement notices independently using the tools of the CPPIS⁸². The publication of fuel procurement notices in CPPIS and the conduct of fuel procurement procedures through CPPIS will make it possible to carry out fuel procurement using electronic tools rather than paper envelopes, thereby contributing to greater transparency in fuel procurement.

Through **information notices on preventive supervision** published in 2025, the PPO sought to inform all interested parties about the results of procurements preventively reviewed in 2024 and about procurements subject to preventive review in 2025, drawing attention to the procedure for reviewing procurement documents and to comments addressed to contracting authorities when preparing

⁷⁶ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/statistika-ir-analize/pirkimu-vykdytoju-zemelapis-svieslente-1/>

⁷⁷ https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/metodine-pagalba/pirkimu-vykdytojams_3/gaires-ir-rekomendacijos/

⁷⁸ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/nuorodos/kiti-duomenys/powerbi/nepatikimi-tiekejai-1/>

⁷⁹ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/nuorodos/kiti-duomenys/powerbi/melaginga-informacija-pateikusi-tiekeju-sarasas-3/>

⁸⁰ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/del-nepatikimu-tiekeju-ir-melaginga-informacija-pateikusi-tiekeju-sarasu-MsF/>

⁸¹ The information notice can be found at: <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/nepatikimu-tiekeju-ir-melaginga-informacija-pateikusi-tiekeju-sarasai-excel-formatu-clX/>

⁸² The information notice can be found at: <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/kuro-pirkimu-teisinio-reglamentavimo-pokyciai-nuo-2026-01-01-flv/>

procurement documentation.

- In 2025, the PPO prepared **legislative amendments**⁸³ enabling purchasing organisations, as of 1 January 2026, to prepare and publish fuel procurement notices independently via CPPIS. An informational notice and meetings with purchasing organisations were held in December 2025 to present the upcoming changes.

- In fulfilling its statutory functions, the PPO continues **active cooperation** with the Special Investigation Service, the Competition Council, the Chief Official Ethics Commission and the national central purchasing body – the public institution CPO LT. This cooperation aims to ensure consistent, transparent and ethical public procurement practices through data exchange, joint projects and mutual expert support.

- The PPO regularly provides written and oral consultations and other methodological assistance (FAQs, guidelines, informational notices and other tools) related to the LPP and its implementing legislation, including matters of transparency, exclusion grounds and corruption risk mitigation. These measures are publicly available, regularly updated and will be continued.

In conclusion, effective management of systemic corruption risks in public procurement is inseparable from robust technical tools, targeted public awareness and strengthened inter-institutional cooperation. Acting within its competence, the PPO consistently carries out monitoring, education and oversight of high-risk areas, ensuring transparency and effectiveness of public procurement.

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

Among implemented measures of the first plan for the implementation of Agenda for 2023–2025 there are also measures from high-risk sectors, such as:

- public procurement (continued centralisation of public procurement of institutions subordinate to the Ministry of Health; proposals to promote the proper and effective application of the unreliable supplier institute");

- healthcare (social campaign; updated descriptions of Health Sciences study field, which include provisions on anti-corruption topics);

- environment (additional developments for hunting registration module);

- spending of EU funds (establishing additional control measures to more effectively identify illegal conditions for receiving EU support);

- urban planning (improving the functionality of the register of territorial planning documents of the Republic of Lithuania; creation of a tool on the Lithuanian Spatial Information Portal that allows the public (ordinary user) to find clear and relevant information about the status of state land, its management and use in one place).

In 2025, among anti-corruption assessments of legislation and draft legislation (ACA), and corruption risk analyses (CRA) conducted by STT, 47 of them were conducted in high-risk areas, such as public procurement (5 CRA) healthcare (7 ACA and 1 CRA), construction (1 ACA), transport/infrastructure (3 ACA, 3 CRA), defence (2 ACA), agriculture (1 ACA), environment (17 ACA), spending of EU funds (1 ACA), urban planning (3 ACA). STT provided recommendations to decision-makers to address identified corruption risks.

25. *Measures for the prevention of corruption in relation to the issuing of official permits (e.g. related to environment, energy, service provision and various types of construction)*

⁸³ <https://vpt.lrv.lt/lt/naujienos-3/kuro-pirkimu-teisinio-reglamentavimo-pokyciai-nuo-2026-01-01-flv/>

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

In 2025, among CRA conducted by STT in relation to the issuing of official permits 2 CRA were conducted on service provision. STT provided recommendations to decision-makers to address identified corruption risks.

C. Repression

☐ No developments regarding the repression of corruption

☒ If there have been developments related to the repression of corruption, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

26. *The legal framework on the criminalisation and sanctions for corruption and related offences, including foreign bribery.*

Prosecutor General's Office

In October 2025 the Seimas adopted amendments to Article 228 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania, which mitigate liability for abuse of office by reducing the maximum term of imprisonment by one year. As a result of this amendment, abuse of office for personal gain (Article 228(2) of the Criminal Code) was changed from a serious crime to an aggravated crime. This change has made it possible to apply certain provisions of the General Part of the Criminal Code that were previously not applicable, namely:

- Release from criminal liability on bail (Article 40 of the Criminal Code).
- Partial suspension of the execution of a custodial sentence (Article 75(3) of the Criminal Code).
- The range of applicable fines has been reduced—from 150 to 6,000 MLS prior to the amendment, to 100 to 4,000 MLS following the amendment.
- The statute of limitations for criminal prosecution has been shortened from 15 to 12 years (Article 95 of the Criminal Code).
- The duration of a criminal record has been reduced from 5 to 3 years (Article 97 of the Criminal Code).

In the opinion of the Prosecutor's Office, this amendment falls outside the context of criminal acts of a corruption, as bribery involving large sums of money, trading in influence, and bribery remain serious corruption crimes. However, if abuse for financial or other personal gain (an essential feature of a corruption crime that distinguishes it from simple abuse) and significant damage (according to the latest court practice, significant financial damage in abuse of office is 400 MLS), it will no longer be a serious crime, but only an aggravated crime. Meanwhile, bribes exceeding 250 MLS remain serious crimes (Criminal Code, Article 225(3), Article 226(3-4), Article 227(3)). Moreover, a serious crime will be committed simply by offering, agreeing, promising to give and/or accepting a bribe, even if the bribe is not given and no consequences arise. Meanwhile, if real significant damage is caused by abuse for personal gain, i.e., if real serious consequences arise, we will only have an aggravated crime.

It should be noted that after these amendments were adopted, a group of Seimas members appealed to the Constitutional Court of Lithuania with a request to examine the compatibility of the Law Amending Article 228 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania with Article 69(1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania as well as the constitutional principles of the rule of law and responsible governance. The applicants point out that some of the drafters of the Amendments and the members of the Seimas who voted for its adoption had a direct interest in the adoption of a law mitigating criminal liability, as they themselves are subject to pre-trial investigations.

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

Upon initiative of the Members of the Parliament, which sparked a lot of public debate, the Parliament overcame President's veto and adopted⁸⁴ Amendments⁸⁵ to the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania establishing that:

Article 228(1): the maximum term of imprisonment was reduced from 5 years to 4 years.

Article 228(2): the maximum term of imprisonment was reduced from 7 years to 6 years.

More information on this in question No. 28.

By other legislative proposal, which sought to address the concerns of the OECD Working Group on Bribery, the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania was supplemented with Article 40¹, which establishes the grounds for the exemption of a legal person from criminal liability as provided for in Articles 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40 of this Code⁸⁶. Also, the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania was supplemented with Article 58¹, which establishes the grounds for the mitigation of punishment for a legal person⁸⁷.

27. *Official data on the number of investigations, prosecutions, final judgments, and the application of sanctions for corruption offences (differentiated by offence if possible)⁸⁸. Please indicate whether the cases: involve legal persons; are related to the implementation of EU or national funds⁸⁹; involve high level corruption. Please indicate which data is publicly available and how policy-making is informed by the data.*

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

Statistics of 2025 in the criminal cases of corruption-related offences, that were investigated by the STT:

- During the reporting period, 98 pre-trial investigation cases were initiated;
- During the reporting period, 51 pre-trial investigation cases were transferred to the court;
- 115 persons (all natural) were served with a notice of suspicion;
- 98 persons (90 – natural persons, 8 – legal person) were convicted in the first instance and/or higher instance if a decision contrary to that of the previous instance was made;
- 38 persons (37 – natural persons, 1 – legal person) were acquitted in the first instance and/or higher instance if a decision contrary to that of the previous instance was made;
- 90 persons (82 – natural persons, 8 – legal person) were convicted in the first instance;
- 20 persons (19 – natural persons, 1 – legal person) were acquitted in the first instance;
- 1 case related with EU funding has been initiated (separated from another pre-trial investigation) and is being overseen by a European Delegated Prosecutor (EPPO);
- 4 persons were convicted and sentenced to imprisonment in the first instance and/or higher instance if a decision contrary to that of the previous instance was made (without suspension of sentence execution). One individual was sentenced to 4 years of imprisonment, another to 3 years and 5 months, a third to 2 years and 3 months, and a fourth to 2 years.
- 3 high level and complex corruption cases were investigated.

⁸⁴ <https://www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/2716299/seimas-laikosi-savo-nuomones-del-cekutininku-pataisunausedos-veto-atmetas?srsId=AfmBOooSuNCtepYVkr5uMG2-t3ajuZvIqMVvqKYi2aTAEgplgRWLsB7e>

⁸⁵ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/legalAct/c36aa082ab4a11f0a34db2fbd35a03b2>

⁸⁶ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/legalAct.html?documentId=5e517ba0087c11efbcbfb318996800a8>

⁸⁷ <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/legalAct.html?documentId=5e517ba0087c11efbcbfb318996800a8>

⁸⁸ Please include, if available the number of (data since 2022 or latest available data): indictments; first instance convictions; first instance acquittals; final convictions; final acquittals; other outcomes (final) (i.e. excluding convictions and acquittals); cases adjudicated (final); imprisonment / custodial sentences through final convictions; suspended custodial sentences through final convictions; pending cases at the end of the reference year.

⁸⁹ For MS participating in the EPPO, data on cases related to EU funds does not encompass investigations and prosecutions carried out by the EPPO.

• Court decisions (sanctions) expressed in percentage in the first instance and/or higher instance if a decision contrary to that of the previous instance was made (during 2025):

- Fine – 89 %
- Prison Sentence (actual and suspended) - 3 %
- Fine and Prison Sentence - 6 %
- Liquidation of a legal entity – 1 %
- Restriction of liberty – 1 %

The most common sanction for corruption related crimes is a fine (89 % of total sanctions imposed by courts.

* We note that the National Courts Administration is responsible at the national level for collecting and analysing statistical data on court decisions.

Prosecutor General's Office

In 2025, only 140 corruption-related crimes were registered (38% less than in 2024).

Statistical data on the examination of cases involving corruption-related criminal offences in courts will be available in late January or early February.

Preliminary investigations and court proceedings concerning abuse of office and fraud by local government politicians that began in 2023 continued in 2024-2025. By the end of 2025, the courts had already convicted 31 politicians. Six politicians were acquitted or had their cases dismissed.

28. *Potential obstacles identified in law or in practice to the investigation and prosecution of high-level and complex corruption cases (e.g. political immunity regulation, procedural rules, statute of limitations, cross-border cooperation, pardoning).*

Prosecutor General's Office

In 2024 -2025, prosecutors had to terminate pre-trial investigations into the abuse of power and fraud committed by two members of the Seimas (former municipal council members) in embezzling local government funds, as parliament did not consent to bring them to criminal liability. Both members of Parliament belong to the largest governing party. However, the Seimas did consent to criminal prosecution of several other members of the Seimas for crimes of the same nature (abuse of power and fraud involving the misappropriation of municipal funds).

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

The most debated development was a year-long legislative process concerning **Criminal Code Article 228 (abuse of office)**, which is widely used in corruption-related investigations and prosecutions.

Throughout 2025, several versions of draft amendments were tabled and revised, attracting strong criticism from institutions, civil society and the media, including concerns about both **substance** (narrowing the scope of the offence and reducing sanctions) and the **accelerated legislative procedure** used. The Seimas ultimately adopted amendments to Article 228 (Law No. **XV-474**), which **entered into force on 18 October 2025**. The President vetoed the adopted amendments, but the Seimas **overrode the veto** and re-adopted the changes; media reporting highlighted that the changes **reclassified the offence from “serious” to “less serious/medium gravity”** by lowering maximum imprisonment, with potential consequences for investigation and prosecution tools (e.g., procedural options and limitation periods).

In response to the risk that reclassification could restrict the use of criminal intelligence measures, amendments to the **Law on Criminal Intelligence** (Law No. **XV-475**) were adopted on **16 October**

2025. The amended framework explicitly includes **Criminal Code Article 228** among the offences for which criminal intelligence may be used, aiming to preserve investigative effectiveness for abuse-of-office cases.

Beyond the substantive and procedural controversies, the 2025 amendments to **Criminal Code Article 228 (abuse of office)** raised additional rule-of-law concerns because the provision is actively used in **numerous ongoing criminal proceedings involving politicians** (including high-profile “expense allowance/“čekiukai”” cases), meaning the changes could directly affect pending investigations and prosecutions. These concerns were compounded by the fact that the legislative votes were taken in a context where some members of Parliament could be perceived as having a **direct personal or political stake** in the outcome; consequently, a group of MPs submitted the claim to the **Constitutional Court** alleging, inter alia, potential breaches of public and private interest rules and constitutional principles in the adoption of these amendments, and the Constitutional Court has accepted the request for examination.

29. *Information on effectiveness of criminal and non-criminal measures and of sanctions (e.g. recovery measures and administrative sanctions) on both public and private offenders.*

Other – please specify

III. Media pluralism and media freedom

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2024 Report regarding media pluralism and media freedom (if applicable):

A. Media authorities and bodies⁹⁰

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to media authorities and bodies, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution:

30. *Measures taken to ensure the independence, enforcement powers and adequacy of resources (financial, human and technical) of media regulatory authorities and bodies.*

31. *Conditions and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head / members of the collegiate body of media regulatory authorities and bodies.*

Ministry of Culture

The appointment procedures remained unchanged; however, new appointments were carried out in two regulatory authorities.

In June 2025, the Seimas appointed Dainius Radzevičius as the Journalists' Ethics Inspector⁹¹. The appointment followed the statutory procedure requiring parliamentary approval of the head of an independent media oversight body. Mr Radzevičius previously served for many years as Chair of the

⁹⁰ Cf. Article 30 of Directive 2018/1808.

⁹¹ in LT – [XV-265 Dėl Dainiaus Radzevičiaus skyrimo žurnalistų etikos inspektoriumi](#).

Lithuanian Journalists' Union.

In April 2025, the Seimas appointed Mantas Martišius as Chair of the Lithuanian Radio and Television Commission⁹². The appointment followed the statutory procedure requiring parliamentary approval of the Commission's Chair. At the same time, a new composition of the Commission was appointed following the expiry of the majority of members' previous terms. Mr Martišius is a communication sciences scholar and has previously served as Vice-Chair and Chair of the LRTK.

32. *Existence and functions of media councils or other self-regulatory bodies.*

B. Safeguards against government or political interference and transparency and concentration of media ownership

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related government or political interference or transparency and concentration of media ownership, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

33. *Measures taken to ensure the fair and transparent allocation of state advertising*

Ministry of Culture

The Ministry of Culture is currently working on the implementation of the European Media Freedom Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1083 establishing a common framework for media services in the internal market) and on aligning national legislation with its requirements.

The principles for the allocation of state advertising, ensuring diversity of media service providers and taking into account national and local specificities of media markets, as well as the monitoring of their implementation, are not yet established in Lithuanian law. These principles are planned to be introduced through forthcoming amendments to the Law on the Provision of Information to the Public.

It should also be noted that the exception provided in the second subparagraph of Article 25(2) of the Regulation does not apply in Lithuania.

34. *Safeguards against state / political interference, in particular:*

- safeguards to ensure editorial independence of media (private and public)

Ministry of Culture

More information in pillar III.

- specific safeguards for the independence of heads of management and members of the governing boards of public service media (e.g. related to appointment, dismissal), safeguards for their financial and operational independence (e.g. related to reporting obligations and the allocation of resources) and safeguards for plurality of information and opinions

Ministry of Culture

More information in pillar III.

⁹² in LT – [XV-165 Dėl Lietuvos radijo ir televizijos komisijos pirmininko paskyrimo](#).

- *information on specific legal provisions and procedures applying to media service providers, including as regards granting/renewal/termination of licences, company operation, capital entry requirements, concentration, and corporate governance*

Ministry of Culture

With the amendment to Article 50 of the Law on the Provision of Information to the Public, which entered into force on 1 July 2025⁹³, competence for GDPR-related complaints was clarified, a two-year limitation period for complaints and enforcement measures was introduced, and publication of the Journalists' Ethics Inspector's decisions was mandated, strengthening transparency and legal certainty of media ethics oversight.

35. *Transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information, including on direct, indirect and beneficial owners*

Ministry of Culture

Transparency International Lithuania conducted monitoring of politicians' and their spouses' involvement in media ownership in 2021–2025, based on the STIRNA.info media database. The findings show that over five years the number of politicians, public officials and their spouses owning media outlets decreased from 68 to 54, while the number of media outlets under their ownership fell from 129 to 109⁹⁴.

C. Framework for journalists' protection, transparency and access to documents

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to the framework for journalists' protection or transparency/access to documents, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

36. *Rules and practices guaranteeing journalist's independence and safety, including as regards protection of journalistic sources and communications, referring also, if applicable, to follow-up given to alerts lodged with the Council of Europe's Platform to promote the protection of journalism and safety of journalists.*

Ministry of Justice

Having described the individual and general measures (the trainings for the judiciary, the events held, developed case-law of the Supreme Administrative Court, to name a few) taken in the execution process of the [ECtHR judgment in Eigirdas and VI "Demokratijos plėtros fondas" v. Lithuania](#) (nos. 84048/17 and 84051/17) of 12 September 2023, where a violation of Article 10 of the Convention was found, in the [Action Report of 15 December 2025](#) the Agent of the Government invited the Committee of Ministers to close the supervision of the case.

Ministry of Culture

State institutions implemented activities under the 2023-2025 Action Plan for Protecting, Safeguarding and Empowering Journalists.

⁹³ in LT - [XV-319 Lietuvos Respublikos visuomenės informavimo įstatymo Nr. I-1418 50 straipsnio pakeitimo įstatymas](#).

⁹⁴ in LT – [Politikai ir žiniasklaida: nuo 0,01% „Lietuvos ryto“ iki 100% Utenos radijo akcijų - Verslo žinios](#).

The Media Support Fund awarded grants to investigative journalists⁹⁵.

37. *Law enforcement capacity, including during protests and demonstrations, to ensure journalists' safety and to investigate attacks on journalists.*

38. *Access to information and public documents by public at large and journalists (incl. transparency authorities where they exist, procedures, costs/fees, timeframes, administrative/judicial review of decisions, execution of decisions by public authorities, possible obstacles related to the classification of information).*

Ministry of Culture

On 29 August 2025, the Lithuanian Judicial Council established a working group to assess the practical application of the legal framework governing the provision of information on court cases to media service providers and to develop proposals for improving this regulation. The results of the working group are expected in the first quarter of 2026.

39. *Lawsuits (incl. SLAPPs - strategic lawsuits against public participation) and convictions against journalists (incl. defamation cases) and measures taken to safeguard against manifestly unfounded and abusive lawsuits.*

Ministry of Justice

In 2025, the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania had prepared the amendments to the Code of Civil Procedure and to the Law on the Implementation of EU and International Legal Acts Regulating Civil Procedure to fully implement the Directive (EU) 2024/1069 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 on protecting persons who engage in public participation from manifestly unfounded claims or abusive court proceedings ("Strategic lawsuits against public participation"). For example, in the case of the application of the procedure of early dismissal of the claim, the law sets the deadlines for the consideration of cases; the examples of criteria to be considered by the court when assessing whether an action is not a SLAPP are specified, etc. It must be noted that draft laws were extensively coordinated with stakeholders: with the judicial community, media representatives, non-governmental organizations, and academic institutions. At the end of 2025, the amendments were adopted by the Parliament⁹⁶.

Ministry of Culture

On 18 December 2025, amendments to the Code of Civil Procedure (Law No. XV-700) were adopted and will enter into force on 7 May 2026⁹⁷. The amendments introduce procedural mechanisms to address manifestly unfounded or abusive civil claims, including the possibility to order security for costs and to apply an early dismissal procedure.

In parallel, on 18 December 2025, amendments to the Law on State-Guaranteed Legal Aid (Law No. XV-702) were adopted⁹⁸. They provide that persons defending lawful public participation who request the application of the early dismissal procedure for manifestly unfounded claims are entitled to state-guaranteed legal aid, ensuring effective access to justice for potential SLAPP defendants.

⁹⁵ in LT - [Fondas skelbia tiriamosios žurnalistikos stipendijų finansavimo rezultatus - Medijų rėmimo fondas](#).

⁹⁶ [Lietuvos Respublikos civilinio proceso kodekso 95, 95-1, 142 straipsnių pakeitimo ir Kodekso papildymo priedu įstatymas](#); [Lietuvos Respublikos civilinį procesą reglamentuojančių Europos Sąjungos ir tarptautinės teisės aktų įgyvendinimo įstatymo Nr. X-1809 priedo pakeitimo ir Įstatymo papildymo devintuoju-7 skirsniu įstatymas](#).

⁹⁷ in LT – [XV-700 Lietuvos Respublikos civilinio proceso kodekso 95, 95-1, 142 straipsnių pakeitimo ir Kodekso papi...](#)

⁹⁸ in LT - [XV-702 Lietuvos Respublikos valstybės garantuojamos teisinės pagalbos įstatymo Nr. VIII-1591 12 straipsn...](#)

In addition, Law No. XV-701 of 18 December 2025 amended the Law on the Implementation of European Union and International Civil Procedure Instruments⁹⁹, establishing the national legal framework for the application of Directive (EU) 2024/1069.

Other – please specify

Constitutional Court

At the beginning of 2026, the Constitutional Court received a petition from the members of the Seimas¹⁰⁰ requesting an examination into whether Articles 11 and 19 of Republic of Lithuania's Law (No I-1571) of 27 November 2025 Amending the Law (No XV-618) on the National Radio and Television¹⁰¹ is in contradiction with Article 25 of the Constitution, the constitutional principles of a pluralistic democracy, responsible governance, and a state under the rule of law, as well as with Article 1 of the Constitutional Act on Membership of the Republic of Lithuania in the European Union, which is an integral part of the Constitution. The petitioner has raised doubts about the financing of the national broadcaster, and the Constitutional Court is considering the admissibility of this petition.

IV. Other institutional issues related to checks and balances

Constitutional Court

There were no recommendations for Lithuania concerning the system of checks and balances. However, it is worth mentioning that, since November 2024 and September 2025, there have been two pending cases in the Constitutional Court related to the legal regulation on the composition of the Government adopted by the decrees of the President of the Republic of 4 December 2024 and 9 September 2025 (petition No 1B-23/2024 (case No 2/2025)¹⁰² and petition No 1B-11/2025 (case No 14/2025)¹⁰³.

Overall, in their petitions, two groups of members of the Seimas state that although the Law on the Government stipulates that there are 14 ministries in Lithuania, these two decrees of the President of the Republic approved the Government that consisted of 12 ministers. According to the petitioners, the Constitution does not provide for the formation of the Government in separate stages, therefore a situation where only a certain part of the Government is approved, with the remaining ministers being approved later, is unacceptable under the Constitution. The Constitution enshrines that the President of the Republic shall, upon the assent of the Seimas, appoint the Prime Minister; shall charge the Prime Minister with forming the Government; and shall approve the composition of the formed Government (Article 84(4)); the Government shall consist of the Prime Minister and Ministers (Article 91); the Prime Minister, within 15 days of his appointment, shall form and present to the Seimas the Government, approved by the President of the Republic, and shall submit the programme of the formed Government for consideration by the Seimas (Article 92(3)). In the petitioners' opinion, the 15-day period for approving the composition of the Government, as established in the Constitution, means that the entire composition of the Government must be approved within that period. The petitioners state that the adoption of the decrees of the President of the Republic violated the constitutional principles of a state under the rule of law and responsible governance, which, among other requirements, imply that all state

⁹⁹ in LT - [XV-701 Lietuvos Respublikos civilinį procesą reglamentuojančių Europos Sąjungos ir tarptautinės teisės a...](#)

¹⁰⁰ available in Lithuanian at https://lrkt.lt/data/public/uploads/2026/01/1b-1_2026.pdf.

¹⁰¹ available in Lithuanian at <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/4a5d6b22cf8d11f08918e1adc7c5b1ec>.

¹⁰² the petition is available in Lithuanian at https://lrkt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/01/23_2024.pdf.

¹⁰³ the petition is available in Lithuanian at https://lrkt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/09/kreipimasis-i-konstitucini-teisma_2025-09-23.pdf.

authorities and officials must act solely on the basis of the Constitution and the law, must not exceed the powers granted to them by the Constitution and the law, and that substatutory legal acts must not contradict the laws and the Constitution.

Thus, according to the petitions of two groups of members of the Seimas, the aforementioned two decrees of the President of the Republic are incompatible with Article 84(4), Article 91, Article 92(3) of the Constitution, the constitutional principles of a state under the rule of law and responsible governance, Article 6(2) and Article 29 (2) of the Law on the Government.

A. The process for preparing and enacting laws

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to the process for preparing and enacting laws, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

40. *Framework, policy and use of impact assessments and evidence based policy-making, stakeholders¹⁰⁴/public consultations (including rules and practices on the transparent participation of civil society to policy development and decision-making processes, and transparency and quality of the legislative process both in the preparatory and the parliamentary phase.*

Ministry of Justice

New measures by the Ministry of Justice were not implemented. Public consultations are the responsibility of the Government Chancellery.

Having assessed positively the individual and general measures (legislative amendments of the Law on Religious Communities and Associations, dissemination, the Seimas' decision to grant State recognition to the Ancient Baltic religious association Romuva, to name a few) described by the Agent of the Government in [the Action Report of 13 January 2025](#), which were taken in the execution process of [the ECtHR judgment in the case of Ancient Baltic religious association Romuva v. Lithuania \(No. 48329/19\)](#) of 8 June 2021 where violations of Article 14 of the Convention read in conjunction with Article 9 and Article 13 of the Convention were found, the Committee of Ministers by the Resolution of 2 December 2025 [CM/ResDH\(2025\)369](#) closed the supervision of the case. To add, the ECtHR by the [decision of 24 April 2025](#) struck out the second application of the Ancient Baltic religious association Romuva v. Lithuania (No. 1747/24) out of its list of cases.

Having assessed positively the individual and general measures (the adoption of new Methodological recommendations, the specialisation of prosecutors, the evolution of the domestic case-law, the relevant trainings, to name a few) described by the Agent of the Government in the [Action Report of 29 July 2024](#), which were taken in the execution process of the [ECtHR judgment in the case of Beizaras and Levickas v. Lithuania \(No. 41288/15\)](#) of 14 January 2024, where a violation of Article 14 of the Convention in conjunction with Article 8 of the Convention and Article 13 of the Convention was found on account of the refusal of the authorities, due to their discriminatory attitudes, to launch an investigation into the applicants' allegations of having been subjected to serious homophobic online hate speech in 2014, after 31 hateful comments were posted on the first applicant's Facebook page, as well as the denial of an effective domestic remedy in respect of their complaint concerning a breach of their right to private life, on account of the discriminatory attitudes in the application of domestic law, the Committee of Ministers by the Resolution of 10 December 2025 [CM/ResDH\(2025\)432](#) closed the supervision of the case.

¹⁰⁴ This includes also the consultation of social partners.

41. *Rules and use of fast-track procedures and emergency procedures (for example, the percentage of decisions adopted through emergency/urgent procedure compared to the total number of adopted decisions)*

42. *Safeguards to ensure legal certainty, the stability of the legal framework and non-discrimination.*

Constitutional Court

In 2025, the Constitutional Court ensured a non-discriminative legal framework in several cases. For example, in its ruling of 10 April 2025 on the provision of assisted reproduction services¹⁰⁵, the Constitutional Court created the conditions to ensure equality between persons who have entered into a marriage or registered a partnership and other certain persons in the sphere of health care service of assisted reproduction.

The Constitutional Court investigated the legal regulation according to which only persons who have entered into a marriage or registered a partnership have the right to receive the health care service of assisted reproduction. The Constitutional Court recognised that the impugned legal regulation of the Law on Assisted Reproduction is in conflict with Article 29 (establishing the principle of the equality of the rights of persons and their non-discrimination) and paragraph 1 of Article 53 (related to health care service) of the Constitution. The Constitutional Court noted that one of the grounds of discrimination prohibited by Article 29 of the Constitution is the restriction of human rights on the basis of one's family situation. It was also noted that, when regulating the conditions for the provision of health care services financed either from the funds of compulsory health insurance or from private sources of financing, the legislature is bound, among others, by the requirement, arising from paragraph 1 of Article 53 of the Constitution, to ensure universal access to health care. This constitutional requirement presupposes, among others, that, when establishing in laws the conditions for the provision of health care services, such a legal regulation must be consolidated under which, in the event of an identified objective medical need, inter alia, when there are objective circumstances related to a person's health, health care services would be provided to persons when paying heed to the requirements arising from the Constitution, including the constitutional principle of the equality of the rights of persons, which is enshrined in Article 29 of the Constitution and which would be violated if certain persons were discriminated against in the course of the provision of health care services.

This ruling of the Constitutional Court will be officially published in the Register of Legal Acts on 10 April 2026, paying regard to the fact that the legislature requires a certain period of time in order to eliminate the uncertainty regarding the legal regulation governing the conditions for the provision of assisted reproduction services and to establish, in compliance with the Constitution, a legal regulation under which these health care services would be provided to all persons in the event of an identified objective medical need, inter alia, objective circumstances relating to a person's health.

The conditions for ensuring the equality were also created by the Constitutional Court's ruling of 17 April 2025 on the institution of cohabitation without marriage (partnership)¹⁰⁶. In this ruling, the Constitutional Court recognised, inter alia, that Article 3.229 of the Civil Code, insofar as it provides for a partnership only between a man and a woman, is in conflict with, inter alia, Article 29 of the Constitution. The Constitutional Court, inter alia, noted that one of the forms of discrimination prohibited under Article 29 of the Constitution is the restriction of the rights of a person on the grounds of his or her gender identity and/or sexual orientation; such a restriction should also be regarded as degrading human dignity.

The Constitutional Court also noted that, by establishing a specific form of legal recognition and protection for couples who have not entered into marriage, such as the possibility of registering a

¹⁰⁵ available in English at <https://lrkt.lt/en/court-acts/search/170/ta3122/content>.

¹⁰⁶ available in English at <https://lrkt.lt/en/court-acts/search/170/ta3133/content>.

partnership, the legislature, in accordance with Article 29 of the Constitution, may not lay down a legal regulation that creates the preconditions for discrimination against participants in family relationships on the grounds of their sexual orientation, i.e. it may not lay down such a legal regulation under which the form of legal recognition and protection provided for by the law is available only to different-sex couples and may not be accessed by same-sex couples.

In this context, it was pointed out that stereotypes existing in society cannot constitute constitutionally justified grounds for denying or limiting the fundamental rights or freedoms of a particular person or groups of such persons in a democratic state under the rule of law. A legal regulation determined by prejudice, among others, against same-sex couples, would be incompatible with the Constitution, among others, with the concept of the family stemming from it and other constitutional values.

43. *Rules and application of states of emergency (or analogous regimes), including judicial review and parliamentary oversight.*

44. *Regime for constitutional review of laws*

Constitutional Court

Most of the rulings of the Constitutional Court are implemented in time and there are only about 5 percent of rulings waiting for implementation (not all of them were adopted in 2025, but also before that year). The legislature has the duty to revise and to amend the legal regulation to the extent it was recognised as violating the Constitution.

B. Independent authorities

☐ No developments regarding independent authorities

☒ If there have been developments related to independent authorities, please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

45. *Independence, resources, capacity and powers of national human rights institutions ('NHRIs'), of ombudsman institutions if different from NHRIs, of equality bodies if different from NHRIs and of supreme audit institutions¹⁰⁷*

The Seimas Ombudspersons' Office

As mentioned in the previous report on 7 November 2024 the Seimas adopted the Law on the Seimas Ombudspersons No VIII-950 amending Articles 1, 3, 4, 24 and Section III of the Law on the Seimas Ombudspersons and supplementing the Law with Article 19-3¹⁰⁸, which provide that from 1 January 2025 the Seimas Ombudspersons' Office undertook the role of the National Rapporteur on trafficking in human beings. Additional funding was allocated to cover two positions working on this issue and the first monitoring report was issued in 2025.

However, the changes and additional functions of the Seimas Ombudspersons' office did not stop there. On 30 June 2025, the last day of Parliament's spring session, the Parliament using the expedited procedure adopted Law No. XV-392, amending, *inter alia*, Articles 2, 7, 12, 13, 24 and 28 of the Law

¹⁰⁷ Cf. the website of the European Court of Auditors: <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/SupremeAuditInstitutions.aspx#>

¹⁰⁸ Law No VIII-950 of the Republic of Lithuania on the Seimas Ombudspersons of the Republic of Lithuania amending Articles 1, 3, 4, 24, the title of Section III, and supplementing the Law with Article 19-3 and the Annex, accessible via: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/87323e009dab11ef955ff95815eb5ce5?jfwid=>.

on the Seimas Ombudspersons¹⁰⁹, and increasing the number of Seimas Ombudspersons to three (the amendments entered into force on 1 August 2025). The proper justification why the expedite procedure was needed was not provided. The third Ombudsperson, according to the intentions of the lawmaker, was meant to protect the rights and interests of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses.

In order to circumvent the arguments, put forward by the Legal Department of the Parliament, as to the unconstitutionality of including a specialised Ombudsperson defending the interests of only a narrow group of applicants, the text of the law as adopted does not mention the aforementioned specialisation of the third Ombudsperson. However, throughout all the hearings, procedures and public communication, this position was explicitly referred to (and continues to be referred to) as Ombudsperson for Small and Medium-Sized Businesses¹¹⁰. Substantively, the amendments introduce elements into the competence framework. In particular, the revised provisions indicate that Seimas Ombudspersons also examine complaints concerning violations committed in the provision of public services to Small and Medium-Sized Business, and that applicants may complain not only about abuse of office and bureaucracy in public administration, but also about violations committed in the context of public services to Small and Medium-Sized Business.

Taking account that Lithuanian Ombudspersons' Office is accredited as an A level National Human Rights Institution, this situation might become quite problematic, regarding the integrity of the institution itself, the rights and interests of businesses would come into conflict with human rights (for instance, when assessing the complaint of a construction developer complaining about allegedly excessive regulation concerning the preservation of green areas in the neighbourhood). In addition, the expectations of the initiators of these amendments were that the third Ombudsperson will act as a lobbyist representing the interests of small and medium businesses on such matters as taxes and other duties both in Government and in Parliament. Whereas recommendations of current Ombudspersons to adopt or repeal laws are based on international and constitutional standards, or on identified overlap of functions performed by different institutions, legal gaps and other shortcomings resulting in violations of the right to good public administration, and not in the need to lobby for the more favourable legal environment for a certain interest group in the field of public policy.

Comparable reform attempts have attracted critical scrutiny internationally. In Moldova, the proposed establishment of an “Ombudsman for Entrepreneurs’ Rights” within the NHRI structure was criticised by The European Network of Human Rights Institution (ENNHRI), OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)¹¹¹ and the Venice Commission¹¹², including on grounds relating to mandate coherence, potential conflicts, and the need for clear safeguards if such functions are pursued¹¹³. As in Lithuania expedited procedure was used for adoption of the law introducing the third Ombudsperson, there was no possibility to request for such opinions.

Between August 2025 and January 2026, the Speaker of Parliament proposed two candidates for the

¹⁰⁹ Law No VIII-950 of the Republic of Lithuania on the Seimas Ombudspersons of the Republic of Lithuania amending Articles 2, 7, 12, 13 24 and 28, accessible via: [XV-392 Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo kontrolierių įstatymo Nr. VIII-950 2, 7, 12, 13, 24 ir 28 straipsnių p...](#)

¹¹⁰ [Seimas pritarė smulkiojo ir vidutinio verslo ombudsmeno pareigybės steigimui - Lietuvos Respublikos ekonomikos ir inovacijų ministerija.](#)

¹¹¹ Opinion on the draft law introducing a “People’s advocate for entrepreneurs’ rights”, accessible via: [482083.pdf](#).

¹¹² Republic of Moldova - Draft Law amending the Law no. 52/2014 on the People’s Advocate (Ombudsman), accessible via: [Republic of Moldova - Draft Law amending the Law no. 52/2014 on the People’s Advocate \(Ombudsman\) - Venice Commission of the Council of Europe.](#)

¹¹³ ENNHRI issues opinion on the proposed establishment of an Ombudsman for Entrepreneurs Rights within the structure of the Moldovan NHRI, accessible via: [ENNHRI issues opinion on the proposed establishment of an Ombudsman for Entrepreneurs Rights within the structure of the Moldovan NHRI - ENNHRI.](#)

position of the third Ombudsperson. In the course of considering the first nominee¹¹⁴, shortly before the vote, information emerged indicating that the candidate did not meet the applicable statutory eligibility requirements of necessary education; the decision-making process was therefore put on hold pending clarification and was not resumed. Subsequently, Speaker of the Parliament submitted a second candidate¹¹⁵, who had close links to the ruling political party and had held senior posts in the current government, including Vice-Minister of Health and, later, Chancellor of the Ministry of Justice. The appointment procedure was pursued in an urgent manner, introducing publicly the candidate on the evening of 15 December, holding a Human Rights Committee hearing on 17 December with the final vote on 23 December. The absence of a transparent appointment procedure, in combination with a political affiliation of the candidate was referred by some legal and human rights experts not only as incompatible with political neutrality of an Ombudsperson, but also as a threat that could significantly undermine public trust in the Seimas Ombudspersons' Office, especially given that the Ombudsman's core mandate is to oversee ministries, state institutions and municipalities largely governed by representatives of the same political party. In the end, the Parliament did not approve the nomination, as the candidate failed to obtain the required number of votes in favour during a secret ballot. Consequently, the appointment procedure for the third Ombudsperson remains formally open and unresolved at this stage.

At the same time, there has been a positive and encouraging development. Amendments to the Law on the Parliamentary Ombudspersons have been registered¹¹⁶, proposing to prohibit the nomination of individuals who are actively engaged in political activity. Under the proposed amendments, a person would not be eligible for appointment as an Ombudsperson if, during the five years preceding the submission of their candidacy to the Parliament, they held the status of a state politician. This initiative, if adopted, would significantly strengthen the institutional guarantees of political neutrality and independence. However, at present, there is no information as to when, or indeed whether, these proposed amendments will be considered and included in the parliamentary agenda.

Also, it is worth drawing attention to another legislative initiative related to the functioning of the Parliamentary Ombudspersons. Under the current Law on Administrative Proceedings, administrative courts do not have jurisdiction to review decisions of the Parliamentary Ombudsperson refusing to examine a complaint¹¹⁷. The constitutionality of this regulation was confirmed by the Constitutional Court in its ruling of 9 November 2021¹¹⁸. Decisions of the Parliamentary Ombudspersons are likewise not subject to judicial review. Nevertheless, in August, amendments to the Law on Administrative Proceedings were registered proposing to allow decisions of the Parliamentary Ombudspersons to be

¹¹⁴ Draft resolution of the Seimas "On the appointment of Rasmina Čepkauskienė as the Seimas Ombudsperson of the Republic of Lithuania", accessible via: [Seimo nutarimo „Dėl Rasminos Čepkauskienės skyrimo Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo kontroliere“ projektas](#).

¹¹⁵ Draft resolution of the Seimas "On the appointment of Nerija Stasiulienė as the Seimas Ombudsperson of the Republic of Lithuania", accessible via: [Seimo nutarimo „Dėl Nerijos Stasiulienės skyrimo Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo kontroliere“ projektas](#).

¹¹⁶ Law No VIII-950 of the Republic of Lithuania on the Seimas Ombudspersons of the Republic of Lithuania amending Articles 4, 6, 7 and 10, accessible via: [Seimo kontrolierių įstatymo Nr. VIII-950 4, 6, 7 ir 10 straipsnių pakeitimo įstatymo projektas](#).

¹¹⁷ Paragraph 2 of Article 18 of the Republic of Lithuania's Law on Administrative Proceedings (wording of 2 June 2016) states that the competence of the administrative courts does not extend to investigating the decisions of the Ombudsman of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania to refuse to consider complaints, accessible via: <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.67B5099C5848/pgduGdjmYs>.

¹¹⁸ The Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania, Ruling on the compliance of the provision of paragraph 2 of article 18 of the Republic of Lithuania's law on administrative proceedings with the constitution of the Republic of Lithuania, accessible via: [On the decisions of the Seimas Ombudsman to refuse to consider complaints - Constitutional Court of The Republic of Lithuania](#).

challenged before the courts¹¹⁹. Yet allowing judicial review of Ombudsperson decisions would risk judicializing a non-judicial institution, undermining its discretion, autonomy, and effectiveness, and altering its constitutional position in a manner incompatible with the independent and complementary nature of the Ombudsperson institution. A further and particularly serious concern is that, in practice, it would be primarily state and municipal authorities that would challenge Ombudsperson decisions before the courts. It could place an additional and unjustified burden on the Ombudsperson to participate in judicial proceedings and divert institutional resources away from core oversight, human rights protection, and systemic monitoring functions. The aforementioned draft law was submitted to the Parliament in November. It remains uncertain when the matter will be taken up again.

46. *Statistics/reports concerning the follow-up to recommendations by National Human Rights Institutions, ombudsman institutions, equality bodies, and supreme audit institutions in the past two years.*

47. *Safeguards to ensure the effective independence of supervisory and regulatory authorities with a direct impact on economic operators such as national economic oversight, enforcement and competition authorities,*

C. Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to the accessibility and judicial review of judicial decisions please specify which, in particular regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

48. *Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data) and respect of the good administration principle (including the obligation of the administration to give reasons for decisions)*

49. *Judicial review of administrative decisions: short description of the general regime (in particular competent court, scope, suspensive effect, interim measures, and any applicable specific rules or derogations from the general regime of judicial review).*

50. *Safeguards (other than judicial review) regarding decisions or inaction of administrative authorities, including remedies (e.g. administrative review)*

51. *Rules and practices related to the application by all courts, including constitutional jurisdictions, of the preliminary ruling procedure (Art. 267 TFEU)*

52. *Implementation of final judgments by the public administration and State institutions and follow-up given to supranational judgments, including decisions from the European Court of Human Rights, as well as available remedies in case of non-implementation*

Constitutional Court

In this context it is worth mentioning that, in the Constitutional Court's ruling of 18 December 2024¹²⁰, which was based on the conclusions made in the case *Macatė v Lithuania* (No 61435/19) adopted by the ECtHR, it was recognised that item 16 of paragraph 2 of Article 4 of the Republic of Lithuania's Law on the Protection of Minors against the Detrimental Effect of Public Information is in conflict with the Constitution; however, the unconstitutional provision of this Law has not been amended by the

¹¹⁹ Draft Law Amending Article 18 of the Law on Administrative Proceedings No. VIII-1029, accessible via: [Administracinių bylų teisenos įstatymo Nr. VIII-1029 18 straipsnio pakeitimo įstatymo projektas](https://www.legalis.lt/aktus/teisena/1029/18/straipsnio/pakeitimo/jstatymo/projektas).

¹²⁰ available in English at <https://lrkt.lt/en/court-acts/search/170/ta3096/content>.

legislature yet.

The Seimas Ombudspersons' Office

Recently Lithuania undertook positive steps to ensure the right to have a conscientious objection to military service that complies with international human rights standards and implements the European Court of Human Rights decisions in the cases of *Teliatnikov v. Lithuania* (Application no. 51914/19) and *Rutkauskas v. Lithuania* (Application no. 15816/20). On January 1, 2026, the amendments to Law on Conscription and Alternative National Defence Service, adopted on 13 June 2024¹²¹, came into force. These amendments establish a civilian model for the alternative national defence service by transferring its administration to a civilian institution. On 17 December 2025 the Government of the Republic of Lithuania adopted a resolution¹²² that appointed the Agency of Youth Affairs under the Ministry of Social Security and Labor to act as an administrative body of the alternative national defence service. Currently the Ministry of Social Security and Labor is preparing secondary legal acts to implement the reform of the alternative national defence service¹²³.

53. *Oversight, including by courts, of the use of intrusive surveillance software by national authorities*

Constitutional Court

While deciding on the formation of the ad hoc commission of the Seimas that investigated the possible unlawful influence on the presidential election in 2019 and on the approval of its conclusion, in its ruling of 6 June 2025¹²⁴, the Constitutional Court drew attention to the European standards on the supervision of intelligence agencies (security services) (especially, the Venice Commission report on the democratic oversight of the security services, as well as the checklist of parameters on the relationship between the parliamentary majority and the opposition in a democracy) and provided the conclusion about the separate aims of the two procedures (a criminal procedure and a political procedure before the ad hoc commission). Based on these standards, the relationship between the Parliament, exercising control over the activities of security services engaged in intelligence activities, and an independent specialised control institution, exercising investigations and examining the complaints from individuals, were among the objects in this ruling.

After a detailed examination, the Constitutional Court found that two resolutions of the Seimas, i.e. the resolution of 31 October 2023 on the establishment of the ad hoc investigation commission of the Seimas and the resolution of 4 June 2024 on the conclusion of the ad hoc investigation commission of the Seimas were in conflict with the Constitution (Articles 67 and 76 of the Constitution and the constitutional

¹²¹ Law amending the Law on Conscription I-1593, No 13 June 2024, No. XIV-2729, accessible via: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/9136b9b02d6e11efb121d2fe3a0eff27?jfwid=-66kv13x6f>.

¹²² Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on the Implementation of the Law on Conscription and Alternative National Defence Service of the Republic of Lithuania, 17 December 2025, No. 907, accessible via: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/dd380510dbf211f0948bfb5fa1e0c51b?positionInSearchResults=1&searchModelUUID=f2a42e9f-b959-4ea2-a52b-417755b6545b>.

¹²³ Draft order of the Minister of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania on the Implementation of The Law on Conscription And Alternative National Defence Service Of The Republic Of Lithuania, registered on 31 December, 2025, No. 25-19742, accessible via: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAP/b64d14d0e65c11f0948bfb5fa1e0c51b?positionInSearchResults=0&searchModelUUID=f2a42e9f-b959-4ea2-a52b-417755b6545b>.

¹²⁴ its summary in English is available at <https://lrkt.lt/en/court-acts/search/170/ta3148/summary>.

principles of responsible governance and a state under the rule of law, as well as the constitutional principles of responsible governance and a state under the rule of law respectively).

In 2025, the Constitutional Court adopted for consideration a petition on the basis of individual constitutional complaint concerning the collection and use of intelligence information on the private life of persons¹²⁵. The petitioner has doubts whether certain provisions of the Law on Intelligence are in conflict with the Constitution, as this Law does not establish: (1) specific criteria for the collection of intelligence information about the private life of individuals, (2) the maximum term of gathering intelligence information, (3) the right of a person to apply to a court regarding the application of means of gathering intelligence information which limits human rights, and (4) the terms for the storage of intelligence information and the detailed procedure for its processing, use, and provision to other entities. These aspects apply to such means of gathering intelligence information as monitoring and recording of the content of information transmitted via electronic communications networks, correspondence, and other forms of communication.

D. The enabling framework for civil society

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to the enabling framework for civil society, please specify which, regarding topics listed below: ...

Relevant topics to be covered in your contribution include:

54. *Measures regarding the framework for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. legal framework and its application in practice incl. registration, transparency and dissolution rules)*

55. *Rules and practices having an impact on the effective operation and safety of civil society organisations and human rights defenders. This includes measures to protect them from attacks – verbal, physical or on-line –, intimidation, legal threats incl. SLAPPs, negative narratives or smear campaigns, measures capable of affecting the public perception of civil society organisations, etc. It also includes measures to monitor threats or attacks and dedicated support services, as well as available remedies.*

56. *Organisation of financial support for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. framework to ensure access to funding, and for financial viability, taxation/incentive/donation systems, measures to ensure a fair distribution of funding)*

E. Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture

☐ No developments

☒ If there have been developments related to initiatives to foster a rule of law culture, please specify which, (e.g. debates in national parliaments on the rule of law, public information campaigns on rule of law issues, contributions from civil society, education initiatives, etc.): ...

Constitutional Court

Legal education and civic awareness lessons. In 2025, while implementing its mission of legal education and civic awareness, the Constitutional Court actively cooperated with universities, schools, and other interested groups of the public of Lithuania. Therefore, the Court justices gave a number of lectures to

¹²⁵ this petition No 1A-4/2025 in case No 7-A/2025 is available in Lithuanian at <https://lrkt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/05/skonicamino25051314510.pdf>.

students, pupils, and other interested groups of the public on the Court's place in the legal system, the appointment of its justices, its activities, and the most important cases. The publication of the official constitutional doctrine. The Constitutional Court prepared a supplemented edition of the most important provisions of the official constitutional doctrine (1993–2025), which is useful not only for lawyers, but also for all interested persons.

The publication on the basis of the Constitution. In the context of its civil education initiatives, in December 2025, the Constitutional Court prepared and published the book “Me and the Constitution: My Rights, Freedoms, and Duties” for children, their parents, and children's education specialists, which is aimed at facilitating discussions about the Constitution with children. The book was prepared on the basis of the text of the Constitution¹²⁶.

The Culture Night. The Constitutional Court traditionally joined the festival of culture and art “The Culture Night 2025”, which took place on 13 June 2025 in Vilnius. The Constitutional Court's justices and lawyers invited the public to the event – the battle of minds “Without the Constitution, not a single step!”. The participants after the event had the possibility of familiarising themselves with the Constitutional Court and its justices.

The Constitution examination. The Constitutional Court is one of the organisers of the traditional Constitution examination on the Day of the Constitution, which was held on 23 October 2025. The examination is open to different groups of society (school pupils, persons studying law and with a degree in law, as well as other persons) and tests their participants' legal knowledge and understanding of the Constitution, at the same time, spreading the idea of both the supremacy of the Constitution as the supreme law and the rule of law.

The National Law-Knowledge Olympiad. The Constitutional Court was among the institutions that submitted tasks related to its activities to the National Law-Knowledge Olympiad, which was held on 15 April 2025 and 23 May 2025. The Olympiad is open for school pupils of different age in Lithuania and tests their legal knowledge of different fields of law, including constitutional law.

The annual international scientific–practical conference. The Constitutional Court is one of partners contributing to the organisation of the annual international scientific–practical conference in the Seimas, dedicated to mark the Day of the Constitution. On 24 October 2025, the conference titled “The Role of Independent Oversight Institutions in the Constitutional System” commemorated the 30th anniversary of the Office of the Seimas Ombudspersons, established under Article 73(1) of the Constitution. The conference searched for the ways to strengthen human rights protection and democratic oversight mechanisms (first and foremost, ombudsman institutions)¹²⁷.

Other – please specify

¹²⁶ available in Lithuanian at <https://lrkt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/12/as-ir-konstitucija-web.pdf>.

¹²⁷ <https://lrkt.lt/en/international-annual-12th-scientific-practical-constitutional-law-conference-the-role-of-independent-oversight-institutions-in-the-constitutional-system/2263>.

LITHUANIAN CONTRIBUTION TO THE 2026 RULE OF LAW REPORT
Additional questionnaire guiding questions on following topics

23 JANUARY 2025

Lithuanian contribution to the Rule of Law Report's additional questionnaire on the following topics is compiled by the Ministry of Foreign affairs of Lithuania from the inputs made by:

- Ministry of Social Security and Labor of the Republic of Lithuania;
- Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania;
- Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania;
- Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania;
- Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania.

Questions for input on the single market dimension of the Rule of Law Report

Pillar I:

- Possible follow-up to the reforms of the remuneration systems for judges, prosecutors, civil servants, and other court and prosecutorial staff, finalised in January 2025, in particular in the context of the 2026 State budget.
- Judicial appointments – Follow-up to the ECtHR decision in case *MISIŪNAS v. LITHUANIA*.

National Courts Administration

On the implementation of the recommendation to continue efforts to improve the transparency of the system of appointments to judicial positions, notably to the Supreme Court, taking into account European standards on judicial appointments.

Taking into account the expectations of the judicial community regarding the efficiency and clarity of the selection process for judicial candidates and judges seeking judicial promotion, the Judicial Council, established a working group “On the Improvement of the Procedures for the Selection of Judges and Judicial Candidates” by Resolution No. 13P-30-(7.1.2.E) of 31 January 2025. This working group will conclude its activities on 28 February 2026. Taking into account the dynamic nature of issues related to the system for the selection of candidates for judicial office, the members of the working group have currently identified the following key directions: changes to the judicial selection process related to the review and updating of the legal regulation of the Judges’ Competence Model (the Description of the Procedure for the Selection Criteria for Candidates to Judicial Office, the Assessment Criteria for Persons Seeking Judicial Career, and the Assessment of Personal Competences, approved by Resolution No. 13P-32-(7.1.2.) of the Judicial Council of 28 January 2022); a review of the Description of the Procedure for the Selection Criteria for Candidates to Judicial Office, the Assessment Criteria for Persons Seeking Judicial Career, and the Assessment of Personal Competences, with particular emphasis on the structure of selection scores and the methods for their calculation; and adjustments to the legal regulation governing the inclusion, in the general ranking lists provided for in the Law on Courts, of candidates who were not deemed suitable by members of the Selection Commission for Candidates to Judicial Office (i.e. received fewer than half of the votes of the Commission members). The scope of activities of the working group also includes the assessment of changes in the legal regulation on the formation of the corps of judges in the light of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in

the case of *Misiūnas v. Lithuania* (No. 38687/22)¹²⁸.

- Legal aid system - State of play of the implementation of the pilot project (additional information following the discussion in the follow-up meeting in October).

Ministry of Social Security and Labor of the Republic of Lithuania

Public governance reform launched in the second half of 2023 and in 2024 have led to a significant increase in public sector salaries. The largest increases were in the salaries of heads of public administrations, state politicians and officials, and judges. Starting from 1 July 2023, changes to judicial remuneration included the following:

- The salaries of the President of the Constitutional Court and the President of the Supreme Court were aligned with those of the Prime Minister and the Speaker of the Seimas.
- The length-of-service bonus for service to the Lithuanian state was abolished.
- Deputy court presidents and heads of divisions were set to receive about 10% lower salaries than court presidents.
- The average salary of judges increased by around 20% (from EUR 4,820 to EUR 5,842 before tax), with changes across courts ranging from EUR 150 to EUR 1,600; [Transformation of public governance improvements launched in 2024 results in rising public sector salaries | Lietuvos Respublikos valstybės kontrolė](#)
- As the base salary amount used to calculate the salaries of state politicians, officials, prosecutors, intelligence officers, judges, civil servants and other public sector employees increases, judges' salaries also rise, depending on the coefficient established by law for their position.

Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania

Since 1st January 2025 public sector remuneration system has been changed. Significant attention was paid to top managers. Salaries significantly (from 30 to 200 percent) were increased to politicians, state officials, judges, prosecutors, and heads of institutions to attract high skilled talents to public sector.

To give heads of institutions more power and flexibility, the procedures and criteria for setting remuneration levels was set out in the institutions' remuneration policies.

The seniority bonus was abolished for all heads of institutions (including politicians, state officials, judges, and prosecutors). The percentage of seniority bonus for all civil servants was capped from 30 to 20 percent.

In 2025, the salaries of career civil servants were increased by 7.5%.

It is planned that in 2026, the average salary of civil servants will increase by 7.3%.

Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania

Having assessed positively the individual and general measures (the evolution of the practice of the Supreme Court, training programs for the judiciary, dissemination, to name a few) described by the Agent of the Government in the [Action Report of 13 November 2024](#), taken in the execution process of the [ECtHR judgment in Sacharuk v. Lithuania \(No. 39300/18\)](#) of 23 April 2024, where a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention was found due to lack of impartiality of the Supreme Court of Lithuania upholding the applicant's conviction, the Committee of Ministers by the Resolution of 30 April 2025 [CM/ResDH\(2025\)75](#) closed the supervision of the case.

Following the [ECtHR judgment in Misiūnas v. Lithuania \(No. 38686/22\)](#) of 7 October 2025, where a violation of Article 6 § 1 of the Convention was found due to the applicant's inability to effectively contest the President's decision, not formalised by a decree, not to reappoint him to the post of district judge, the explanatory notes were placed together with the judgment on the official internet website of

¹²⁸

<https://tm.lrv.lt/lt/veiklos-sritys-1/atstovavimas-eztt/naujienos/eztt-privazino-kad-nebuvo-uztikrinta-veiksminga-teismine-perziura-pareiskejui-siekiant-apskusti-klaidas-tariamai-padarytas-neskiriant-jo-is-naujo-teiseju/>

the Ministry of Justice. Having regard to the fact that the judgment became final on 7 January 2026 further individual and general measures in the execution process shall be taken and the Action Plan/Report to the Committee of Ministers in this regard shall be submitted in due course.

Pillar II:

- State of play of the 2023-2025 Implementation plan for the National Anti-Corruption Agenda, and preparation of the new plan.

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

During the second year of the first plan for the implementation of Agenda for 2023–2025¹²⁹, STT issued second monitoring report¹³⁰ with tendencies of implementation, areas which need continuous improvement and monitoring of activities¹³¹. The report is issued along with information for the public to engage the society in monitoring of the national strategies¹³².

After two years of implementation 86 percent of all the activities planned for the period 2023-2024 are implemented and other are ongoing. According to the horizontal impact indicators stated in the Agenda, and after 2 years of implementation positive changes were indicated:

Corruption Perception Index +3, Control of Corruption Index +3, Lithuanian Map of Corruption (Population who believe that bribery helps solve problems) – 6 percent.

During the 2023–2024 period, activities aimed at raising anti-corruption awareness in schools were successfully implemented, along with social campaigns promoting understanding of the harm caused by nepotism and bribery; tasks related to the implementation of corruption prevention measures were assigned to heads of public sector institutions for the duration of their terms of office. In addition, efforts were made to develop open data, strengthen public sector competencies, increase transparency in asset management and public procurement, and improve corruption detection and prevention mechanisms.

After two years of implementation 86 percent of all the activities planned for the period of two years 2023-2024 are implemented and other are ongoing. Among implemented measures there are also measures:

- from high-risk sectors, such as public procurement (continued centralisation of public procurement of institutions subordinate to the Ministry of Health; proposals to promote the proper and effective application of the unreliable supplier institute), healthcare (social campaign; updated descriptions of Health Sciences study field, which include provisions on anti-corruption topics), environment (additional developments for hunting registration module), spending of EU funds (establishing additional control measures to more effectively identify illegal conditions for receiving EU support), urban planning (improving the functionality of the register of territorial planning documents of the Republic of Lithuania; creation of a tool on the Lithuanian Spatial Information Portal that allows the public (ordinary user) to find clear and relevant information about the status of state land, its management and use in one place);

- for prevention of conflicts of interest and undue lobbying (methodology for assessing risks of conflict of interest; distance learning materials for prevention of conflicts of interests and undue lobbying);

- for whistle-blowers (information campaign and practical guidance).

The conclusions drawn from monitoring the implementation of the 2023–2025 plan serve as the basis for preparing the 2026–2029 Plan. The STT presented the results of the two-year implementation period, highlighting areas requiring improvement, to the Ministry of Justice (MoJ), which is designated by the

¹²⁹ According to the Agenda, the Agenda (for 12 years) is implemented by 3 plans, each for the period of 4 years.

¹³⁰ The report is issued during the period of the next 6 months after closing the auditing year, i.e. in 2025 report includes information about activities implemented during the year 2024.

¹³¹ <https://stt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/06/darbotvarkes-ataskaita-uz-2024-m-galutine.pdf>

¹³² <https://stt.lt/data/public/uploads/2025/07/pazyma-apie-pazanga-projektas-07.01-galutine-kpv.pdf>

Government to prepare the draft Plan in cooperation with the STT, as well as to the working group established by the MoJ.

The working group responsible for developing the new Plan includes representatives of ministries and other institutions, such as the Chief Official Ethics Commission, the Prosecutor General's Office, the Public Procurement Office, and the non-governmental organisation Transparency International. The working group met on 30 June, 22 September and 1 December 2025 to prepare and negotiate the draft Plan, which is currently being finalised and prepared for approval.

Ministry of Justice

To ensure continuity and prepare for the next planning period (2026–2029), the Minister of Justice, by Order No. 1R-195 of 19 June 2025, established an interinstitutional working group tasked with preparing the draft new implementation plan. The group comprises representatives from all ministries, the Special Investigation Service (STT), the National Courts Administration, the Central Electoral Commission, the Prosecutor General's Office, the Public Governance Agency, the Chief Official Ethics Commission, and the Public Procurement Office, as well as invited representatives of social partners and non-governmental organisations, namely the Lithuanian Chamber of Auditors, Transparency International Lithuania, and the Association of Local Authorities in Lithuania. Representatives from 24 institutions/entities have actively contributed to the work of the group.

The working group, chaired by the Ministry of Justice and co-chaired by the STT, has discussed lessons learned from the 2023–2025 plan and identified priorities for the next implementation period. The first draft of the 2026–2029 plan was published for consultation on 12 November 2025, and the group met again on 1 December 2025 to review the draft and the feedback received. Further interinstitutional consultations are currently ongoing, and the draft plan is being finalised for submission to the Government.

- Update on addressing shortcomings in fighting against foreign bribery, in particular state of play of the implementation plan referred in the 2025 Rule of Law Report.

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

The OECD Working Group on Bribery considered and approved Lithuania's two-year follow-up report on the implementation of the Phase 3 evaluation. Out of 49 recommendations, Lithuania failed to implement only 8, while the measures implemented were assessed as having a tangible impact.

The OECD report reviews the actions taken since December 2023 to implement the 49 recommendations addressed to Lithuania and to address the follow-up issues identified during the evaluation. The Working Group concluded that Lithuania has fully implemented 27 recommendations, partially implemented 14 recommendations, and not implemented 8 recommendations.

In assessing progress, the OECD Working Group continues to express concern regarding not implemented priority recommendation – The Phase 3 Report found that a legal person can be held liable for foreign bribery only if its shareholders are culpable by knowing, encouraging, or tolerating the commission of the crime, as current Lithuanian law on corporate liability does not conform to the Convention, and departs significantly from the practice in other Working Group countries. The Working Group also encourages a more proactive approach to investigating the bribery of foreign public officials, strengthening whistle-blower protection, and tightening liability for retaliatory actions against whistle-blowers.

- Developments regarding the rate of acquittals in corruption offences.

Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania

Statistics in the criminal cases of corruption-related offences, that were investigated by the STT:

Court decisions concerning individuals at the first instance and/or a higher instance, where a decision contrary to that of the previous instance was adopted:		
Year	Total number of court decisions concerning individuals:	Number of acquitted persons
2023	172	47 (27,32 %)
2024	154	27 (17,53 %)
2025	145	38 (26,20 %)

Court decisions concerning individuals (at first instance):		
Year	Total number of court decisions concerning individuals:	Number of acquitted persons
2023	150	41 (27,33 %)
2024	122	13 (10,65 %)
2025	117	20 (17,09 %)

Ministry of Justice

The OECD Working Group on Bribery's (WGB) Phase 3 report, completed in 2023, evaluated Lithuania's implementation of the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials and related instruments. In total, Lithuania received 49 recommendations.

To ensure their effective implementation and to maintain consistency and progress in implementing the WGB recommendations, Lithuania adopted a strategic approach. An implementation plan involving around 20 public institutions was drafted and approved by the Minister of Justice. The Phase 3 report and the WGB findings were presented to and discussed by the Government Commission for Corruption Prevention, chaired by the Prime Minister of Lithuania. We believe this demonstrates active political-level engagement and also a continuous and strong commitment to meeting the highest anti-corruption standards.

Since the Phase 3 evaluation in 2023, Lithuania has made significant progress in strengthening its legal framework, enhancing its capacity to detect and investigate foreign bribery, raising awareness of foreign bribery across the public and private sectors, and consolidating whistleblower protection efforts. These efforts have been further supported by improved resourcing, including increases in prosecutors' salaries.

A number of legislative acts were adopted, among them amendments to the Criminal Code expressly providing that a company's corporate compliance programme would be considered at sentencing and further encouraging self-reporting. Lithuania enacted a new Audit of Financial Statements Law, which, among other things, encourages companies that receive reports of suspected acts from external auditors to actively and effectively respond to such information. The Law on Whistleblower Protection was amended to explicitly and clearly extend protection against reprisals to legal entities.

To maintain comprehensive statistics on mutual legal assistance and extradition requests, a digital information system was expanded to include the required statistical functionalities.

Lithuania's third national money laundering risk assessment includes a section on corruption risk and explicitly references foreign bribery. Lithuania has carried out the first national bribery risk assessment, including a survey of companies on their experience with foreign bribery.

Various guidelines have been developed to strengthen the reporting and detection of foreign bribery. In addition, recommendations for prosecutors and investigators to ensure effective and consistent practice have been updated and further developed. Specialised anti-corruption guidance for businesses operating abroad was recently prepared and published, and a dedicated workshop to raise awareness will be held.

Building on WGB recommendations and best practices, Lithuanian institutions have carried out numerous capacity-building and awareness-raising activities.

Among the many measures implemented, the EU-financed project enabled study visits to seven WGB member states and the organisation of five workshops specifically focused on foreign bribery. In total,

over 300 participants—including investigators, prosecutors, and judges—took part in these trainings.

On 9 December 2025, the WGB approved [the Phase 3 Follow-Up Report on Lithuania](#). The Working Group commended Lithuania for the progress made in addressing numerous issues. In summary, 27 recommendations have been fully implemented, 14 partially implemented, and 8 remain unimplemented.

Lithuania acknowledges that some concerns remain and that further work is needed. Accordingly, the Ministry of Justice will continue to coordinate the implementation plan referenced in the 2025 Rule of Law Report.

Pillar III:

- Information about the results of two audits of LRT, particularly the one tasked by the Parliament.

Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania

In 2025, the LRT Council initiated an internal audit focusing on compliance with political neutrality and internal processes¹³³.

As noted in the 2025 Rule of Law Report, the budget of the Media Support Fund increased to EUR 10.5 million, EUR 4 million above the initial allocation. However, in 2025 a subsequent budgetary decision reduced the Fund's financing by EUR 555,000. Consequently, under the Law on the Approval of the 2026–2028 State Budget of the Republic of Lithuania (No. XV-651, entered into force on 23 December 2025), the Media Support Fund's budget for 2026 is set at EUR 9.9 million¹³⁴.

This cut triggered strong opposition from the media sector and professional media organisations, which warned of direct negative consequences for media pluralism and the viability of regional media¹³⁵.

In October 2025, the National Audit Office of the Republic of Lithuania published the results of a financial and performance audit of the Lithuanian National Radio and Television (LRT)¹³⁶. The audit was conducted pursuant to the mandate assigned by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania under Resolution No. XV-171 of 17 April 2025¹³⁷ and evaluated the activities of the LRT for the period 2021–2024 from the perspectives of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

On 3 December 2025, Law No. XV-618 amending Articles 11 and 19 of the Law on Lithuanian National Radio and Television (No. I-1571) was adopted¹³⁸.

The amendment introduced temporary and targeted adjustments within the existing governance and statutory funding framework of the public service broadcaster. It temporarily stabilised public funding by fixing state budget appropriations for LRT for the years 2026–2028 at the level of the 2025 allocation, and provided that the statutory funding formula based on tax revenues shall apply again from 2029 onwards, subject to a minimum funding threshold calculated as the average of the last three budgetary years.

In addition, the amendment adjusted the statutory funding formula by revising the applicable percentages of state and municipal tax revenues allocated to LRT. Specifically, the allocation based on personal income tax revenues was set at 0.75% and the allocation based on excise duty revenues at 0.8%, replacing the previous rates of 1% and 1.3% respectively, while maintaining a minimum funding safeguard linked to recent budgetary allocations.

Matters concerning LRT governance were the subject of legislative initiatives registered in the Seimas in 2025. On 24 November 2025, Draft Law No. XVP-1052 amending Article 5 of the Law on the

¹³³ in EN - [LRT journalists seek transparency on 'political neutrality' audit - LRT](#).

¹³⁴ in LT - [XV-651 Lietuvos Respublikos 2026–2028 metų biudžeto patvirtinimo įstatymas](#).

¹³⁵ in ENG - [Revenge or necessary cuts? Culture institutions see funding slashed following protests - LRT](#).

¹³⁶ in LT - [Produktas | Lietuvos Respublikos valstybės kontrolė](#).

¹³⁷ in LT - [XV-171 Dėl pavidimo Lietuvos Respublikos valstybės kontrolei atlikti valstybinį auditą](#).

¹³⁸ in LT - [XV-618 Lietuvos Respublikos Lietuvos nacionalinio radijo ir televizijos įstatymo Nr. I-1571 11 ir 19 str...](#)

Lithuanian National Radio and Television (No. I-1571) was registered¹³⁹. The draft raised significant concerns and did not proceed to further consideration in the Seimas.

On 10 December 2025, a second legislative initiative affecting LRT governance was registered — Draft Law No. XVP-1119 amending Article 13 of the same Law¹⁴⁰. This proposal likewise attracted substantial criticism, particularly regarding the attempt to consider it under an urgent procedure. The urgent procedure was subsequently withdrawn.

Pillar IV:

- Information on timeframes for public consultations, and timing when they occur (in particular in light of concerns expressed by investors, as mentioned in the 2025 Rule of Law Report).
- Concrete actions to improve the effective participation of civil society in decision-making processes, in particular at local level.

Ministry of Social Security and Labor of the Republic of Lithuania

Under the Swiss–Lithuanian Cooperation Programme “Civil Society Engagement,” our concrete instrument to improve effective civil society participation—especially at local level—is the project **“Strengthening the Role of NGOs and Increasing Their Transparency”**. In 2024, the Ministry of Social Security and Labour **announced and ran the operator selection** for Component I “Strengthening civic participation in decision-making,” Sub-component I “Strengthening the role of NGOs and increasing their transparency,” and later CPVA/CPMA signed the financing agreement with the selected operator, enabling implementation with partners (National NGO Coalition and others).

Project delivers five actions:

1. **Co-creation and implementation of an NGO Transparency Standard** to raise accountability and trust.
2. **Strengthening municipal NGO councils** (training/method support) for structured dialogue with local authorities.
3. **Organisation of Citizens’ Assemblies in selected municipalities** to produce representative, evidence-based recommendations for local decision-makers.
4. **A nationwide communication campaign** to build awareness of NGO value and transparency; and
5. **Transfer of Swiss good practice** via cooperation with **Foundation ZEWO** on NGO quality and transparency. [\[cpva.lt\]](https://cpva.lt), [\[zewo.ch\]](https://zewo.ch)

Financing:

The project is financed by the Swiss Confederation and Lithuania’s state budget under the Swiss–Lithuanian Cooperation Programme. **Total budget: €2,356,495.51 for 2025–2028 (42 months).** [\[cpva.lt\]](https://cpva.lt)

Expected local-level impact by 2028: an adopted transparency standard, delivered citizens’ assemblies, and strengthened municipal NGO councils—directly improving the quality, inclusiveness, and impact of civil society participation in local decision-making. [\[cpva.lt\]](https://cpva.lt)

¹³⁹ in LT - [Lietuvos nacionalinio radijo ir televizijos įstatymo Nr. I-1571 5 straipsnio pakeitimo įstatymo p...](#)

¹⁴⁰ in LT - [Lietuvos nacionalinio radijo ir televizijos įstatymo Nr. I-1571 13 straipsnio pakeitimo įstatymo ...](#)