

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Results Report:
Romania 2022-2024

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Executive Summary

Under Romania’s sixth action plan, sustained commitments across action plan cycles and civil society engagement led to notable results in transparency and open data. For future success, reformers can strengthen government stakeholder buy-in, support for the open government agenda nationwide, and inter-agency coordination.

Early Results:

Out of the 10 commitments in this action plan, one achieved moderate and two significant results. Notably, two of the three commitments identified as promising in the Action Plan Review delivered significant early results. This marks a contrast to the previous cycle, where no commitments achieved significant results.

The two most successful commitments are Commitment 6 under which the government provided data on the allocation of substantial resources for local development plans in Romania. The public has now access to implementation data for two local development programs multiple times per year. Second, the government advanced comprehensive implementation of the 2022 Open Data law (Commitment 7). This led to the publication of 40% more datasets, from 3,200 in July 2022 to 4,679 in September 2024, in the country’s open data portal. Both commitments benefitted from sustained engagement from Romanian civil society, which laid the groundwork across multiple cycles to achieve these outcomes.

Completion:

The action plan addresses several key areas that Romania has consistently focused on. This includes local investment fund transparency, open data, and reducing bureaucracy. It also introduces new focus areas, such as participatory budgeting, improving access to justice for victims of gender-based violence, and enhancing gender equality in decision-making. Despite greater progress compared to previous action plan cycles, this progress was somewhat limited due to a lack of high-level political support (particularly influenced by the country’s election cycle) and coordination issues between state agencies. Three commitments were substantially completed or completed, a decrease compared to the previous action plan.

Commitments that were substantially completed or completed benefitted from sustained engagement from civil society. Civil society seized momentum, such as the repetition of certain topics in the press (commitment 6) to deliver results. Publication of open data for transparency, accountability and social innovation is the policy area that delivered the most notable results.

IMPLEMENTATION AT A GLANCE

LEVEL OF COMPLETION	
3/10	Complete or substantially complete commitments
EARLY RESULTS	
3/10	Commitments with early results
2/10	Commitments with significant results
COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS	
Acting according to OGP process.	

Commitments related to culture and justice (commitments 3 and 4) made limited progress, whereas the commitments related to extractive industries and environmental issues (commitments 5 and 10) were not started. High-level authorities from the respective ministries had little to no engagement in implementation.¹

Participation and Co-Creation:

The Romanian OGP process is overseen by the National Coordination Committee (Comitetul Național de Coordonare, or CNC). It comprises seven representatives from public administration agencies and seven representatives from civil society organizations (CSOs). Civil society played a key role by proposing and amending commitments and by taking part in the CNC. Not all CSO members maintained consistent interest and participation during implementation.² Some were unable to allocate sufficient resources to the open government agenda or were preoccupied with the approaching elections. Despite these challenges, civil society, in general, sustained a meaningful level of engagement throughout the cycle. Their feedback was considered in monitoring all the commitments and in implementing some of them, as was the case in previous action plans. Overall, the country acted according to OGP process.

Implementation in context:

The consistent and determined efforts of Romanian civil society, particularly in areas such as transparency and open data, have been instrumental in driving progress. However, in 2024, Romania held and will hold several important elections. Local elections, including mayoral and council seats with the European Parliament elections took place in June. Presidential elections will take place in November, followed by the national parliamentary elections in December. The run up to the election in Romania has temporarily diverted attention from governance reforms, creating obstacles for planned initiatives. Additionally, the lack of sufficient coordination and integration among government agencies has hindered fulfillment of some commitments.

¹ Septimius Pârvu (Good governance and Elections at Expert Forum), interview with IRM researcher, 6 September 2024; Larisa Barac (OGP Point of Contact for Romania), interview with IRM researcher, 29 July 2024.

² Pârvu, interview; Barac, interview.

Table of Contents

Section I: Key Observations.....2

Section II: Implementation and Early Results4

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation 10

Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators..... 14

Annex I: Commitment Data 16

Section I: Key Observations

Romania's sixth action plan cycle highlights the benefits of sustained civil society advocacy to advancing reforms. It also underscores the importance of consistent high-level political support and inter-agency coordination for commitments to achieve their full ambition.

Observation 1: Persistent civil society advocacy on key issues has driven effective open government reforms in Romania. Consistent with the findings of the 2020-2022 Results Report,¹ the success of commitments suggested by Romanian civil society initiatives demonstrates the importance of sustained civil society engagement to achieve results. This observation is in line with the 2022-2024 Action Plan Review, where the two commitments that achieved significant results (commitments 6 and 7), have been supported by ongoing civil society advocacy and accumulated experience over multiple action plans. Commitment 6, for example, benefited from Expert Forum engaging directly in implementation.² Expert Forum's consistent advocacy and long-term research and production of reports on the issue has facilitated meaningful progress and enhanced commitment effectiveness.³ This highlights a key pattern: commitments backed by long-term civil society engagement are more likely to achieve impactful outcomes over time.

Observation 2: Support for the open government agenda is a limited resource that should be leveraged whenever possible. Political buy-in and leadership support plays a crucial role in advancing the open government agenda. A common feature among commitments that failed to achieve significant results was a lack of high-level political support. This was further aggravated by inadequate planning around how fixed upcoming events, such as the 2024 Romanian elections, could impact implementation. As noted by Expert Forum, there was no participation and meaningful engagement from senior political figures during implementation, limiting progress on commitments that would have benefited from their support. The run up to the 2024 election further shifted attention toward election-related concerns.⁴ This meant that some commitments that had government support during the co-creation phase, such commitments 1 and 10, lost that support. Although technical staff expressed interest in the open government agenda, the absence of strong political engagement hindered the progress of commitments 2, 4, 8 and 9 and the concretization and visibility of potential reforms (commitment 3 and 10). According to MSF representatives, the political landscape is expected to remain relatively stable post-election,⁵ which, in combination with the availability of financial and human resources, may create an opportunity to reenergize efforts and advance the reform agenda.

Observation 3: Insufficient coordination between agencies can undermine the success of commitments. Implementation was hampered by challenges in the foreseen integration and coordination among government agencies. For example, Commitment 1, which sought to create online submission tools for applications for public utility status, remains under development as the General Secretariat of the Government (SGG) needs the approval of the Ministry of Justice to publish the data. This initiative is currently awaiting a parliamentary debate. This example highlights that integration and approval processes can be obstacles to full implementation. To address these challenges, reformers can map out and involve all relevant agencies from the beginning of the commitment design process. Early and ongoing interagency collaboration, determining who will assume responsibility of which milestone and with what

resources, could streamline integration efforts, ensure alignment, and facilitate smoother implementation.

¹ “Results Report 2020-2022 Romania”, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/romania-results-report-2020-2022-for-public-comment/>.

² Septimius Pârnu (Good governance and Elections at Expert Forum), interview with IRM researcher, 6 September 2024.

³ Pârnu, interview.

⁴ Pârnu, interview.

⁵ Pârnu, interview.

Section II: Implementation and Early Results

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

Commitment 6: Increase transparency on national investment allocations

Ministry of Development, Public Works and Administration (MDLPA)

Context and Objectives:

This commitment aimed to improve transparency in the implementation of two local development programs managed by the MDLPA: the National Local Development Plan (Programul Național de Dezvoltare Locală, or PNDL) and the Anghel Saligny Program. Together, these programs represent the Romanian government's main tool to promote local and sustainable development in the country. The PNDL mostly targets rural areas, while the Anghel Saligny Program targets local community modernization through investments in infrastructure, such as roads, sewerage, water treatment plants, and natural gas distribution networks. This initiative built upon efforts from previous action plans focused on PNDL transparency and responded to priorities identified by civil society, led by Expert Forum.¹

Since 2021, the implementation of PNDL and the Anghel Saligny Program has been under scrutiny for mismanagement and possible fraud.² While civil society organizations (CSOs) had previously requested and received data from the government, this information had not been published systematically in an open format. The IRM assessed the commitment as having the potential for substantial results, as it aimed to establish a clear timeline and standards for data publication. Additionally, the commitment aimed to foster civic participation by organizing a public meeting to discuss the implementation of the Anghel Saligny Program.³

Early Results: Significant Results

This commitment achieved significant results and a substantial level of completion. The Ministry of Development, Public Works and Administration now publishes implementation data for the PNDL every six months and for the Anghel Saligny Program every three months, despite some delays.⁴ This was the first time such data had been made publicly available, allowing civil society and journalists to monitor procurement processes and report any detected irregularities.⁵ As envisioned in this and the two previous action plans, the data, now available on data.gov.ro, includes information on lists of completed projects, their status, location, including public procurement information and supplier lists. They also include details on projects where criminal irregularities have been identified for both PNDL and the Anghel Saligny Program. Furthermore, on November 16, 2022, the MDLPA organized an online public meeting to enhance transparency around the Anghel Saligny Program. Both the meeting minutes and an Expert Forum report can be consulted online.⁶ The commitment is assessed as substantially complete rather than complete due to delays in publishing certain types of data and the API

system not having been developed. Government stakeholders expect transparency on implementation data for both programs to be continued in future action plans.⁷

Expert Forum, a leading civil society organization involved in this commitment and a member of Romania's multi-stakeholder forum, noted that while there were delays in publishing the databases and some limitations in data customization, the commitment had a significant impact. Civil society and journalists used the disclosed data sources and published articles on corruption scandals.⁸ According to Romania's OGP Point of Contact, challenges in the implementation of this commitment, including delays in database publication, were due to resource limitations (personnel time) and difficulties in integrating the platform with the public procurement system.⁹ However, both the OGP Point of Contact and Expert Forum representatives agreed that the Ministry in charge of the commitment was highly responsive and maintained continuous communication with civil society organizations throughout the implementation phase.

In November 2023, Expert Forum published a report based on the available data, which also drew attention from the Court of Accounts. This led to a productive dialogue and the Court of Accounts committing to publish the requested data.¹⁰ This demonstrates how transparency and access to information can advance public accountability and reforms. Regarding data readability, the Expert Forum representative acknowledged certain limitations but emphasized that the value lies in the data's availability, a first in Romania. The Ministry also took into account proposals from Expert Forum to improve the user-friendliness of the data, and some of these suggestions on how to operationalize the data were implemented.¹¹

Looking Ahead:

Despite some delays, this commitment has improved public oversight of the PNDL and the Anghel Saligny Program. It has enhanced visibility of the implementation of local development programs and shed light on how substantial public funds (circa 100 billion RON, which represent approximately 22 billion USD), are being allocated. Looking ahead, these transparency improvements are expected to be integrated into future action plans to maintain effective oversight of public procurement and local development projects.¹² A strong incentive for continued transparency for PNDL and the Anghel Saligny program is Romania's accession process to the OECD, which requires an ongoing commitment to transparency and the use of open data.¹³ To build on this success, it is recommended to keep strengthening mechanisms that facilitate the reuse of this data across various platforms, e.g., data journalism, an area where Expert Forum has already made strides.¹⁴ This approach would increase the relevance and sustainability of the data's publication while ensuring broader accessibility and impact.

Commitment 7: Publication of open data sets

General Secretariat of the Government, Authority for the Digitalization of Romania

Context and Objectives:

With this commitment, the General Secretariat of Government (SGG) and the Authority for the Digitalization of Romania (ADR) sought to deliver a robust implementation of Law No. 179/2022 on Open Data¹⁵. To achieve this, they planned to involve CSOs in the law's implementation through consultation meetings and in the identification of key high-value datasets for publication. Their strategy included fostering collaboration among leading open data

institutions, data publishers, and the community of open data re-users. This approach aimed to enhance both the quantity and quality of published data, as well as increase data re-use and its potential impact. Key actions involved organizing inter-institutional and mixed working groups that included public authorities and data re-users. These groups were tasked with developing guidelines for implementing Law 179, identifying and prioritizing high-quality datasets for publication, and promoting best practices in data publication and reuse.¹⁶

The IRM deemed this commitment capable of delivering substantial results in the Action Plan Review¹⁷. While Romania previously included commitments focused on open data in all its past action plans, these efforts had primarily involved ad hoc data publication. In contrast, this commitment aimed to implement a newly approved legal framework for open data across public administration based on an “open by design and by default” principle, while at the same time addressing the lack of digital skills and data reuse among the population.

Early Results: Significant Results

This commitment achieved significant progress in strengthening the open data ecosystem in Romania. Notably, the number of open datasets published on the portal data.gov.ro increased significantly during the implementation period (Milestone 1). Datasets increased from 3,200 in July 2022 to 4,679 in September 2024, which represents an increase of over 40% of available datasets. Moreover, the substantial progress made has laid the foundation for a more ambitious open data agenda, reflected in the ongoing development of the National Open Data Strategy.¹⁸

As for setting up inter-institutional and mixed working groups to develop rules for implementing Law 179 (Milestone 2), these started by mid-2022, with the groups holding several meetings to draft and finalize the guidelines¹⁹. Between December 2023 and January 2024, the GSS submitted the proposed rules for online and in-person public and inter-institutional consultation,²⁰ holding an additional public debate in January 2024 on the topic of open data governance.²¹ As reported by the POC and Expert Forum, this process experienced significant delays. Although communication between government and civil society representatives was good, CSO feedback was frequently received too late, making it difficult for the government to incorporate it on time. While some improvements were made based on this feedback, some datasets remain incomplete or missing. Expert Forum reported that the government counterpart is aware of these issues and working to address them, but limited human resources and time have constrained progress, as foreseen in the 2022-2024 Action Plan Review. Overall, the implementing agencies have been responsive and organized meetings and bilateral discussions with civil society to address these challenges and improve the data portal.²²

As for milestone 3, implementing agencies set up inter-institutional working groups with institutions covered by EU Regulation No. 138/2023²³. Working groups focused on compiling a list of specific high-value datasets and outlined measures for the regulation's implementation. Concurrently, through Decision 824/2023, the regulation governing the Technical-Economic Committee for the Information Society (Comitetului Tehnico-Economic pentru Societatea Informațională), functioning under the ADR, was amended to include open data provisions, complying with EU standards²⁴. These actions led the Romanian government to begin developing its first National Open Data Strategy,²⁵ incorporating one of the recommendations made by the IRM in the Action Plan Review.²⁶ According to the Point of Contact, this process is undertaken by a dedicated interministerial committee and includes a public debate, need

identification surveys for open data stewards, the results of the user feedback survey on the national open data portal, and public and inter-ministerial consultations.²⁷ These developments significantly contribute to the OECD accession process.²⁸

Regarding activities to promote best practices in publishing and reuse (milestone 4), SGG held several events, including webinars, public meetings, and local dissemination efforts throughout 2023 and 2024, most notably during the Open Government Week.²⁹ Finally, in collaboration with the National Institute of Administration (Institutul National de Administratie), SGG established the certified training course on open data (milestone 5).³⁰

Looking Ahead:

After several years of dedicated efforts, this commitment has laid the groundwork for a more coordinated and ambitious approach to open data in Romania. In addition, according to the Point of Contact, the development of the National Open Data Strategy will positively influence the timing and scope of the upcoming action plan. The next action plan could align with the strategy's objectives to ensure that future commitments are more integrated and strategically target specific sectors.³¹ To strengthen the next action plan, the IRM recommends that the General Secretariat of the Government and the Authority for the Digitalization of Romania:

- **Engage high-level government stakeholders** to ensure the action plan has secure backing from early on. This support would help address some of the challenges faced in this action plan and facilitate cross-ministry collaboration.
- **Facilitate inter-ministerial and interagency collaboration** from early on in the co-creation process. This could include in-person or online meetings with all interested government stakeholders to support relationship building. This could be supported by clearly delineating necessary steps for implementation, as well as noting ministry or agency ownership of each step.

¹ "Romania 2022-2024 – Action Plan Review", Open Government Partnership, 16 February 2024, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/romania-action-plan-review-2022-2024/>.

² Eremia Radu, Raport. Ce bani au fost dați pentru investiții, prin PNDL și „Anghel Saligny”, în teritoriu [Report. What money was given for investments, through PNDL and "Anghel Saligny", in the territory], 11 October 2023, <https://adevarul.ro/politica/raport-bani-investitii-pndl-anghel-saligny-2307479.html>; Andreea Pora, Afară e Saligny, înăuntru e PNDL. 50 de miliarde de lei pentru primari înainte de congresul PNL [Saligny outside, PNDL inside. 50 billion lei for mayors before the PNL congress], 12 August 2021, <https://romania.europalibera.org/a/clientelismul-pndl-congres-pnl/31407088.html>; Daniela Mineva, Tihomira Kostova et. Al, Bridges to nowhere: state capture and corruption risks in fiscal transfers and public procurement at the local level in Southeast Europe, 2023, Center for the Study of Democracy, https://zbw.eu/econis-archiv/bitstream/11159/654210/1/1871337593_0.pdf.

³ "Romania 2022-2024 – Action Plan Review", Open Government Partnership.

⁴ Romania Open Government Public Repository, https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1T7FowwN2_oMk_ivGro41r0OTFwBdCuw5iu-aKMhLSOM/edit?gid=0#gid=0.

⁵ Septimius Pârnu (Good governance and Elections at Expert Forum), interview with IRM researcher, 6 September 2024.

⁶ "Concluziile dezbaterii privind asigurarea transparenței în Programul Anghel Saligny" [The conclusions of the debate on ensuring transparency in the Anghel Saligny Program], Expert Forum, 18 November 2022, <https://expertforum.ro/concluzii-dezbateri-saligny/>

⁷ Larisa Barac (OGP Point of Contact for Romania), interview with IRM researcher, 29 July 2024.

⁸ Pârnu, interview.

⁹ Barac, interview.

- ¹⁰ “Programele naționale de investiții: stadiul implementării PNI Anghel Saligny” [National investment programs: the stage of implementation of the PNI Anghel Saligny], 8 November 2023, <https://expertforum.ro/implementare-saligny-sept2023/>, [Accessed 10 September 2024].
- ¹¹ Pârvu, interview.
- ¹² Barac, interview.
- ¹³ Meeting of the Council at Ministerial Level, 9-10 June 2022, Roadmap for the OECD Accession Process of Romania, OECD, [https://one.oecd.org/document/C/MIN\(2022\)25/FINAL/en/pdf](https://one.oecd.org/document/C/MIN(2022)25/FINAL/en/pdf).
- ¹⁴ “Lansare online + demonstrație live Detectorul de bani publici” [Online Launch + Live Demo Public Money Detector], Expert Forum, 25 August 2022, <https://expertforum.ro/demonstratie-detectorul-bani-publici/>.
- ¹⁵ “Lege nr. 179 din 9 iunie 2022 privind datele deschise și reutilizarea informațiilor din sectorul public” [Law No 179 of June 9, 2022 on open data and re-use of public sector information], Legislative Portal, last modified 9 June 2022, <https://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliiDocument/256414>.
- ¹⁶ Romania 2022-2024 National Action Plan, 25 July 2022, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Romania_Action-Plan_2022-2024_June_EN.pdf.
- ¹⁷ “Romania 2022-2024 – Action Plan Review”, Open Government Partnership.
- ¹⁸ Barac, interview.
- ¹⁹ “Grup de lucru norme date deschise” [Open Data Norms Working Group], 8 July 2022, data.gov.ro, <https://data.gov.ro/blog/grup-de-lucru-norme-date-deschise>.
- ²⁰ “Consultare publică - proiect de Hotărâre a Guvernului pentru aprobarea Normelor metodologice de aplicare a Legii nr. 179/2022 privind datele deschise și reutilizarea informațiilor din sectorul public” [Public consultation - draft Government Decision for the approval of the Methodological Norms for the application of Law no. 179/2022 on open data and the reuse of public sector information], 6 December 2023, data.gov.ro, <https://data.gov.ro/blog/consultare-publica-hg-normelor-metodologice-d-date-deschise>.
- ²¹ “Rezumatul dezbaterii publice - De la date deschise la guvernanta datelor” [Summary of the public debate - From open data to data governance], 15 January 2024, data.gov.ro, <https://data.gov.ro/blog/rezumatul-dezbaterii-publice-de-la-date-deschise-la-guvernanta-dator>.
- ²² Pârvu, interview.
- ²³ “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2023/138 of 21 December 2022 laying down a list of specific high-value datasets and the arrangements for their publication and re-use”, EU Commission, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2023/138/oj.
- ²⁴ “Hotărâre nr. 824 din 8 septembrie 2023 pentru modificarea și completarea Hotărârii Guvernului nr. 941/2013 privind organizarea și funcționarea Comitetului Tehnico-Economic pentru Societatea Informațională” [DECISION no. 824 of September 8, 2023 for the amendment and completion of Government Decision no. 941/2013 regarding the organization and operation of the Technical-Economic Committee for the Information Society], Legislative Portal, last modified 8 September 2023, <https://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliiDocumentAfis/274486>.
- ²⁵ “Cadrul Strategic” [The Strategic Framework], data.gov.ro, <https://data.gov.ro/pages/cadrul-strategic>.
- ²⁶ “Romania 2022-2024 – Action Plan Review”, Open Government Partnership.
- ²⁷ “Reuniunea Comitetului pentru elaborarea Strategiei privind Datele Deschise 8 aug. 2024” [Meeting of the Committee for the elaboration of the Open Data Strategy Aug. 8. 2024], General Secretariat of the Government, 9 August 2024, <https://data.gov.ro/blog/reuniunea-comitetului-pentru-elaborarea-strategiei-privind-datele-deschise-8-aug-2024>; “Proiectul de HOTĂRÂRE pentru aprobarea Strategiei Naționale privind Datele Deschise 2024-2028” [Draft DECISION for the approval of the National Open Data Strategy 2024-2028], General Secretariat of the Government, e-consultare.gov.ro, 10 September 2024, <https://e-consultare.gov.ro/w/2024/09/proiectul-de-hotarare-pentru-aprobarea-strategiei-nationale-privind-datele-deschise-2024-2028/>; “Consultare publică - proiect de HG pentru aprobarea Strategiei Naționale privind Datele Deschise” [Public consultation - draft GD for the approval of the National Open Data Strategy], General Secretariat of the Government, 11 September 2024, <https://data.gov.ro/blog/consultare-publica-proiect-de-hg-pentru-aprobarea-strategiei-nationale-privind-datele-deschise>; “Hotărârea Guvernului pentru aprobarea Strategiei naționale privind datele deschise 2024-2028 - În avizare” [Government Decision for the approval of the National Open Data Strategy 2024-2028 - Under approval], General Secretariat of the Government, 21 October 2024, <https://data.gov.ro/blog/hotararea-guvernului-pentru-aprobarea-strategiei-nationale-privind-datele-deschise-2024-2028-avizare>; “Analiză elaborare Strategie Națională privind Datele Deschise” [National Open Data Strategy development analysis], https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSebqkfSb7eIYOmhzb1ACG3KajzM9R_d5pPGqpSIL90AHrjBTg/viewform; “Chestionar data.gov.ro 2024” [Questionnaire data.gov.ro 2024], https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScOLBkSxm198S07m2hE3sgWolw1w1CZ_AOA9GeHlug2toYh9A/viewform.
- ²⁸ Barac, interview.
- ²⁹ “Săptămâna Guvernării Deschise - Un univers de date utile – INS” [Open Government Week - A universe of useful data - INS], 31 May 2024, data.gov.ro, <https://data.gov.ro/blog/saptamana-guvernarii-deschise-un-univers-de-date-utile-ins>.

³⁰ “Date deschise în administrația publică” [Open data in public administration], INA, 18 March 2024, <https://ina.gov.ro/cursuri/programe-de-perfectionare/comunicare-publica-informare-promovare-si-transparenta-decizionala/date-deschise-in-administratia-publica>.

³¹Barac, interview.

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation

Although there was strong rapport and communication between implementing agencies and civil society organizations, participation declined during the implementation phase. This decrease in engagement was partly due to limited resources and the ongoing parliamentary election campaign, which diverted attention from implementation.

OGP member countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the updated OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards that came into force on 1 January 2022.¹ The IRM assesses all countries that submitted action plans from 2022 onwards under the updated Standards. However, OGP instituted a 24-month grace period to ensure a fair and transparent transition. During this time, the IRM will assess countries' alignment with the Standards and compliance with the minimum requirements.² Therefore, countries will only be found to be acting contrary to OGP process if they do not meet the minimum requirements for submitted action plans to begin in 2024 and later.

Romania's engagement with the OGP is overseen by the National Coordination Committee (Comitetul Național de Coordonare, or CNC),³ which was established in 2020. According to its bylaws, the CNC is responsible for co-creating action plans, coordinating their implementation, and monitoring and evaluating their progress.⁴ The CNC consists of seven representatives from public administration authorities and seven from civil society organizations.⁵ The nongovernmental members of the CNC were selected through a nomination process by the previous Committee's civil society members for the 2022–2024 period. By early 2024, their term was extended until the adoption of the next action plan but no later than April 2025.⁶ A lack of resources, particular lack of staff and funds, was repeatedly mentioned by CSOs stakeholders as a limitation to follow the OGP implementation process more closely.⁷

The co-creation process took place between February and June 2022. This process aimed to meet OGP standards by ensuring that civil society played an active role in shaping the commitments. In addition, CSOs recommended that the action plan's commitments prioritize the protection of civic space, anti-corruption measures, digitization initiatives, and transversal inclusion and equal opportunities⁸. A total of 75 commitment proposals were received online from central government agencies and CSOs,⁹ while 8 additional recommendations were received from CSOs to fine-tune commitment proposals initiated by government agencies¹⁰.

CNC held six meetings between November 2022 and March 2024 to monitor commitment implementation. The first implementation meeting took place in November 2022, in a hybrid format, and brought together 20 representatives from civil society and central public administration institutions involved in implementing the action plan. Despite the frequency of the meetings, both the OGP Point of Contact and Expert Forum noted that civil society representatives were not as actively involved as expected by providing feedback or attending all the meetings. For example, the Expert Forum noted that one particular CNC member did not attend any of the meetings, which contributed to CSOs' perception that interest in OGP in the country was waning, particularly in the context of the upcoming elections.¹¹ In addition, the same CSO representatives were often involved in all aspects of implementation, which may have limited the breadth of engagement and oversight.¹² According to the Romanian

Quantitative Studies Association, they faced challenges in identifying clear incentives to participate and fulfill the actions required by the commitments. One potential solution could be to include specific actions and designate responsible civil society actors for each activity. This approach could also enhance the chances of securing necessary resources—such as funding, staff, and expertise—for successful implementation.¹³

As was the case during the implementation of the 2020-2022 Action Plan, the OGP Club continued to advance a complementary agenda alongside the CNC for Romania's OGP process. An informal mechanism established in 2014, the OGP Club aims to foster dialogue between government and civil society on open government issues. During the sixth action plan cycle, the OGP Club organized two public events, which encouraged the discussion around two open government initiatives. One discussed the technical implications of implementing the e-Factura system¹⁴, an electronic invoicing platform designed to streamline the issuance, transmission, and validation of invoices between businesses and public institutions, improving transparency and compliance with tax regulations. The other debated a future Open Government Strategy¹⁵.

The action plan reflected input gathered from the public and civil society. For example, the action plan included commitments to address gender equality and gender-based violence for the first time. Other commitments reflect the persistence of civil society actors, such as Expert Forum, in advocating for specific topics across action plan cycles. These include Commitment 6 on transparency in the allocation of local development funds and Commitment 7 on open data. Continued efforts have contributed to accumulated experience on these topics (particularly on the PNDL and Anghel Saligny Program), which ultimately led to results.

Table 1. Compliance with minimum requirements

Minimum requirement	Met during co-creation?	Met during implementation?
1.1 Space for dialogue: The National Coordination Committee (Comitetul Național de Coordonare, or CNC) is the multi-stakeholder forum for OGP in Romania. It met at least once every six months, and its basic rules are publicly available. ¹⁶ The most recent CNC meeting during the implementation of the sixth Action Plan took place on 21 March 2024. ¹⁷	Yes	Yes
2.1 OGP website: The SGG maintains a publicly accessible website that contains all matters regarding OGP-related activities in Romania, including the latest action plans. ¹⁸	Yes	Yes
2.2 Repository: There is an online repository available. It is updated at least twice a year and contains information on both the co-creation ¹⁹ and implementation phases. ²⁰	Yes	Yes
3.1 Advanced notice: The SGG posted the co-creation timeline and the overview of opportunities for stakeholders to participate on the OGP and on the SGG's websites. The SGG posted the calendar two weeks before the start of the co-creation process. ²¹	Yes	Not applicable
3.2 Outreach: Outreach activities -such as debates on the culture of open government, integrity, and	Yes	Not applicable

transparency policies- were carried out through the OGP Club. In addition, the SGG and the CNC organized information sessions as well as activities linked to commitments in the previous action plan. ²²		
3.3 Feedback mechanism: There was an online consultation platform for gathering input from a range of stakeholders. Meanwhile, other co-creation activities were also open to the public. Other co-creation activities required registration but were open to the public. The platform was open for collecting inputs for about two months. ²³	Yes	Not applicable
4.1 Reasoned response: The SGG documented contributions from stakeholders and made them available for public consultation on the online repository. The SGG also published a synthesis table with the reasons for rejecting proposals from the co-creation process. ²⁴	Yes	Not applicable
5.1 Open implementation: The CNC, as Romania’s MSF for the OGP process, met a total of six times during implementation. ²⁵ During these meetings, implementation progress was presented and civil society could comment. ²⁶	Not applicable	Yes

¹ “OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards,” <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>.

² Independent Reporting Mechanism, *Guidelines for the Assessment of OGP’s Minimum Requirements*, May 2022, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/IRM-Guidelines-for-Assessment-of-Minimum-Requirements_20220531_EN.pdf.

³ “Comitetul Național de Coordonare,” [National Coordination Committee], CNC, <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/comitetul-national-de-coordonare>.

⁴ “Organizarea și funcționarea Comitetului Național de Coordonare a implementării Parteneriatului pentru Guvernare Deschisă în România,” [Organization and functioning of the National Coordination Committee for the implementation of the Open Government Partnership in Romania] CNC, https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CNC_2020.pdf.

⁵ “CNC 2022-2024” [National Coordination Committee 2022-2024], CNC, <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/cnc-2022-2024/>.

⁶ “Hotărârea CNC nr.1/2024 privind modificarea ROF 2022-2024” [Judgment No 1/21.03.2024 on the National Steering Committee of the Open Government Partnership in Romania], CNC, https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Hotarare-CNC-modif-ROF_21mar.pdf.

⁷ Septimius Pârvu (Good governance and Elections at Expert Forum), interview with IRM researcher, 6 September 2024; Bogdan Voice (Romanian Quantitative Studies Association), email correspondence with IRM researcher, September 2024; Laura Albu (President of the Center for Mediation and Community Security), interview with IRM researcher, 26 September 2024.

⁸ “Consultare 2022” [Consultation 2022], CNC, <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/consultare-2022/>.

⁹ Larisa Barac (OGP Point of Contact for Romania), interview with IRM researcher, 29 July 2024.

¹⁰ “Centralizator propuneri primite / motivare preluare” [Centralizer of proposals received / motivation for taking over], CNC, <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Centralizare-propuneri-PNA-2022-2024.docx>.

¹¹ Pârvu, interview.

¹² Barac, interview.

¹³ Voicu, email correspondence.

¹⁴ “OGP Club Implementarea e-Factura – provocări și oportunități” [OGP Club e-Invoice implementation – challenges and opportunities], 3 April 2024, OGP Club, <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/2024/04/03/ogp-club-e-factura/>.

¹⁵ “OGP Club: Prima strategie națională în domeniul guvernării deschise” [OGP Club: The first national open government strategy], 17 January 2024, OGP Club, <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/2024/01/17/ogp-club-prima-strategie-nationala-in-domeniul-guvernarii-deschise/>.

¹⁶ “OGP Romania – Parteneriatul pentru Guvernare Deschisă” [OGP Romania – Open Government Partnership], <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/>.

¹⁷ “Minută Întâlnirea Comitetului Național de Coordonare a implementării Planului Național de Acțiune al Parteneriatului pentru Guvernare Deschisă în România 2022-2024 - 21.03.2024” [Minutes : Meeting of the National Coordinating Committee for the implementation of the National Action Plan of the Partnership for Open Government in Romania 2022-2024], 21.03.2024, CNC, https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Minuta-Intalnire-CNC_21.03.2024.pdf.

¹⁸ “OGP Romania – Parteneriatul pentru Guvernare Deschisă”, [OGP Romania – Open Government Partnership], <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/>.

¹⁹ “Elaborare PNA 2022–2024, Prupneri angajamente primite” [Elaboration of the NAP 2022-2024, Follow-up of commitments received], https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1SFS3QRf_RKt7T_diWJMQbiJqbVJJ4CeM.

²⁰ “Monitorizare PNA 2022-2024”, https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1T7FowwN2_oMk_ivGro41r0OTFwBdCuw5iu-aKMhLSOM/edit?gid=0#gid=0.

²¹ “Romania 2022-2024 – Action Plan Review”, Open Government Partnership.

²² “Romania 2022-2024 – Action Plan Review”, Open Government Partnership.

²³ “Romania 2022-2024 – Action Plan Review”, Open Government Partnership.

²⁴ “Romania 2022-2024 – Action Plan Review”, Open Government Partnership.

²⁵ “OGP Romania – Parteneriatul pentru Guvernare Deschisă” [OGP Romania – Open Government Partnership], <https://ogp.gov.ro/nou/>.

²⁶ Barac, interview.

Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators

This report supports members' accountability and learning through assessment of (i) the level of completion for commitments' implementation, (ii) early results for commitments with a high level of completion identified as promising or that yielded significant results through implementation, and (iii) participation and co-creation practices throughout the action plan cycle.¹ The IRM commenced the research process after the first year of implementation of the action plan with the development of a research plan, preliminary desk research, and verification of evidence provided in the country's OGP repository.²

Completion

The IRM assesses the level of completion for each commitment in the action plan, including commitments clustered in the Action Plan Review.³ The level of completion for all commitments is assessed as one of the following:

- *No evidence available*
- *Not started*
- *Limited*
- *Substantial*
- *Complete*

Early Results

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

The early results indicator establishes three levels of results:

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

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

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

This report was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with Soledad Gattoni and was reviewed by Andy McDevitt, IRM external expert. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products and review process is overseen by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).⁴ For more information, refer to the "IRM Overview" section of the OGP website.⁵ A glossary on IRM and OGP terms is available on the OGP website.⁶

¹ For definitions of OGP terms, such as co-creation and promising commitments, see "OGP Glossary," <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/>

² Romania. OGP Repository. Date accessed: 19 September 2024:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1T7FowwN2_oMk_ivGro41r0OTFwBdCuw5iu-aKMHLsOM/edit?gid=0#gid=0.

³ The IRM clusters commitments that share a common policy objective during the Action Plan Review process. In these instances, the IRM assesses "potential for results" and "Early Results" at the cluster level. The level of completion is assessed at the commitment level. For more information on how the IRM clusters commitments, see Section IV on Methodology and IRM Indicators of the Action Plan Review.

⁴ Open Government Partnership, Independent Reporting Mechanism, *International Experts Panel*, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/who-we-are/international-experts-panel/>.

⁵ Open Government Partnership, *IRM Overview*, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/>.

⁶ Open Government Partnership, *OGP Glossary*, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/>.

Annex I: Commitment Data¹

Commitment 1: Standardization of administrative procedures for the recognition of the public utility status

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Limited • Early results: No Notable Results |
|--|--|

Through this commitment, the SGG sought to standardize the administrative procedures for recognizing public utility status. It aimed to do so by developing tools to harmonize practices among local authorities and manage the application process. As reported by the SGG, SGG met with representatives of the target institutions and civil society. The assessment of civil society participation through a questionnaire yielded a good response rate (14 out of 24 questionnaires sent). In addition, the database of legal entities with public utility status as of 2022 was uploaded to the data.gov.ro portal.² However, operationalization of the working tools for the online submission of applications, which was the goal of the commitment, remains a work in progress. It was included among other proposals sent by the SGG to the Ministry of Justice but is currently awaiting debate and adoption by the Parliament.

Commitment 2: Pilot Program - participatory budgeting process

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Substantial • Early results: No Notable Results |
|--|--|

This commitment, led by the SGG, aimed to foster participatory budgeting practices among public authorities. To achieve this, it aimed to analyze existing participatory budgeting experiences in the country, organize exchanges and training sessions for public authorities, and publish a guide. The implementing agencies completed most activities, including a baseline analysis based on a questionnaire sent to local authorities, working meetings to present national best practices, and training sessions to guide local authorities through the stages of participatory budgeting. However, the guide with recommendations for public authorities and civil society is still pending approval by the Court of Accounts of Romania. This was considered a preliminary step for the wider adoption of participatory budgeting and therefore one of the most important milestones. In the meantime, although the Point of Contact valued this commitment as an opportunity to set the discussion on the topic,³ there is no evidence that its implementation has yet to widen adoption of participatory budgeting practices by government authorities in Romania.

Commitment 3: Increasing the transparency, de-bureaucracy and integrity of the decentralized services of the Ministry of Culture

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Limited • Early results: No Notable Results |
|--|--|

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for results: Modest 	
<p>Through this commitment, the Ministry of Culture, with the support of Transparency International Romania, sought to develop an anti-corruption strategy aimed at fighting corruption within its decentralized services. It envisaged a comprehensive analysis of the existing normative framework, specialized procedures, vulnerabilities to corruption and good practices in the field of anti-corruption at the level of decentralized services, the elaboration and dissemination of guides with procedures on the subject, and their publication on the websites of decentralized services and the Ministry. Some progress was made regarding the preparatory assessment, a training session and the drafting of a list of specialized procedures for combating corruption at the level of the decentralized services. However, this information was not disseminated as expected and did not lead to the effective implementation of these operational procedures. The IRM researcher contacted the TI Romania chapter but received no reply. Based on the evidence provided to the IRM, no notable results can be reported from commitment implementation.</p>	
<p>Commitment 4: Development of an integrated national IT system for recording criminal claims</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Limited • Early results: No Notable Results
<p>Under this commitment, the National Agency for the Management of Seized Assets (ANABI) and the Ministry of Justice aimed to enhance the functionalities of ROARMIS, an integrated IT system developed with EU support to improve the efficiency of recovering claims arising from crimes. Key actions included providing training on ROARMIS for prospective users, integrating ROARMIS with Romania's Electronic Court Record Information System (ECRIS 5), and subsequently publishing datasets on criminal cases on the data.gov.ro portal. On the one hand, ROARMIS has been operational since late 2022 and ANABI, whose role was praised as very positive by Expert Forum,⁴ provided the planned training for its staff, and for ROARMIS' main beneficiaries and end users.⁵ Nevertheless, the foreseen integration of ROARMIS with ECRIS 5 is still a work in progress, therefore the publication of datasets could not be initiated.</p>	
<p>Commitment 5: Responsible management of protected natural areas</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Not Started • Early results: No Notable Results
<p>The National Agency for Protected Natural Areas (ANANP) proposed to establish a framework for assigning protected natural areas to dedicated management structures, with CSOs providing advisory support in the designation process. However, the commitment was ultimately dropped. According to the Point of Contact,⁶ a proposal for an Emergency Government Ordinance changed some of the responsibilities and duties of ANANP to other entities, thus reducing their ability to implement the commitment⁷.</p>	

Commitment 6: Increase transparency on national investment allocations

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

This commitment is assessed in Section II.

Commitment 7: Publication of open datasets

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

This commitment is assessed in Section II.

Commitment 8: Balanced participation of women and men in decision-making in public and political life

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Limited • Early results: No Notable Results |
|--|--|

Through this commitment, the National Agency for Gender Equality (ANES), with the participation of Expert Forum, aimed to address gender imbalances in the Romanian public sphere. The commitment aimed to conduct sectoral analyses (i.e., in the central public administration, in the labor market and in electoral processes) to assess these imbalances. Concerning the gender imbalance in the central administration, the completed analyses have led to a situation report⁸ and another report on Romania's position in the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) database.⁹ Meanwhile, to address the gender imbalance in the labor market, a working group was established in 2024 by the Secretary of ANES. Its task is to monitor gender equality in employment, mobility and labor migration policies. Finally, Expert Forum examined gender balances in the list of candidates during the elections and expected this area to be covered by this commitment. Despite the launch of an analysis, progress was hampered by the lack of interest of the Permanent Electoral Authority and the generally low level of engagement of civil society.¹⁰ A representative from the Romanian Quantitative Studies Association noted limited transparency in the implementation of this commitment, with no representatives present in the discussions and a lack of understanding of where funding to implement this commitment came from.¹¹

Commitment 9: Ensuring access to justice for victims of domestic and gender-based violence

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Complete • Early results: Moderate Results
<p>The commitment, proposed by the National Agency for Gender Equality (ANES), aimed to improve access to justice for victims of domestic and gender-based violence through a platform and standardized methodology for legal guidance. ANES reported notable progress, including the development of a unified legal advice methodology piloted in five Romanian counties¹² and eight training sessions where CSOs representatives trained public servants to enhance their communication with victims.¹³ According to the President of the Center for Mediation and Community Security, this was the first time CSOs received funding from the Ministry of Justice for training and knowledge-transfer. This equipped thousands of stakeholders (police officers and bureaucrats) to better support victims. The National Gender and Domestic Violence Barometer was completed.¹⁴ Although its impact remains unclear, as IRM assessment was limited by a lack of response from CSO Catalactica.</p>	

Commitment 10: Preparation of Romania's accession to Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Not Started • Early results: No Notable Results
<p>This commitment initially aimed to lay the groundwork for Romania's adoption of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) standards. However, the Ministry of Energy, the implementing agency, decided not to further pursue implementation¹⁵. The technical and high-level representatives that initiated the commitment are no longer part of the Ministry of Energy. The IRM researcher contacted the current contact persons but received no reply.¹⁶ A CSO representative explained that it was likely the lack of financing sources, incentives and CSO commitment which contributed to the commitment's withdrawal.¹⁷</p>	

¹ Editorial notes:

1. For commitments that are clustered, the assessment of potential for results and early results is conducted at the cluster level, rather than the individual commitment level.
2. Commitments' short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see Romania action plan: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/romania-action-plan-2022-2024-june/>
3. For more information on the assessment of the commitments' design, see Romania Action Plan Review: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/romania-action-plan-review-2022-2024/>.

² "Evidența unică a persoanelor juridice cu statut de utilitate publică pentru anul 2022"[The unique record of legal entities with public utility status for the year 2022], data.gov.ro, <https://data.gov.ro/dataset/evidenta-unica-a-persoanelor-juridice-cu-statut-de-utilitate-publica-pentru-anul-2022>.

³ Larisa Barac (OGP Point of Contact for Romania), interview with IRM researcher, 29 July 2024.

⁴ Septimius Pârnu (Good governance and Elections at Expert Forum), interview with IRM researcher, 6 September 2024

⁵ “Sesiuni de instruire regionale în cadrul proiectului Dezvoltarea sistemului informatic național integrat de evidență a creanțelor provenite din infracțiuni” [Regional Training Sessions in the Framework of the project “Development of the Integrated National Information System for Recording Claims from Crimes], ANABI, <https://anabi.just.ro/stiri/sesiuni-de-instruire-regionale-in-cadrul-proiectului-dezvoltarea-sistemului-informatic-national-integrat-de-evidenta-a-creantelor-provenite-din-infracțiuni-cod-sipoca-763-cod-mysmis-135331>.

⁶ “Proiect ordonanța de urgență privind regimul ariilor naturale protejate, conservarea habitatelor naturale, a florei și faunei sălbatice” [Draft emergency ordinance on the regime of protected natural areas, conservation of natural habitats, flora and fauna], Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests, 9 February 2023, <https://www.mmediu.ro/articol/proiect-ordonanta-de-urgenta-privind-regimul-ariilor-naturale-protejate-conservarea-habitatelor-naturale-a-florei-si-faunei-salbatice/5964>.

⁷ Barac, interview.

⁸ “Situația femeilor și a bărbaților în poziții de decizie în administrația publică centrală – 2023” [Situation of women and men in decision-making positions in central public administration - 2023], ANES, <https://anes.gov.ro/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Analiza-2023-Situatia-femeilor-si-a-barbatilor-in-pozitii-de-decizie-in-administratia-publica-centrala.pdf>.

⁹ “Poziționarea României în baza de date online a Institutului European pentru Egalitatea de Șanse între Femei și Bărbați privind echilibrul de gen în poziții de decizie în administrația publică centrală – 2023” [Romania's ranking in the European Institute for Gender Equality's online database on gender balance in decision-making positions in central public administration - 2023], ANES, <https://anes.gov.ro/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/2023-Pozitionarea-Romaniei-in-baza-de-date-a-EIGE.pdf>.

¹⁰ Pârvu, interview.

¹¹ Bogdan Voicu (Romanian Quantitative Studies Association), email correspondence with IRM researcher, September 2024.

¹² Monaliza Cirstea (Director, ANES), email correspondence with IRM researcher, September 2024.

¹³ Laura Albu (President of the Center for Mediation and Community Security), interview with IRM researcher, 26 September 2024.

¹⁴ Dumitru, Silviu, Drăgan, Corina & Căce, Costin Adrian (Eds.) (2024). *Barometrul în domeniul violenței domestice și de gen*. [Barometer on domestic and gender-based violence], Pro Universitaria, <https://bibliotecadesociologie.ro/download/dumitru-silviu-dragan-corina-cace-costin-adrian-eds-2024-barometrul-in-domeniul-violentei-domestice-si-de-gen-bucuresti-pro-universitaria/>.

¹⁵ Barac, interview.

¹⁶ The IRM researcher contacted Luisa Badiu and Madalina Flori Negrea in September 2024 but received no reply.

¹⁷ Voicu, correspondence.