



Adoption: 21 June 2019
Publication: 26 August 2019

Public
GrecoRC4(2019)18

FOURTH EVALUATION ROUND

Corruption prevention in respect of members of
parliament, judges and prosecutors

SECOND COMPLIANCE REPORT

LITHUANIA

Adopted by GRECO at its 83rd Plenary Meeting
(Strasbourg, 17-21 June 2019)

F
O
U
R
T
H

E
V
A
L
U
A
T
I
O
N

R
O
U
N
D

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Second Compliance Report assesses the measures taken by the authorities of Lithuania to implement the recommendations issued in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Lithuania (see paragraph 2) "Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors".
2. The [Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Lithuania](#) was adopted at GRECO's 66th Plenary Meeting (12 December 2014) and made public on 11 February 2015, following authorisation by Lithuania.
3. The [Compliance Report](#) was adopted by GRECO at its 75th Plenary Meeting (24 March 2017) and made public on 24 April 2017, following authorisation by Lithuania. As required by GRECO's Rules of Procedure, the authorities of Lithuania submitted a Situation Report on measures taken to implement the recommendations. This report was received on 10 December 2018 and served, together with the information submitted subsequently, as a basis for the Second Compliance Report.
4. GRECO selected Ukraine (in respect of members of parliament) and the Czech Republic (in respect of judicial institutions) to appoint Rapporteurs for the compliance procedure. The Rapporteurs appointed were Mr Mykhaylo BUROMENSKIY on behalf of Ukraine, and Ms Helena KLIMA LIŠUCHOVÁ, on behalf of the Czech Republic. They were assisted by GRECO's Secretariat in drawing up the Second Compliance Report.

II. ANALYSIS

5. GRECO, in its Fourth Round Evaluation Report, addressed eleven recommendations to Lithuania. In the Compliance Report, GRECO concluded that recommendations vi, viii and ix had been implemented satisfactorily. Recommendations i-v and xi had been partly implemented. Lastly, recommendations vii and x had not been implemented. Compliance with the eight pending recommendations is examined below.

Corruption prevention in respect of all categories under review

Recommendation i.

6. *GRECO recommended that, at the initiative of the Chief Official Ethics Commission, the co-operation on an operational level between the institutions responsible for overseeing the implementation, by members of the Seimas, judges and prosecutors, of rules on conduct, conflicts of interest and related matters be significantly strengthened.*
7. GRECO recalls that this recommendation had been partly implemented at the time of adoption of the Compliance Report. GRECO welcomed the different activities reported by the Chief Official Ethics Commission (COEC), in particular the setting up of a virtual official ethics adviser for civil servants and plans for an automated register of private interests. It however considered that these measures did not directly respond to the objectives of the recommendation. Nevertheless, it also noted that the information provided showed that operational contacts had been established with the Lithuanian Court of Appeal, which it considered to be a positive element towards the implementation of the recommendation.
8. The authorities report that at the end of 2018 the COEC presented a questionnaire to relevant authorities regarding the application of the provisions of the Law on the Adjustment of Public and Private Interests in the Civil Service (hereafter: LAPPICS) and the Law on Lobbying. The aim of this questionnaire was to evaluate the weaknesses in the current application of the two laws. This survey will in future be

conducted on a yearly basis (whereby changes in the replies will be used as one of the impact assessment criteria in the strategic plan). More than 800 authorities have responded to the questionnaire, which highlighted *inter alia* that only 20% have appointed ethics advisers. As a result of issuing the questionnaire more than 200 institutions have requested to be connected to the electronic information system of declarations of interest administered by the COEC.

9. Furthermore, the COEC has been providing trainings¹ and consultations on conflicts of interest and declaration requirements under the LAPPICS. It has also been instrumental in establishing a network of compliance officers from different institutions, in order to facilitate contact with the COEC and to strengthen control within these institutions. For these compliance officers, the COEC has also developed a special training programme, which it has been providing on a weekly basis since May 2018. So far (until June 2019), more than 300 persons have been trained. In June and July 2019, the COEC will provide trainings for designated compliance officers in the judicial sector.
10. In addition, the virtual official ethics adviser for civil servants (allowing civil servants to receive a quick reply on various questions related to official ethics), as mentioned in the Compliance Report, is available on the website of the COEC and accessible on the intranet of various public institutions. The automated register of private interests (PINREG) (which aims to provide for a more effective declaration process), as also mentioned in the Compliance Report, has been tendered and is expected to become operational in 2020. PINREG will provide persons with pre-filled declarations, on the basis of information contained in different state registries, and will facilitate the identification of those persons obliged to declare private interests as well as potential risks of conflicts of interest. It is recalled that in Lithuania more than 130.000 persons have to declare private interests, of which more than 50.000 are made public.
11. The COEC furthermore cooperates with various institutions as regards the investigations into compliance of activities of persons with the provisions of the LAPPICS, including courts and prosecutor's offices, and refers reports to other institutions when appropriate, and provides the Special Investigation Service, the Customs Department and the Prison Department with information on breaches of the LAPPICS by persons seeking a position in the civil service. Moreover, in March 2019, the Judicial Council set up a working group with the aim of strengthening anti-corruption initiatives in judicial authorities and developing cooperation with relevant institutions. Representatives from the COEC and the Special Investigative Service of Lithuania form part of this working group.
12. GRECO takes note of the information provided. As before, it welcomes the different activities reported by the COEC, but considers that few of those directly respond to the objectives of the recommendation. In this respect it recalls that it already noted in the Evaluation Report that "in some areas, such as the analysis of legislation from an anti-corruption perspective and the screening of candidates to certain positions in the public service, co-operation appears to function quite well", but that this was not the case in the area of ethics and conflicts of interests. It noted a wish for regular contacts on issues of common concern, allowing for a common approach, and a need for more guidance from the COEC. Both the network of compliance officers and the working group set up by the Judicial Council could be considered as steps in the right direction in addressing this concern. However, regarding the network of compliance officers, from the information provided it is unclear if this includes co-operation on an operational level beyond the provision of specialised training by the COEC and if this would also include representatives of specifically the Parliamentary Commission

¹ In 2017, 41 workshops were organised for more than 1200 persons (including staff of various courts and prosecutor's offices).

for Ethics and Procedure, the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission and the Commission on Ethics of Prosecutors, as required by the recommendation. Regarding the working group set up by the Judicial Council, this is to be welcomed but, given its recent establishment, it is not clear yet how this has strengthened co-operation. In addition, for the time being this remains limited to judiciary. For these reasons, GRECO can for the moment not say yet that co-operation on an operational level between the institutions responsible for overseeing the implementation of rules on conduct, conflicts of interest and related matters has been significantly strengthened, as required by the recommendation.

13. GRECO concludes that recommendation i remains partly implemented.

Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament

Recommendation ii.

14. *GRECO recommended that the transparency of the legislative process be further improved by ensuring that agendas, working documents and minutes of committee meetings are made accessible in due time.*
15. GRECO recalls that recommendation ii had been partly implemented at the time of adoption of the Compliance Report. GRECO welcomed the draft amendments to the statute of the *Seimas*, which would require the publication on the *Seimas'* website of agendas, draft decisions and conclusions, as well as minutes of committee and commission meetings, and looked forward to their adoption. GRECO emphasised that it expected to receive specific information on the practice followed by the committees of the *Seimas*, as regards the timely publication of agendas, working documents and minutes of committee meetings.
16. The authorities now report that the law envisaging draft amendments to the statute of the *Seimas* is expected to be adopted in the near future, but that, in practice, in the meantime committees of the *Seimas* are already publishing agendas and working documents of their meetings, with additionally the decisions taken at the committee meetings and conclusions on draft legislation being published on the website of the *Seimas* (together with the draft laws in question).² Furthermore, in order to increase the transparency of the legislative process in the *Seimas*, following Decision No. SV-915 of the Board of the *Seimas* of 3 October 2018, all hearings and meetings of committees of the *Seimas* are now also broadcast (live-streamed) on the *Seimas'* website.
17. GRECO is pleased with the decision to live-stream committee meetings, similar to what is done for plenary sessions of the *Seimas*, which will indeed considerably improve the transparency of the legislative process, and welcomes the practice of publishing agendas, working documents and conclusions of meetings of the committees of the *Seimas*, in spite of the fact that the law amending the statute of the *Seimas* has not been adopted yet.
18. GRECO considers that recommendation ii has been implemented satisfactorily.
- Recommendation iii.**
19. *GRECO recommended introducing rules on how members of the parliament engage with lobbyists and other third parties who seek to influence the legislative process.*

² The date of the next committee meeting, the agenda of the meeting and the titles and numbers of the documents to be discussed are published under the link to the relevant committee on the website of the *Seimas* (see https://www.lrs.lt/sip/portal.show?p_r=35733&p_k=1). The documents are published in the electronic register of draft legal acts of the *Seimas* (see <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/documentSearch/lt>).

20. GRECO recalls that recommendation iii had been partly implemented at the time of adoption of the Compliance Report. GRECO welcomed the draft amendments to the 2000 Law on Lobbying Activities aimed at improving the regulation of lobbying and looked forward to the introduction by the *Seimas* of guidance to MPs.
21. The authorities now report that, on 20 June 2017, the *Seimas* adopted a new version of the Law on Lobbying Activities, which entered into force on 1 September 2017. In accordance with this law, lobbying activities can only be carried out by persons who have applied to the COEC to be registered in the register of lobbyists. One of the novelties of this new Law is that lobbyists must submit a report on their lobbying activities within seven days from the day of the beginning of such activities.³ To date (June 2019), more than 150 such reports have been submitted by lobbyists. In order to provide more public information on lobbying activities, the COEC designed a website (www.lobistai.lt), to which registered lobbyists must electronically submit aforementioned reports and on which also the list of registered lobbyists, the declarations submitted by lobbyists and information on persons exercising lobbying activities is made public. Through this website, members of the public may also submit questions or raise issues of concern regarding lobbying. Following the entry into force of the new legislation, the number of registered lobbyists has increased significantly (from 35 to more than 83 at the beginning of June 2019). In order to encourage persons who carry out lobby activities to register in the list and act transparently, the COEC has sent reminders of the applicable provisions of the new law to more than 70 business associations.
22. Furthermore, in order to strengthen supervision of lobbying activities, the COEC has started inspections of possible illegal lobbying activities in the area of construction and territorial planning, selecting a number of public institutions active in this field. To date (June 2019), the COEC has initiated 19 inspections into possible illegal lobbying activities.
23. Moreover, further amendments to the new law are foreseen, following inter-institutional discussions (between representatives of the COEC, the government, the Prosecutor General's Office, the Special Investigative Service, the Ministries of the Interior and Justice, as well as Transparency International), which would provide for the possibility to include legal persons (and not only natural persons, as it is currently) on the list of registered lobbyists, and oblige persons occupying certain positions within these legal persons to declare lobbying activities.
24. Finally, the authorities report that the COEC is preparing written recommendations for public officials regarding their interactions with lobbyists.
25. GRECO takes note of the information provided. While it welcomes the entry into force of a new law on lobbying and the activities of the COEC to facilitate implementation of this new law, it recalls that the recommendation calls for the introduction of rules on how members of the *Seimas* engage with lobbyists and other third parties seeking to influence the legislative process (and not necessarily as regards lobbyists themselves). While the preparation of written recommendations for public officials may be intended to address this issue, without further information GRECO cannot yet conclude that this recommendation has been fully addressed.
26. GRECO concludes that recommendation iii remains partly implemented.

³ These activities include any verbal or written communication with the lobbied person regarding certain provisions of legal acts or administrative provisions. The reports are to indicate the name of the lobbyist, the number of his/her certificate, the name and personal / registration number of his/her client, the department or agency contacted, the name and occupation of the lobbied person and information on the legal act, draft legal act or administrative decision subject to the lobbying activities.

Recommendation iv.

27. *GRECO recommended that appropriate measures be taken to ensure effective supervision and enforcement of the rules regarding declarations of private interests and other rules of conduct of members of the Seimas.*
28. GRECO recalls that this recommendation was partly implemented at the time of adoption of the Compliance Report. GRECO took note of the improved compliance with the declaration duties of persons associated with MPs, following various activities carried out to this end by the COEC. It however reminded the authorities that the focus of the recommendation was to ensure compliance by MPs (and not persons associated with MPs) with their obligations and to strengthen the self-regulations mechanism within the *Seimas*.
29. The authorities underline that the Commission for Ethics and Procedure is a self-regulatory mechanism within the *Seimas*, which carries out supervision of the rules of conduct of MPs. As regards the conduct of Members of the *Seimas*, it adopted 19 conclusions in 2017 and 29 conclusions in the period January-November 2018; 11 conclusions on possible conflicts of interest in 2017, with five in the period January-November 2018; and, two conclusions regarding the compatibility of duties of Members of the *Seimas* with other duties or activities. In these conclusions, the Commission stated that the conduct of the Members in question was either in breach or not in breach of the rules. In appropriate cases, it further recommended Members of the *Seimas* to rectify the established short-comings (e.g. to review their declarations of private interests in order to supplement and rectify errors), drew attention to the declaration requirements, the applicable procedures and time-lines and/or recommended the Members concerned to assess circumstances giving rise to a conflict of interest and to withdraw from discussions where appropriate. All conclusions have been made public on the website of the *Seimas*.
30. Moreover, the authorities highlight that the COEC also has the right to look into the actions of Members of the *Seimas* as regards the declarations of private interests. In 2018, the COEC conducted investigations with regard to seven Members of the *Seimas*.
31. GRECO takes note of the information provided. The factual description of the number and content of the conclusions presented by the Commission for Ethics and Procedure and the number of investigations conducted by the COEC does not allow it to conclude that appropriate measures have now been taken to address the concerns it outlined in the Evaluation Report (in particular the reactive approach by the Commission and that it only assesses the timely submission of declarations of private interests rather than their content). GRECO recalls in this respect its previous statement that "the development of the self-regulation mechanism within the *Seimas* could help improve public perceptions about MPs' integrity".
32. GRECO concludes that recommendation iv remains partly implemented.

Recommendation v.

33. *GRECO recommended that efficient internal mechanisms be developed to promote, raise awareness of, and thereby safeguard, integrity in the Seimas, both at institutional level (training, institutional discussions on ethical issues related to parliamentary conduct, etc.) and on an individual basis (confidential counselling).*
34. GRECO recalls that this recommendation was partly implemented at the time of adoption of the Compliance Report. GRECO welcomed the draft law amending the statute of the *Seimas*, which envisaged making the Commission of Ethics and

Procedure of the *Seimas* responsible for raising awareness of MPs and providing confidential advice on ethical issues.

35. The authorities report that in performing the functions assigned to it by the Law on the COEC, the COEC examines applications and presents individual recommendations to entities with regard to the provisions of this Law and report on a number of recommendations issued by the COEC to various institutions and head of institutions on declarations of private interests, prevention of conflicts of interest, prohibiting the conclusions of employment contracts and representation.
36. GRECO takes note of the information provided. In the absence of any information on internal mechanisms developed to promote, raise awareness of, and thereby safeguard the integrity in the *Seimas*, as required by the recommendation, and bearing in mind that the draft law amending the statute of the *Seimas*, as mentioned in the Compliance Report, has – as indicated in paragraph 16 above – not entered into force yet, GRECO cannot conclude that this recommendation has been implemented.
37. GRECO concludes that recommendation v remains partly implemented.

Corruption prevention in respect of judges

Recommendation vii.

38. *GRECO recommended (i) that the method for appointing the members of the Selection Commission of Candidates to Judicial Offices be reviewed in order to strengthen their independence and that the procedure for appealing against the Commission's decisions be consolidated, and (ii) that the Judicial Council be given a more important role in the procedure for selecting judges.*
39. GRECO recalls that this recommendation was not implemented at the time of adoption of the Compliance Report. GRECO took note of a case reported by the authorities in which the Judicial Council gave a negative opinion on the candidate proposed for judicial appointment. It however pointed out that this case occurred on the basis of procedures existing at the time of adoption of the Evaluation Report. It regretted that no steps had been taken to implement either part of the recommendation.
40. The authorities report that a working group (comprising representatives of the judiciary, representatives from the Office of the President, the *Seimas* and the Ministry of Justice) has prepared amendments to the Law on Courts, which are currently being considered by the Committee on Legal Affairs of the *Seimas*. According to the draft article 55¹ of the Law on Courts, the Selection Commission of Candidates to Judicial Offices will be formed by seven members, with three members to be appointed by the Judicial Council and four members (who are representatives of society) by the President of the Republic. The Selection Commission of Candidates to Judicial Offices will propose a list of most suitable candidates to the President, who shall address the Judicial Council for advice on the candidate to be appointed (with a motivation to be presented at the session of the Judicial Council on the reasons for the choice of candidate). The President shall furthermore establish rules of procedure for the Commission, after having agreed on them with the Judicial Council, and the criteria for the selection of candidates to judicial offices shall be approved by the Judicial Council (whereas before it was the President who set up the Selection Commission and established rules of procedure for such a Commission). In addition the draft law will also establish a procedure for appealing against the Selection Commission's conclusions, which envisages that unsuccessful candidates can appeal decisions by the Selection Commission to the Supreme Court of Lithuania within 10

days of the decision having been taken. The authorities note however that the appeal would only deal with procedural aspects of the Selection Commission's decisions; the evaluation itself would not be subject to review.

41. GRECO takes note of the proposed amendments to the Law on Courts. As regards the first part of the recommendation, while it would have preferred that at least half of the members of the Selection Commission would be judges selected by their peers, it accepts that the proposed composition of the Selection Commission is in line with paragraph 47 of Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)12 (bearing in mind that the Judicial Council itself is fully composed of judges).⁴ Similarly, while it would have also preferred if the possibility to appeal a decision by a Selection Commission could also be done on other than just procedural grounds, it accepts that this proposal is in line with paragraph 48 of Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)12.⁵ As regards the second part of the recommendation, it welcomes that the draft amendments envisage a more important role for the Judicial Council in the procedure for selecting judges, in that it will appoint the three judge members of the Selection Commission (which was before done by the President of the Republic), will approve the criteria for the selection of candidates, will agree with the President on the rules of procedure for the Commission and will have to be addressed by the President for advice on the candidate to be appointed. It is not entirely clear if this means that GRECO's concerns (*inter alia* that the President may choose to appoint a candidate who is not seen to be the most suitable without giving reasons) will have been fully addressed, but as the draft amendments are still under consideration and may undergo further changes, GRECO can in any case at this point only conclude that the recommendation has not yet been fully implemented.
42. GRECO concludes that recommendation vii has been partly implemented.

Corruption prevention in respect of prosecutors

Recommendation x.

43. *In order to increase the transparency and objectivity of the recruitment and promotion in the prosecution service, GRECO recommended strengthening the decisive influence of the selection commissions, by providing that their recommendations be followed as a rule and that written motivation be given if they are not.*
44. GRECO recalls that this recommendation had not been implemented at the time of adoption of the Compliance Report. GRECO took note of improvements to the decision-making process by the Prosecutor General, by introducing a time limit and typology for recruitment decisions. It also noted the assurances by the authorities, that in practice the Prosecutor General follows the recommendations of the selection commissions. However, it underlined that safeguards would be needed to ensure that this would be done systematically in the future.
45. The authorities report that, following an analysis of the legal framework regulating the selection of prosecutors and chief prosecutors by a working group established for this purpose, the Regulations on the Commissions for the Selection of Prosecutors and Chief Prosecutors were amended (in line with the conclusions of the aforementioned working group) on 22 May 2018. Pursuant to these amendments,

⁴ Paragraph 47 of Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)12 on judges: independence, efficiency and responsibilities states: "However, where the constitutional or other legal provisions prescribe that the head of state, the government or the legislative power take decisions concerning the selection and career of judges, an independent and competent authority drawn in substantial part from the judiciary (without prejudice to the rules applicable to councils for the judiciary contained in Chapter IV) should be authorised to make recommendations or express opinions which the relevant appointing authority follows in practice".

⁵ Paragraph 48 of the abovementioned Recommendation states: "(...) An unsuccessful candidate should have the right to challenge the decision, or at least the procedure under which the decision was made."

the Prosecutor General may only choose from candidates from the list established by the relevant selection commission or call for a new selection procedure (if none of the candidates from the list is appointed to the position or if the selection commission fails to propose any suitable candidates). If the Prosecutor General decides to call for a new selection procedure, the candidates who have taken part in the previous selection procedure can do so again.

46. The authorities additionally emphasise that already according to previous amendments to the regulation, which were adopted after the adoption Evaluation Report, only candidates considered to be most suitable would be put on the list submitted to the Prosecutor General, in alphabetical order without ranking the candidates. The candidates put on the list by the selection commission would thus be considered to be equally suitable for appointment. As indicated above, with the amendments to the regulations of May 2018, it has been further specified that the Prosecutor General may only choose from those candidates (i.e. only the candidates on the list forwarded by the selection commission) or else call for a new selection procedure.
47. The authorities furthermore indicate that, in its decision not to appoint a specific person to a position and/or to call for a new selection procedure, the Prosecutor General only takes a procedural decision, which is not an administrative act. For this reason no motivation in writing is being provided. Nevertheless, persons who have participated in the selection procedure can appeal the conclusions of the selection commission to the Prosecutor General and decisions of the Prosecutor General to an administrative court (paragraph 74, Regulations on the Commissions for the Selection of Prosecutors and Chief Prosecutors). In addition, the Collegiate Council of the Prosecution Service considered in its meeting of 6 May 2019 various issues related to the selection procedures of prosecutors and adopted a decision to propose to the Prosecutor General to review the relevant regulations, to specify that all appointment decisions be motivated. The Deputy Prosecutor General has been charged with ensuring the implementation of this decision.
48. GRECO takes note the amendments to the regulations on the appointment of prosecutors, establishing that the Prosecutor General is to appoint a person from the list of candidates drawn up by the relevant selection commission. It additionally notes the additional assurances provided by the authorities that candidates on the list drawn up by the selection commission would not be ranked and would be considered to be equally suitable for the position in question. GRECO considers that with these latest amendments the regulations currently in force limit the discretion of the Prosecutor General to making a choice between equally suitable candidates. A written motivation of each appointment decision would further increase the transparency and objectiveness of the procedure, and thus be a welcome complement to the existing provisions, but GRECO considers that – with the regulations in place – it can be said that the decisive influence of the selection commissions has been strengthened, as required by the recommendation.
49. GRECO concludes that recommendation x has been dealt with in a satisfactory manner.

Recommendation xi.

50. *GRECO recommended that i) the Code of Ethics of Prosecutors be complemented in such a way as to offer practical guidance by way of explanatory comments and/or practical examples on conflicts of interest and ethical issues and (ii) that further measures be taken to raise prosecutors' awareness of these issues, notably by stimulating institutional discussions.*

51. GRECO recalls that this recommendation was partly implemented at the time of adoption of the Compliance Report. Following the publication of a practical guide to the Code of Ethics for prosecutors, GRECO considered the first part of the recommendation to have been implemented satisfactorily. As regard the second part of the recommendation, GRECO appreciated the design of more targeted training efforts, based on feedback received from prosecutors, but found that more needed to be done to ensure that awareness-raising activities on conflicts of interest and ethical issues were held on a regular basis and involved as many prosecutors as possible, preferably at the level of prosecutors' offices themselves.
52. The authorities report that with the adoption of Order No. I-246 of 5 July 2017 the Commission of Ethics of Prosecutors is also charged with providing advice on ethical issues upon request. The Commission examines requests for advice at its meetings, provides a written response to the prosecutor in question and ensures publication of anonymised cases on the website of the prosecutor's office (except for cases which are examined by the Commission in camera, of which only the operative part of the Commission's conclusions is made public).
53. Furthermore, training on ethics, integrity and conflicts of interest is provided on a regular basis, not only in the Prosecutor General's Office, but also at the level of regional prosecutors' offices. In the period November 2016 to November 2018, 37 trainings on issues of relevance to prosecutors' conduct have taken place (such as "prosecutors' ethics", "relevant issues of prosecutors' ethics", "professional ethics in the civil service" and "identification, management and prevention of conflicts of interest"), in which more than 500 prosecutors participated. These trainings will continue on a regular basis. In addition, a constantly updated schedule of trainings is published on the intranet of the prosecutor's office. In most cases, the teaching material of these trainings is also published on the intranet, providing also prosecutors who cannot attend a training an opportunity to familiarise themselves with the training material.
54. GRECO welcomes that training on conflicts of interest and ethical issues is now held on a regular basis, also on the level of regional prosecutors' offices, and is complemented with possibilities for the Commission of Ethics of Prosecutors to provide advice upon request. GRECO considers that with these measures the second part of the recommendation has now also been satisfactorily dealt with.
55. GRECO concludes that recommendation xi has been implemented satisfactorily.

III. CONCLUSIONS

56. **In view of the foregoing, GRECO concludes that Lithuania has implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner six out of eleven recommendations contained in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report.** The five remaining recommendations have been partly implemented.
57. More specifically, recommendations ii, vi, viii, ix, x and xi have now been implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner. Recommendations i, iii, iv, v and vii have been partly implemented.
58. As regards all categories under review, structured co-operation at operational level between the Chief Official Ethics Commission and the oversight institutions responsible for prevention of corruption among parliamentarians, judges and prosecutors remains to be significantly strengthened.
59. Furthermore, with respect to members of Parliament, progress has been made with the live-streaming of meetings of committees of the *Seimas* and the publication of

their agendas, working documents and conclusions. Welcome steps have also been taken to improve regulations on lobbying with the adoption of a new law on lobbying. However, some more work needs to be done on providing rules on interactions of members of the *Seimas* with lobbyists. More determined measures are furthermore needed to ensure effective supervision and enforcement of the rules regarding declarations of private interests and other rules of conduct of members of the *Seimas* and to develop efficient internal mechanisms to promote, raise awareness of integrity in the *Seimas*.

60. As regards judges, positive developments have been reported as regards the one remaining non-implemented recommendation. Draft amendments to the Law on Courts envisage amendments to the method for appointing the members of the Selection Commission of Candidates to Judicial Offices, revising the procedure for appealing against the Commission's decisions on procedural grounds and giving the Judicial Council a more important role in the procedure for selecting judges.
61. Finally as regards prosecutors, the two remaining recommendations have now also been addressed. With amendments to the regulations on the appointment of prosecutors of May 2018, the decisive influence of the selection commissions for prosecutors has been strengthened in a suitable manner. Furthermore, with the provision of regular training on conflicts of interest and ethical issues, complemented with possibilities for the Commission of Ethics of Prosecutors to provide advice upon request, appropriate measures have been taken to raise prosecutors' awareness of integrity issues.
62. GRECO notes that further reforms are underway in respect of a number of the pending recommendations. It encourages the country to pursue these reforms. GRECO, in accordance with Rule 31, paragraph 9 of its Rules of Procedure, invites the Head of Delegation of Lithuania to submit additional information regarding the implementation of the pending recommendations i, iii, iv, v and vii by 30 June 2020 at the latest.
63. Finally, GRECO invites the authorities of Lithuania to authorise, as soon as possible, the publication of the report, to translate the report into the national language and to make this translation public.