SEMINAR ORGANISED BY THE ITALIAN COUNCIL OF STATE IN
COLLABORATION WITH THE HELLENIC COUNCIL OF STATE AND ACA-EUROPE
Turin, 23-24 November 2026

Technological challenges, with particular attention being paid to the introduction of digital technology and artificial intelligence into the organisation of the administration and administrative justice

QUESTIONNAIRE

Responses from the Supreme Court of the Republic of Latvia (Senate)

This questionnaire has been prepared in anticipation of the seminar to be held in Turin on 23 and 24 November 2026. In accordance with point 2 of the guiding principles adopted by the Hellenic Presidency of ACA-Europe, it aims to explore the current challenges facing administrative judges, particularly those related to technology, and more specifically the introduction of digitalisation and artificial intelligence into the organisation and functioning of the administration and administrative justice.

In order to gain an in-depth understanding of the various dimensions of these technological challenges, the survey is split into three parts:

Part A - The digitalisation of administrative proceedings, with a focus on the experience of various supreme administrative jurisdictions and the impact of this transformation on the organisation and conduct of judicial activity.

Part B - Automated administrative decision-making and judicial review by administrative courts, particularly issues of technical discretion, automation and the delimitation of judicial powers.

Part C - The role of the administrative judge and the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions and in the decision-making process, particularly in light of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, known as the 'AI Act', as well as other European Union standards and regulations, such as Regulation (EU) 2016/679, known as the 'GDPR', Regulation (EU) 2022/2065, known as the 'DSA', and Regulation (EU) 2022/1925, known as the 'DMA'.

Part A

The digitalisation of administrative proceedings and the use of artificial intelligence tools by the administrative justice system

A.I – Infrastructure and technological organisation

Co-funded by the European Union

A.I.1 – Digital equipment and resources

1. What is the level of digital equipment available to judges and administrative staff?

☐ Non-existent
☐ Limited
☐ Intermediate
✓ High
☐ Complete
Please explain if necessary:

Judges and administrative staff in the Latvian administrative courts are equipped with modern digital infrastructure enabling the conduct of largely paperless proceedings.
Judges and administrative staff typically are equipped with:

- Individual desktop and laptop computers connected to the court's internal network (intranet) and external networks,
- Dual desktops,
- Access to the electronic case management system,
- Secure authentication tools, including qualified electronic signature,
- Institutional email accounts,
- Secure remote access (via VPN) to court's internal network (intranet), including access to work folders, institutional email and other internal information systems necessary for the performance of judicial and administrative tasks,
- Access to standard office software and document management tools,
- Networked printing and scanning facilities.

Both judges and administrative staff have the possibility to access court's internal network remotely through secure connections, subject to internal regulations and security requirements.

2. Is the technological infrastructure (networks, servers, equipment, connectivity) suited to the day-to-day operational needs of the administrative jurisdictions?

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Somewhat disagree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Somewhat agree
✓ Strongly agree
Please explain if necessary:

Connectivity and system performance are adequate to support routine judicial work, including remote access where authorised. Overall, the existing technological framework allows administrative courts to function efficiently within a predominantly digital working environment.

A.I.2 – Cloud solutions, remote access and interoperability

Co-funded by the European Union

3. To what extent does your jurisdiction use cloud-based solutions for its information systems?

☐ Not at all
✓ To a limited extent
☐ Moderately
☐ Extensively
☐ Completely

Please explain, where applicable, and, in the absence of cloud solutions, specify the alternative infrastructure solutions implemented:

Cloud-based solutions are used to a limited extent. Currently, cloud infrastructure is applied primarily for institutional email services of judges and court staff, as well as for the external website of the Supreme Court. Core judicial information systems, including case management and internal data processing systems, are not cloud-based and operate within on-premises infrastructure.

3a. Do the adopted technical solutions enable judges and staff to perform their duties remotely using the institutional equipment made available to them? If so, please specify any limitations.

Yes. The adopted technical solutions enable judges and administrative staff to perform their duties remotely using institutional equipment, subject to internal security regulations. Secure remote access to the judicial information system is available through encrypted connections and authenticated access tools. Judges are able to consult electronic case files, draft procedural documents and sign decisions electronically. Administrative staff may access case management systems and perform procedural tasks remotely where their functions permit. Certain activities, such as the handling of confidential materials, in person hearings or tasks requiring physical presence, may still require attendance at court premises. Overall, however, the existing technical framework allows effective remote performance of most routine judicial and administrative functions.

3b. Are the applications being used interoperable with other national or cross-border judicial IT systems? If so, please specify the extent of this interoperability.

The judicial information system used by the Latvian administrative courts is integrated with a number of national public administration information systems and registers, enabling courts to obtain relevant data electronically and thereby reducing reliance on paper-based exchanges. It is interconnected, inter alia, with the information systems of the State Environmental Service, the registers of the Road Traffic Safety Directorate, the Inheritance Register, the Enterprise Register, the Unified Migration Information System, as well as the State Unified Computerised Land Register. This integration ensures efficient and secure data exchange between institutions within the scope established by law.

Co-funded by the European Union

A.II – Digitalisation and dematerialisation of judicial administrative proceedings

A.II.1 – Dematerialised administrative proceedings

4. Is a dematerialised judicial administrative proceedings system in place within your jurisdiction?

☐ No
☐ Yes, at an initial stage
☐ Yes, at an intermediate stage
✓ Yes, at an advanced stage
☐ Yes, on a fully integrated basis
Please explain if necessary:

Latvia is currently in a transitional phase towards a fully dematerialised administrative judicial process. The development and gradual implementation of the electronic case platform – e-case (e-lieta) – is ongoing. In the near future, Latvian administrative courts are expected to transition fully to the e-case platform. The e-case platform is intended to provide an integrated digital environment for managing cases electronically, including access to case materials and the electronic exchange of documents. The reform aims to further reduce paper-based processes and strengthen the efficiency and security of judicial proceedings. The Administrative Procedure Law provides for the conduct of administrative court proceedings in electronic case form within the judicial information system.

At present, cases received by the courts are organised in electronic form where this is possible and appropriate. The determination of the case format is made by the judge, taking into account the specific circumstances of the case. As a result, cases are administered in electronic or paper format, depending on the circumstances and procedural considerations of the individual case.

A substantial part of procedural activities is already carried out electronically. Procedural documents may be drafted, submitted and signed in digital form, and communication between courts and parties may take place electronically. In particular, communication with legal entities is primarily conducted through the official electronic address system.

The overall direction of reform is towards a fully integrated and comprehensive digital judicial process.

4a. When this system exists at least at an initial stage, do judges and staff process and sign documents exclusively in digital format in their everyday working practice?

☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
☐ Frequently
✓ Always

Please explain if necessary:

Co-funded by the European Union

Yes, in everyday working practice judges and administrative staff predominantly prepare and sign court documents in digital format.

4b. Percentage of paper files prior to the implementation of dematerialised administrative proceedings that have been digitised:

☐ 0–20%

☐ 20–40%

✓ 40–65%

☐ 60–80%

☐ 80–100%

At present, it is difficult to indicate a precise percentage, as the Latvian court system is undergoing a reform process. A significant number of cases currently pending before the courts, in particular before the Supreme Court, are still maintained predominantly in paper format. By contrast, newly initiated cases are organised in electronic form where this is possible and appropriate. At the same time, even in cases maintained in paper format, procedural documents may be submitted electronically and court decisions are prepared and signed in digital form.

The core objective of the ongoing reform is to ensure a full transition to the e-case platform and comprehensive electronic case management. Accordingly, the current situation reflects a transitional stage, in which paper files coexist with newly created digital case files.

A.II.2 – Digital services for members of the public, lawyers and public authorities

5. Are digital services available for filing documents, consulting files, notifications, payments or other related services? If so, please specify which ones.

The judicial information system is primarily designed to support the internal functioning of the courts and does not constitute a dedicated interactive service platform specifically developed for parties to proceedings.

Nevertheless, parties and their authorised representatives may access and consult the materials of their own cases within the system, subject to authentication and access rights. Parties are also entitled to communicate with the court electronically, including the submission of digitally signed procedural documents. Notifications and procedural documents may be served through electronic channels, such as the official electronic address system. Court fees may be paid via online banking.

6. Do these digital services guarantee an adequate level of accessibility for people with disabilities?

☐ 0–20%

☐ 20–40%

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ 40–65%

☐ 60–80%

✓80 - 100%

While digital services are widely available, the system maintains parallel non digital access mechanisms in order to safeguard inclusiveness and ensure that individuals are not excluded from proceedings due to limited digital capacity or accessibility constraints.

Where necessary, parties may consult case materials on court premises, either in paper form, where available, or electronically using court provided resources. Court decisions that have been prepared and electronically signed may be issued to the parties in paper form as certified copies (extracts). Procedural documents may be submitted by post or in person at the court registry. Court fees may also be paid on site where required.

7. Are lawyers involved in the design, development and implementation of digital platforms and tools intended for their use?
If so, please specify the terms of this involvement.

There is currently no unified large scale digital platform in Latvia specifically designed for lawyers as external users of the court system. The judicial information system is primarily intended to support the internal functioning of the courts, although certain functionalities are accessible to parties and their representatives, for example, parties and their authorised representatives may access and consult the materials of their own cases within the system.

The development and implementation of judicial digital systems are mainly managed by the competent state authorities responsible for judicial administration and information technology. In the course of developing and introducing such systems, judges and court staff may be involved, for example through working groups or consultations in order to ensure that the systems correspond to the practical needs of the courts. However, lawyers as external users of the court system are not involved on a systematic decision-making basis in the design of such systems.

8. Are there any support and training measures in place for users outside the court system (lawyers, members of the public, government agencies) regarding the use of the digital tools available to them?
☐ YES
✓ NO

If so, please specify which ones

A.III – Security of information systems and data protection

A.III.1 – Compliance with the regulatory framework

9. Do your jurisdiction's information systems comply with European and national standards on security, data protection and digital preservation?

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Agree only slightly
☐ Indifferent
☐ Somewhat agree
✓ Strongly agree

Please explain if necessary:

The information systems used by the Latvian administrative courts comply with applicable national and European Union frameworks on data protection, cybersecurity and electronic document management. This includes Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation), Directive (EU) 2022/2555 on measures for a high common level of cybersecurity across the Union, as well as the Latvian Information Technology Security Law, the Personal Data Processing Law and the Electronic Documents Law. Judicial systems operate within secure state managed infrastructure and are subject to established cybersecurity, authentication and access control requirements. Electronic documents are managed in accordance with national rules ensuring their integrity, authenticity and long term preservation.

A.III.2 – Incident management and business continuity

10. Are IT security incidents dealt with promptly and effectively?
☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
✓ Frequently
☐ Always

11. Are business continuity and disaster recovery plans regularly updated and tested?

☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
☐ Frequently
✓ Always

A.III.3 – Publicity and dissemination of court decisions

12. Are court decisions available online in their entirety?

☐ Never
☐ Rarely (only for the most significant decisions)
☐ Occasionally
✓ Frequently
☐ Always

Co-funded by the European Union

Please add any additional information and explain if necessary:

All final rulings of the Supreme Court are published in anonymised form in the *elieta* portal. In addition, judgments of the Supreme Court that concern matters of essential public interest, significant legal issues or that are important for the development of case law are published in the case law database on the website of the Supreme Court. In many such cases, press releases are also prepared. Furthermore, court rulings are also available through the national legislation database likumi.lv, where relevant judgments are linked to specific provisions of legal acts. Decisions are published in compliance with data protection requirements and are therefore anonymised. Judgments containing legally protected information are not subject to publication.

13. Where a system for publishing decisions online is in place, is there an internal policy to ensure the protection of personal data and respect for the right to be forgotten?

☐ No
☐ No formalised policy; anonymisation is carried out by the registry services on a case-by-case basis
☐ No formalised policy; anonymisation is decided on a case-by-case basis on the instructions of judges
✓ Yes, personal data are systematically anonymised
☐ Yes, personal data are anonymised in accordance with an internal policy providing for targeted exceptions
☐ Other (please specify)

A.IV – Training and digital skills

14. Does your jurisdiction offer structured and regularly updated digital technology training courses for judges and staff?

If so, please specify which ones.

Structured and regularly updated digital technology training is provided to judges and court staff. The Supreme Court has organised a range of targeted training activities aimed at strengthening digital competence, cybersecurity awareness and the effective use of information technologies in judicial work. Training topics have included, inter alia: • Good practice in everyday computer use within courts and law enforcement institutions;

Co-funded by the European Union

- Effective use of Microsoft Office tools, including Word and Excel;
- Use of electronic documents, including mechanisms for ensuring authenticity and reliability, as well as the legal aspects of electronic document circulation and electronically signed documents;
- Fundamentals of information security and practical cyber hygiene for everyday users;
- Data protection requirements;
- Safe digital working environments;
- Use of internet technologies in professional practice;
- Recognition of misinformation and manipulation in the digital environment;
- Artificial intelligence in judicial work.

These training activities are organised within the broader framework of professional development and are updated in line with technological developments and evolving digital risks.

A.V – Involvement of judges in digital transformation

15. To what extent are judges involved in decision-making and design processes relating to technological innovation and digital transformation in the judiciary? If applicable, please provide details.

The development and implementation of digital solutions within the judiciary are generally coordinated by the competent judicial administration authorities and institutions responsible for information technology. However, judges may participate in working groups, where such groups have been established, or otherwise be involved in the development and implementation of digital solutions in a consultative capacity, providing proposals and assessing the impact of planned solutions on judicial proceedings. In addition, broader strategic issues concerning the development of the judicial system, including digital transformation initiatives, may be considered within the framework of the Judicial Council.

In practice, judicial input is typically provided in relation to functional requirements, procedural implications and the impact of technological solutions on adjudication and judicial independence, rather than on purely technical design aspects. Accordingly, judges are involved mainly at the level of consultation, functional specification and evaluation, rather than direct system development.

A.VI – Use of AI systems in administrative justice

A.VI.1 – Tools and level of deployment

16. Are artificial intelligence systems currently used to assist in judicial or administrative activities?

Co-funded by the European Union

At present, artificial intelligence systems are not widely implemented in judicial decision-making in Latvia.

However, certain automated processes and digital tools are already used in support functions. For example, the anonymisation of court decisions prior to publication is carried out using automated tools in order to ensure compliance with data protection requirements. In addition, digital tools are used to support case management, document processing and data exchange; these systems function primarily as information management and workflow tools rather than as artificial intelligence systems assisting in adjudication.

At the same time, the Supreme Court uses certain artificial intelligence and online tools in its work in accordance with external and internal rules governing their use. These tools may be used for supportive tasks, such as information retrieval, structuring of materials or other auxiliary functions, while their use for drafting judicial decisions or other documents capable of producing legal effects is not permitted.

In addition, the Supreme Court is currently developing a specialised artificial intelligence tool intended to operate within the Court's digital knowledge-sharing platform. The tool will assist judges and legal staff in identifying relevant case law and other materials contained in internal databases, thereby facilitating legal research and improving efficiency.

Overall, artificial intelligence tools are used only as supportive instruments, while judicial decision-making remains entirely under human responsibility and control.

16a. If so, which ones are used? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ Chatbots

✓ Semantic search tools

✓ Automated anonymisation of decisions

✓ Text analysis and assistance with legal research

✓ Tools to assist with organisation and court management

✓ Other (please specify)

The Supreme Court subscribes to and uses certain artificial intelligence and online tools, such as DeepL Translator and DeepL Write, the natural language processing model ChatGPT, the speech recognition tool Tilde, and the transcription and subtitling tool Happy Scribe. These tools are used for supportive tasks, including translation of materials, preparation and structuring of written texts, speech recognition, transcription of audio recordings and similar auxiliary functions. Their use is limited to technical or organisational support and does not extend to drafting judicial decisions, legal opinions or other documents capable of producing legal effects.

16b. Overall level of internal deployment of AI systems:

☐ Occasional or isolated use
☐ Trial phase

Co-funded by the European Union

✓ Development phase
☐ Widespread use
☐ Full integration

Please explain if necessary:

See answer to question 16.

A.VII – Governance, regulation and ethical framework for AI

A.VII.1 – Internal guidelines and regulatory compliance

17. Has your jurisdiction adopted any internal guidelines, charters or policies governing the use of AI systems, in particular in application of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), the GDPR and other relevant European instruments?

✓ YES

☐ NO

If so, please specify which ones.

At the institutional level, the Supreme Court of Latvia has adopted internal rules governing the use of artificial intelligence and other online tools. These rules were adopted in August 2025 and entered into force on 1 September 2025. They establish the framework for the use of such tools within the Court, including the principles governing their use and the rights and responsibilities of users. The rules were developed in line with Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), the General Data Protection Regulation and other applicable legal provisions. They require users to ensure the protection of personal data and other restricted information, to critically verify the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated content, and to indicate the use of such tools where they have been used in the preparation of materials. The rules allow the use of artificial intelligence tools only for supportive tasks, such as information retrieval, translation, transcription or structuring of materials, while prohibiting their use for drafting judicial decisions, legal opinions or other documents capable of producing legal effects. Judicial decision-making remains entirely under human responsibility and control.

18. Are AI systems subject to prior risk assessments?

✓ YES

☐ NO

If so, please specify the terms of these assessments

The use of artificial intelligence and online tools within the judiciary is subject to risk-related safeguards arising from applicable European Union and national legislation, including Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation), and national rules on information security and the protection of restricted

Co-funded by the European Union

information. These legal frameworks require that risks related to data protection, confidentiality, reliability and security be assessed when digital tools are used in institutional activities.

At the institutional level, the Supreme Court has adopted internal rules governing the use of artificial intelligence and other online tools. These rules summarise and operationalise the requirements arising from the applicable legal framework and establish practical safeguards for their use.

In particular, users are required to assess potential risks related to the processing of personal data and restricted information, ensure pseudonymisation or anonymisation of data before entering information into online tools, and critically verify the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated content. The rules also limit the use of AI tools to supportive tasks and prohibit their use for drafting judicial decisions or other documents capable of producing legal effects.

19. Are there specific requirements in terms of transparency for the use of AI systems? If so, please provide details.

Transparency requirements for the use of artificial intelligence systems arise from the applicable European Union and national legal framework, including Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation), and national rules governing information security and the handling of restricted information. These frameworks require that the use of digital tools in institutional activities be transparent, accountable and subject to appropriate safeguards.

At the institutional level, the rules adopted by the Supreme Court require users to indicate when such tools have been used in the preparation of materials, except where they are used only for purely technical tasks, such as formatting. Users are also required to critically verify the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated content and its sources.

In addition, the rules limit the use of artificial intelligence tools to supportive functions and prohibit their use for drafting judicial decisions or other documents capable of producing legal effects. These measures are intended to ensure transparency, accountability and human oversight in the use of artificial intelligence within judicial activities.

20. Is the use of AI systems accompanied by human oversight mechanisms?

✓ YES

☐ NO

If so, please provide details

The use of artificial intelligence and online tools within the judiciary is subject to human oversight. Judicial decision-making remains entirely under the responsibility and control of judges.

In accordance with the applicable legal framework and the internal rules adopted by the Supreme Court, users are required to critically assess and verify the content generated by

Co-funded by the European Union

artificial intelligence tools, including checking the accuracy of information and the reliability of sources. AI tools may only be used for supportive tasks, such as information retrieval, translation, transcription or structuring of materials.

The use of such tools for drafting judicial decisions, legal opinions or other documents capable of producing legal effects is expressly prohibited. As a result, artificial intelligence tools may support certain preparatory or administrative tasks, but the assessment of facts, interpretation of the law and the adoption of judicial decisions remain exclusively within human responsibility.

21. Are specific methodologies implemented during the design, development and deployment of AI systems to ensure their traceability, reliability, integrity and accuracy? If so, please provide details.

The design, development and deployment of artificial intelligence systems within the judiciary are expected to comply with applicable European and national legal frameworks, including Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), as well as data protection and information security requirements. These frameworks establish general requirements relating to reliability, accountability, traceability and human oversight when digital technologies are introduced into institutional activities.

In relation to the artificial intelligence tool currently under development at the Supreme Court, a dedicated working group has been established. This working group includes, inter alia, judges and court staff, who provide functional input and advise on the practical needs of the Court. Their involvement helps ensure that the system is designed in a manner consistent with judicial requirements, procedural safeguards and practical working needs.

A.VIII – Innovation, prospects and future needs

A.VIII.1 – Current innovation projects

22. Are there any innovation projects currently under way in the following areas? (please tick all that apply)

✓ Process automation
✓ System interoperability
✓ Modernisation of existing systems
✓ Advanced digital services for external users
✓ AI systems
☐ Other (please specify)

As previously mentioned, several innovation projects are currently under way within the Latvian judiciary.

The development and implementation of the e-case platform constitute a major modernisation initiative aimed at transitioning administrative proceedings to a fully electronic case management environment. This reform includes further automation of

Co-funded by the European Union

procedural workflows, improved interoperability with other state information systems and enhanced digital access to case materials.

In addition, the Supreme Court is developing an artificial intelligence tool intended to support legal research within its internal digital knowledge-sharing platform. The tool is designed to assist judges and court staff in identifying relevant case law and materials contained in internal databases, thereby improving efficiency. The system is conceived as a supportive instrument operating under full human oversight.

A.VIII.2 – Barriers to digital transformation

23 What do you consider to be the main barriers to the digital transformation of administrative justice? (please tick all that apply)

☐ Complexity of the regulatory framework
✓ Insufficient financial resources
☐ Lack of specialised human resources
✓ Organisational complexity
✓ Resistance to change and digital skills gap
✓ Cybersecurity risks and challenges
☐ Other (please specify)

The digital transformation of administrative justice involves organisational and financial challenges.

The transition to a fully electronic case management system requires substantial financial investment, long-term planning and continuous technological maintenance. Organisational complexity, including the need to adapt established procedural practices and coordinate between courts and other public institutions, may slow the pace of reform. As with any structural transformation, resistance to change and varying levels of digital competence among users must also be addressed through training and capacity-building measures. Furthermore, cybersecurity risks and the protection of sensitive judicial data require continuous attention and investment, particularly in light of evolving technological threats.

A.VIII.3 – Investment priorities

24. What do you think should be the priority areas for investment over the next few years? (please tick all that apply)

✓ Modernisation of infrastructure
✓ Cybersecurity
✓ Training and skills development
✓ Deployment of AI systems
✓ Interoperability at European level
✓ Complete digitalisation of administrative procedures
☐ Other (please specify)

Co-funded by the European Union

Priority investment areas over the coming years should include the continued modernisation of judicial IT infrastructure and the full implementation of electronic case management through the e-case platform. Ensuring robust cybersecurity safeguards will remain essential, given the sensitivity of judicial data and evolving technological risks.

Investment in training and digital skills development for judges and court staff is equally important to ensure effective use of new technologies. The gradual deployment of carefully designed AI systems, particularly as supportive research tools, should be accompanied by appropriate governance and oversight mechanisms.

Finally, strengthening interoperability, including at European level where applicable, will be important to facilitate efficient cross-border cooperation and data exchange within the European Union framework.

25. Please describe one or more good practices in digitalisation that have been implemented or are planned within your jurisdiction.

One significant good practice in the digital transformation of administrative justice in Latvia is the development and phased implementation of the e-case platform. This reform aims to enable a full transition to electronic case management in administrative proceedings in the near future. The platform is designed to ensure a unified digital environment for case handling, reduce reliance on paper-based processes and improve efficiency, transparency and data exchange within the judicial system.

Another positive development is the gradual integration of electronic communication tools, including the use of the official electronic address system for communication with legal entities and the possibility for parties to access case materials electronically through the judicial information system. These measures enhance accessibility and procedural efficiency.

In addition, the Supreme Court is developing an artificial intelligence based research support tool intended to assist judges and legal staff in identifying relevant case law and materials within internal databases. The tool is conceived as a supportive instrument operating under full human oversight, thereby combining technological innovation with the preservation of judicial independence and responsibility.

Part B

Automated administrative decisions and judicial review

B.I – Automated administrative decisions: substantive legality and procedure

1. Are there provisions in your legal system that authorise public administrations to use digital or algorithmic technologies in the exercise of their powers?

✓ YES

☐ NO

Co-funded by the European Union

Latvian law allows the use of automated or algorithmic technologies by public administrations only where such use is expressly authorised by statute. In addition, since administrative decisions are normally required to bear a signature in order to have legal force, fully automated decisions, that is, decisions adopted without any signature, are permitted only in cases where the law explicitly provides for such an exception. Such statutory provisions exist in Latvian law, although they are relatively rare. The main recognised examples include:

- Electronic preparation of immovable property tax payment notices, which may be generated within information systems without an official's signature, where the amount payable results automatically from statutory criteria and registered property data.
- Decisions of the State Revenue Service adopted within information systems, including in certain instances involving data profiling. For example, automated favourable decisions may be issued concerning personal income tax refunds where the relevant data are complete and no evaluative assessment is required.
- Administrative fines in road traffic cases where offences are recorded by technical devices such as speed cameras. In these cases, a fixed statutory fine is imposed without discretion. However, this example is provided for illustrative purposes only, as administrative offence proceedings in Latvia do not fall within the jurisdiction of administrative courts.

If so:

1.a. According to these provisions, what are the authorised tools and the objectives pursued by their use?

The authorised tools are primarily automated information systems operating on the basis of predefined legal criteria and structured data processing. Automated systems are used mainly where decisions depend exclusively on objective data available in information systems.

The objectives pursued by these tools are to increase administrative efficiency, accelerate high-volume standardised procedures, reduce administrative workload and ensure consistent application of clear and mandatory legal norms.

1.b. What types of acts can be adopted using these technologies?
In particular, is the use of algorithms permitted for the adoption of administrative decisions involving discretionary powers?

At present, no automated or algorithmic systems are used to adopt administrative decisions involving discretionary powers. Such technologies are applied only in cases where the legal norm does not permit value assessments or balancing of interests, and where the outcome is determined solely by statutory criteria and objective data available in information systems.

Co-funded by the European Union

2. Are there provisions in your legal system governing the design, deployment and use of artificial intelligence systems employed by public administrations?

☐ YES

✓ NO

Latvia has not adopted a comprehensive legal framework specifically regulating the design, deployment and use of artificial intelligence systems in public administration. AI-related activities are governed indirectly through general legislation, including data protection law, sector-specific statutes and rules concerning the legal force of documents and information security.

At the same time, the future development and use of artificial intelligence systems will be subject to Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), which establishes harmonised rules for the development, deployment and use of artificial intelligence systems within the European Union. Accordingly, public authorities will be required to comply with the principles and safeguards laid down in this regulation.

If so,

2.a. what type of implementation measures are these? (for example, legislative or soft law):

There is no dedicated AI-specific statute or comprehensive soft law framework governing artificial intelligence in public administration. The existing regulation consists mainly of general legislative provisions, including data protection law, sector-specific legislation and rules on information security.

At the same time, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act) establishes a harmonised legal framework for artificial intelligence at the European Union level and will apply directly to the development, deployment and use of AI systems by public authorities.

2.b. Is there an obligation for public administrations to inform the public or individuals about the use of AI systems?

There is no general obligation under Latvian law requiring public administrations to inform the public about the use of artificial intelligence systems as such. However, under data protection legislation, individuals must be informed about the existence of automated decision-making, including meaningful information about the logic involved and the envisaged consequences of such processing (Articles 13(2)(f) and 14(2)(g) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679).

2.c. Are any authorities or bodies responsible for developing general rules or standards for the use of artificial intelligence within public administrations?

At present, no specialised national authority is responsible for developing general rules or standards governing the use of artificial intelligence in public administration. However, this

Co-funded by the European Union

does not remove the responsibility of public authorities to ensure that the use of artificial intelligence tools within their activities complies with applicable legal requirements, including data protection, information security and administrative law principles. In practice, public authorities may develop internal rules or guidelines governing the use of artificial intelligence and other digital tools within their respective institutions.

3. What conditions must be met to ensure the legality of administrative procedures involving the use of artificial intelligence systems?

First, the use of automated decision-making must be expressly authorised by law. Secondly, such use must comply with data protection requirements, in particular with Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Where applicable, appropriate safeguards must be in place, including the right to contest the decision before a competent authority or court.

Furthermore, automated systems may be used only in situations where the legal norm does not involve discretionary assessment.

If artificial intelligence tools are used only in a supportive or assistive capacity in administrative activities or in the preparation of decisions, their use remains subject to all applicable legal requirements, including the general rules governing administrative procedures and decision-making.

In any event, all decisions, regardless of whether artificial intelligence tools were used in their adoption, must comply with all applicable legal requirements.

In particular:

3.a. Is the decision-making administration required to indicate the type of algorithmic system used and its principal characteristics?

There is no general obligation under Latvian law requiring the administration to indicate the specific type of algorithmic or artificial intelligence system used or to disclose its technical characteristics.

However, under Articles 13(2)(f) and 14(2)(g) of the General Data Protection Regulation, individuals must be informed about the existence of automated decision-making.

3.b. At what stage of the procedure must the administration provide information about the use of an algorithmic system and its characteristics?

Under the General Data Protection Regulation, information about automated decision-making must be provided at the time personal data are collected (Article 13) or, where data are not obtained directly from the individual, within the timeframe specified in Article 14.

In administrative proceedings, information about the use of automated decision-making is usually indicated directly in the administrative decision itself, especially where sector-specific legislation requires such an indication.

Co-funded by the European Union

3.c. Does the interested party have the opportunity to comment on or challenge the use or operation of the AI system before the final decision is made?

Latvian law does not provide a specific procedural mechanism allowing an interested party to challenge the use of an AI or automated system as such prior to the adoption of a decision. Legal safeguards are ensured through the general system of administrative review and judicial protection.

4. Are specific areas of administrative law in your country subject to express authorisation for the use of administrative decisions based on artificial intelligence systems?

At present, Latvian law does not contain express authorisation for the use of administrative decisions based specifically on artificial intelligence systems as such. Existing legislation allows the use of automated decision-making only in narrowly defined situations and only where explicitly provided by law. If the question concerns not fully automated decisions but the use of artificial intelligence tools merely in a supportive or assistive capacity in administrative activities or in the preparation of decisions, Latvian law does not identify any specific area of administrative law in which such use is expressly authorised. In general, the use of such tools for auxiliary purposes is not prohibited. However, any administrative activity in which artificial intelligence tools are used must comply with all applicable legal requirements governing administrative procedures and decision-making.

5. Are there specific areas of administrative law in which the use of artificial intelligence systems for issuing administrative decisions is expressly prohibited?

In Latvia, the use of artificial intelligence or automated systems for issuing administrative decisions is permitted only where it is expressly and specifically authorised by law. In the absence of such explicit statutory authorisation, public authorities may not adopt decisions based solely on automated systems. Furthermore, under the current legal framework, the use of artificial intelligence systems is not permitted in cases involving discretionary powers. Automated decision-making is allowed only in situations where the applicable legal norm is clear and mandatory and does not require value assessments or the balancing of interests. Where artificial intelligence tools are used merely in a supportive or assistive capacity in administrative activities or in the preparation of decisions, Latvian law does not identify specific areas in which such use is expressly prohibited. However, any such use remains subject to all applicable legal requirements governing administrative procedures and decision-making.

Co-funded by the European Union

B.II – Judicial review of automated administrative decisions

6. Does national case-law recognise the legality of automated administrative decisions?

☐ YES

✓ NO

Please explain if necessary:

At present, there are no known cases in Latvian judicial practice in which the legality of automated administrative decisions, as such, has been directly examined by the courts. While courts have reviewed administrative decisions adopted within information systems, there is no established body of case-law specifically analysing the legal status of fully automated or artificial intelligence-based decision-making. Accordingly, the permissibility of automated administrative decisions derives primarily from statutory provisions rather than from developed judicial doctrine on this matter. It should also be noted that, in those areas where automated administrative decisions are provided for by law, individuals generally have the right to challenge such decisions before a higher administrative authority. In such review procedures the decision is reassessed by a human official. Only after this administrative review may the matter be brought before a court.

If so:

6.a. What principles and conditions have been identified by national case-law as necessary for these decisions to be legally valid?

At present, Latvian case-law has not developed specific principles or conditions concerning the legality of automated administrative decisions as such. The legality of such decisions is therefore assessed on the basis of general administrative law principles. Accordingly, any automated administrative decision would need to comply with the general requirements applicable to administrative acts, including competence, lawful basis, procedural fairness and the possibility of contestation and appeal.

6.b. Have any limitations been identified with regard to the possibility of delegating the administration's decision-making power to algorithmic systems?

At present, Latvian case-law has not expressly developed a doctrine concerning the delegation of decision-making powers to algorithmic systems. However, under the general principles of administrative law, public authorities may exercise only those powers that are conferred upon them by law, and such powers must be exercised by the competent authority. Decision-making competence cannot be transferred or delegated to a technical system unless this is expressly authorised by statute.

Co-funded by the European Union

In practice, automated systems may be used only as technical tools for implementing clearly defined statutory criteria. Where the exercise of discretion, value assessment or balancing of interests is required, the decision must be taken by a human official. Accordingly, while algorithmic systems may support administrative activity, the administration's decision-making power cannot be delegated to them in the absence of explicit legal authorisation, and it remains subject to human responsibility and judicial review.

6.c. In particular, which of the following principles must be respected, according to national case-law, when adopting an automated administrative decision? (Please tick all that apply)

✓ Principle of transparency
✓ Principle of non-exclusivity of human intervention ('human in the loop')
✓ Principle of non-discrimination
☐ Principle of knowledge and comprehensibility of algorithmic functioning
✓ Principle of attributing the decision to an authority vested with power
✓ Other (please specify)

Latvian case-law has not developed specific principles applicable exclusively to automated administrative decisions. However, any such decision must comply with all general principles governing administrative acts.

These include, inter alia, the principles of legality, proportionality, equality, legitimate expectations and good administration. Automated decision-making does not exempt the administration from observing procedural fairness or ensuring that the decision is attributable to a competent authority and subject to effective review.

7. Has national case-law ruled on the nature and legal classification of the algorithm or AI system used for administrative decision-making?

At present, Latvian case-law has not ruled specifically on the nature or legal classification of an algorithm or artificial intelligence system used for administrative decision-making.

8. What are the limits of the judicial review that administrative judges can exercise over automated administrative decisions?

There is no specific statutory regulation or developed case-law in Latvia defining particular limits of judicial review in relation to automated administrative decisions. Accordingly, such decisions are subject to the general framework of judicial review applicable to all administrative acts.

In practice, automated administrative decisions may only be adopted in situations where the administrative authority does not exercise discretionary powers, but applies clearly defined legal criteria on the basis of data available in information systems. As a result, the court is able to carry out full judicial review of such decisions, including verification of the factual

Co-funded by the European Union

basis, the correctness of the data used and the proper application of the relevant legal provisions.

9. According to national case-law, is the right of access to the algorithmic process that led to the automated administrative decision recognised?

☐ YES
✓ NO

At present, Latvian administrative courts have not ruled on the existence of a specific right of access to the algorithmic process underlying an automated administrative decision.

However, under general administrative law principles, an administrative decision must be reasoned, and the individual concerned must be provided with sufficient information to understand the legal and factual grounds of the decision and to effectively exercise the right to contest it. In addition, data protection legislation requires that individuals be informed about the existence of automated decision-making and provided with meaningful information about the logic involved.

If so:
9.a. What information relating to the AI system (data, logic, key parameters) must be made available to the party concerned?

Part C

Administrative judges and the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions and in the decision-making process, in light of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the 'AI Act') and other European Union standards and regulations, such as the GDPR, the DSA, the DMA, etc.

1. Does your country recognise, at constitutional level, principles that expressly refer to the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions?

☐ YES

✓ NO

If so, please specify which ones

The Latvian Constitution does not contain any provisions expressly referring to the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions.

2. Has your country adopted or is it in the process of adopting national measures to implement Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act) concerning the use of artificial intelligence to support judicial decision-making, which is classified as a 'high-risk' activity (Annex III, point 8(a))?

Co-funded by the European Union

✓ YES

☐ NO

If so:

2.a. What is the nature of these measures (legislative, regulatory, guidelines, soft-law instruments)?

At present, Latvia has not adopted specific national measures expressly dedicated to implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act) in relation to the use of artificial intelligence to support judicial decision-making.

At the same time, the future development and use of artificial intelligence systems within the judiciary will be subject to Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), which establishes harmonised requirements for high-risk AI systems at the European Union level. Public authorities will therefore be required to comply with the principles and safeguards laid down in that regulation.

However, at the institutional level, the Supreme Court in August 2025 adopted internal rules on the use of artificial intelligence and online tools. These rules were developed in line with the requirements of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), as well as with applicable data protection legislation and other relevant legal provisions. The document establishes the framework for the use of artificial intelligence and other online tools within the Supreme Court, including the principles governing their use, as well as the rights and obligations of users. Its purpose is to ensure that such tools are used in a secure, ethical and legally compliant manner. The rules are binding on all judges and staff of the Supreme Court.

This and the following responses primarily reflects the practice of the Supreme Court. At the same time, all courts are required to comply with applicable legal provisions governing the use of artificial intelligence and digital tools in their activities. These include, inter alia, Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the Information Technology Security Law, the Personal Data Processing Law, and other national regulations concerning information security, data protection and the processing of official documents. These legal frameworks ensure that the use of digital tools within the judiciary complies with requirements relating to data protection, cybersecurity, transparency and accountability.

2.b. For what purposes is the use of AI permitted? (Please tick all that apply)

✓ Research and interpretation of the law

☐ Research and assessment of the facts

☐ Application of the law to a specific factual situation

✓ Administrative activities that are purely ancillary (recital 61 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)

Co-funded by the European Union

Please explain if necessary:

The internal rules adopted by the Supreme Court permit the use of artificial intelligence and other online tools primarily for supportive and ancillary purposes. These include searching for and processing information and sources, structuring and formatting content, preparing presentations and correspondence, as well as transcription and translation. AI tools may also be used for administrative support tasks that do not have a direct impact on judicial proceedings.

At the same time, the rules explicitly prohibit the use of such tools for drafting judicial decisions or legal opinions that may produce legal effects, as well as for analysing or interpreting facts or legal norms, or applying the law to a specific set of facts without human assessment. The use of AI tools for processing personal data or other restricted information is also prohibited unless appropriate data protection safeguards are ensured.

2.c. What measures are taken to ensure human oversight (Article 14 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)? In particular, under what conditions is the user able to ignore, cancel or override the result produced by the artificial intelligence system (Article 14(4)(d) of the AI Act), or to suspend or interrupt its use (Article 14(4)(d) of the AI Act)?

Human oversight over the use of artificial intelligence tools within the Supreme Court is ensured through a combination of organisational rules and user responsibilities. The internal procedure adopted by the Supreme Court requires that AI tools be used only as supportive instruments and always under human supervision. Users remain fully responsible for the content produced with the assistance of such tools and must critically evaluate and verify the generated information before using it.

The rules explicitly prohibit the use of AI tools for drafting judicial decisions, legal opinions or other documents capable of producing legal effects, as well as for analysing or interpreting facts or legal norms or applying the law to a specific set of facts without human assessment.

Users are required to verify the accuracy of the output generated by AI tools, identify potential errors, bias or distortions and assess the reliability of the sources on which the generated content is based. Where necessary, users may disregard or modify the output produced by the AI system and rely on their own professional judgment.

Furthermore, access to AI tools is centrally managed by the Court's Information Technology Department, which monitors their use and may intervene in cases of improper use. Training and guidance are also provided to ensure responsible and secure use of such tools.

These measures ensure that AI tools function strictly as auxiliary instruments and that the final assessment, control and responsibility remain with the human user.

2.d. What regulatory measures have been adopted to ensure the transparency, accuracy and robustness of the artificial intelligence system used (Articles 13 and 15 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 – the AI Act)?

Co-funded by the European Union

To ensure transparency, accuracy and robustness in the use of artificial intelligence tools, the Supreme Court as well as other courts operates within the framework of applicable European Union and national legislation, including Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation), and national legal provisions governing information security, personal data protection and the processing of official documents.

These legal frameworks establish general requirements relating to transparency, accountability, reliability of automated systems, protection of personal data and human oversight in the use of digital technologies within public institutions.

At the institutional level, the Supreme Court has adopted internal rules governing the use of artificial intelligence and other online tools. These rules summarise and operationalise the requirements arising from the applicable legal framework and establish practical guidance for judges and court staff.

The rules require users to critically assess and verify the content generated by AI tools, including checking the accuracy of information and identifying potential errors, biases or distortions. Transparency is ensured through the obligation to indicate the use of AI tools when they have been employed in the preparation of materials, except where such tools are used only for purely technical tasks.

The rules also limit the use of AI tools to supportive functions, such as information retrieval, content structuring, transcription or translation, and prohibit their use for drafting judicial decisions or legal opinions capable of producing legal effects. In addition, users must ensure the protection of personal data and other restricted information, including anonymisation or pseudonymisation where necessary.

Together, these legal and organisational safeguards are intended to ensure that artificial intelligence tools are used in a transparent, accurate and secure manner, while maintaining full human responsibility for the final outcome.

3. Are there any official forms of testing or use of artificial intelligence systems for decision-making or generating judicial decisions currently in place in your country?

☐ YES

✓ NO

Please explain if necessary:

At present, there are no official projects in Latvia involving the testing or operational use of artificial intelligence systems for judicial decision-making or for generating judicial decisions.

If so:

Co-funded by the European Union

3.a What do they consist of?

3.b. What data sets are used?

3.c. Is the software used publicly owned or provided by private operators?

3.d. Have any biases been identified in its operation? If so, what kind?

4. Are measures planned in your country to ensure a sufficient level of artificial intelligence literacy specifically for judges (Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)?

✓ YES

☐ NO

If so:

4.a. What do these measures consist of?

Measures are being taken within the Latvian judiciary to strengthen artificial intelligence literacy among judges. In particular, training activities and seminars are organised to familiarise judges and court staff with the functioning, capabilities and risks of artificial intelligence and other digital tools.

Co-funded by the European Union

The internal rules adopted by the Supreme Court on the use of artificial intelligence and online tools also provide for the organisation of seminars and informational materials on the responsible and secure use of such tools.

Although there is currently no comprehensive national programme dedicated specifically to AI literacy for judges, training and awareness-raising activities are being gradually developed within the framework of the judiciary's ongoing digital transformation.

4.b. Is specific training planned to prevent or limit the phenomenon known as 'automation bias' (Article 14(4)(b) of the AI Act)?

✓ YES

☐ NO

Please explain if necessary:

Measures aimed at preventing excessive reliance on artificial intelligence tools, including the risk commonly referred to as "automation bias", are addressed through training and internal guidelines within the judiciary. Judges and court staff receive training and informational materials concerning the responsible use of artificial intelligence and other online tools, including their limitations and associated risks.

The internal rules adopted by the Supreme Court emphasise that users must critically assess the content generated by AI tools, verify the accuracy of the information produced and independently evaluate the results. These requirements are intended to ensure that AI-generated outputs are not accepted uncritically and that human judgment remains decisive in all professional activities.

5. Is the use of generative or agentic artificial intelligence systems permitted in your country to assist in the drafting of procedural documents or court decisions?

To help you understand the question better: **generative artificial intelligence (AI)** is a category of AI models which, thanks to machine learning and training on vast amounts of data, are capable of creating original content (text, images, videos, music, etc.). **Agentic AI** is described as a system capable of autonomously planning, making decisions and executing complex tasks with minimal human intervention to achieve a defined objective [source: OECD].

At present, the use of generative or agentic artificial intelligence systems for drafting procedural documents or court decisions is not permitted within the Latvian judiciary. AI tools may be used only for supportive tasks, such as information retrieval, content structuring, translation, transcription and other ancillary administrative activities.

Also the internal rules adopted by the Supreme Court explicitly prohibit the use of AI tools for drafting judicial decisions, legal opinions or other documents capable of producing legal effects.

Co-funded by the European Union

6. Has the national case law of your country addressed issues concerning the interpretation and application of EU Regulation 2024/1689?

☐ YES

✓ NO

Please explain if necessary:

At present, there is no national case-law in Latvia addressing the interpretation or application of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689.

6.a. If yes, which principles have been established?

7. Have national courts of your country submitted preliminary rulings to the Court of Justice of the European Union regarding EU Regulation 2024/1689?

☐ YES

✓ NO

Please explain if necessary:

At present, no national courts in Latvia have submitted requests for a preliminary ruling to the Court of Justice of the European Union concerning the interpretation or application of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689.

7.a. If yes, which questions were referred? What answers has the Court of Justice of the European Union provided?

Co-funded by the European Union