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 Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania (Please indicate your institution)

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

Co-funded by the European Union

A.I – Infrastructure and technological organisation

A.I.1 – Digital equipment and resources

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

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

Each worker has access to hardware and software that allows them to connect securely and continuously, wherever they are in the world. This equipment includes:
- – a notebook and(or) desktop computer;
- – a printer or multifunctional network device;
- – dual monitors (on request);
- – a digital signature dongle;
- – an institutional email account;
- – a client for accessing the VPN (Virtual Private Network) and systems;
- access to judicial and local legislation information systems.

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
X Somewhat agree
☐ Strongly agree

Please explain if necessary:
The technological infrastructure, is based on secure and private local architecture or government data centres. Every court has local support IT technician to accomplish high service level agreements (SLAs). State-of-the-art security solutions have yet to be implemented, while connectivity has been optimally scaled to meet the needs of each court.

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

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

☐ Not at all
X To a limited extent
☐ Moderately

Co-funded by the European Union

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

In accordance with the national data protection strategy and applicable regulations, only local private or government data centres are used.

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.

The high standard of IT equipment provided by the Court, combined with the use of advanced IT applications, allows work to be organised flexibly, based on the 'work anywhere' model.
Workers working remotely connect via VPN (Virtual Private Network) to systems using this private connection and web browser.
This solution offers centralised workflow management, direct access to files and decision archives, and the ability to draft, sign and deliver documents in a fully digital environment.
The limitations relate to the need for adequate digital authentication and connectivity, as well as compliance with the security measures normally required for access to institutional systems.

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 cases system ensures a high level of interoperability with key national platforms – such as the Registrų Centras (Register Center), Infolex system for legislation and local practise, Tax collection system and some others. There is no specific interoperability with international systems.

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
X Yes, on a fully integrated basis
Please explain if necessary:

Co-funded by the European Union

Lithuania has an advanced and largely integrated system for the dematerialisation of judicial proceedings through the Lithuanian Court Information System (LITEKO) and its public electronic services portal e.teismas.lt, which has been operating since 2013.
Through this portal, parties to proceedings (including in administrative cases) may:

- Submit procedural documents electronically using standardised forms;
- Receive court notifications and procedural information electronically;
- Access case files and procedural documents online;
- Pay court fees and fines electronically;
- Follow the progress of proceedings and access hearing records.

Electronic submission of documents through the LITEKO public services subsystem (e.teismas.lt) is a legally recognised means of filing procedural documents with Lithuanian courts, and documents submitted electronically have the same legal effect as those submitted in paper form.
Administrative courts also accept complaints and appeals through this electronic portal, alongside traditional methods such as filing in person or by post.
Therefore, judicial administrative proceedings in Lithuania are largely dematerialised and supported by an integrated national electronic court services system, although paper-based submission remains legally possible as an alternative channel.

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
X Frequently
☐ Always

Please explain if necessary:

Judges and court staff in Lithuania usually process case materials and sign procedural documents electronically through the LITEKO system using qualified electronic signatures. However, paper submissions are still legally permitted under the Law on Administrative Proceedings, so documents are not processed exclusively in digital format in all cases.

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%

Co-funded by the European Union

There are no official statistics on the percentage of administrative court paper files created before the introduction of electronic proceedings that have been digitised. In Lithuania, the LITEKO court information system is used for electronic case management, but historical paper files have not been systematically digitised. Digitisation usually takes place only when older files are required for specific proceedings; therefore, it is difficult to determine the exact percentage.

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.

In Lithuania, digital services related to judicial proceedings, including administrative cases, are available through the Lithuanian Courts Electronic Services Portal (e.teismas.lt), which operates as part of the Lithuanian Court Information System (LITEKO).

These systems allow members of the public, lawyers and public authorities to use several electronic services, including:

- Electronic filing of procedural documents with courts;
- Access to electronic case files and procedural documents;
- Receiving court notifications and procedural information electronically;
- Submission of applications and other procedural requests using electronic forms;
- Electronic payment of court fees and fines.

The use of electronic services in court proceedings is regulated by Lithuanian procedural legislation, including the Law on Administrative Proceedings of the Republic of Lithuania, and by legal acts governing the functioning of the LITEKO court information system. Electronic documents submitted through the system and signed with a qualified electronic signature have the same legal effect as paper documents.

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

☐ 0–20%

☐ 20–40%

☐ 40–65%

☐ 60–80%

☐ 80 - 100%

Digital court services in Lithuania must comply with general legal requirements on accessibility of public sector websites and electronic services for persons with disabilities. However, there is no specific official data measuring the exact level of accessibility of judicial digital services. Therefore, accessibility can be considered partial but not fully ensured for all users with disabilities.

Co-funded by the European Union

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 no legal obligation requiring the involvement of lawyers in the design, development or implementation of judicial digital platforms. These systems are administered and developed by the National Courts Administration. Consultation with users, including lawyers, may occur in practice, but such involvement is not formally regulated by law.

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?
X YES
☐ NO

If so, please specify which ones

Guidance materials, user instructions and assistance for using electronic court services are available through the Lithuanian courts' websites and the e.teismas portal administered by the National Courts Administration. These materials are intended for lawyers, members of the public and public authorities using digital court services. Formal training programmes are not specifically regulated by law.

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?

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

Please explain if necessary:

All systems used are validated according to local cyber and data protection requirements, which automatically ensure compliance with GDPR, NIS2 and other standards and regulation. However, full compliance requires technical resources and capabilities that courts often lack, which is associated with the usage of redundant equipment, the installation of additional security tools and constant network monitoring. IT security incidents dealt according to national law in 72h.

A.III.2 – Incident management and business continuity

Co-funded by the European Union

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

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

☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
X 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
X Frequently
☐ Always

Please add any additional information and explain if necessary:

Many court decisions are published online in anonymised form through the LITEKO public database of court decisions. However, not all decisions are published, particularly in cases involving closed hearings or data protection restrictions.

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
X Yes, personal data are anonymised in accordance with an internal policy providing for targeted exceptions

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ 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.

Training for judges and court staff in Lithuania is organised within the judicial training system coordinated by the National Courts Administration of Lithuania. Training activities include the use of judicial information systems and digital tools used in court work, such as the Lithuanian Court Information System (LITEKO) and electronic court services.
These trainings are provided as part of professional training programmes and practical seminars for judges and court staff, particularly when new digital tools or updates to existing systems are introduced.

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.

Judges are involved indirectly through judicial self-governance institutions.
Under the Law on Courts of the Republic of Lithuania, matters relating to the organisation and administration of courts are considered within the judicial self-governance system, in particular by the Judicial Council of Lithuania, which is composed mainly of judges. Through this body, judges may participate in discussions and decisions concerning the functioning and development of the judicial system, including issues related to digitalisation.
The technical development and administration of judicial information systems, such as the Lithuanian Court Information System (LITEKO) and the Lithuanian Courts Electronic Services Portal (e.teismas.lt), are carried out by the National Courts Administration of Lithuania. Judges may provide input through the judicial governance framework, but there is no specific legal provision establishing a formal role for individual judges in the technical design of digital systems.

A.VI – Use of AI systems in administrative justice

Co-funded by the European Union

A.VI.1 – Tools and level of deployment

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

Lithuanian courts use digital information systems for case management and electronic services, such as the Lithuanian Court Information System (LITEKO), administered by the National Courts Administration of Lithuania. These systems support administrative and procedural functions (e.g., electronic filing, case management, and publication of decisions). However, artificial intelligence systems are not currently used to assist in judicial decision-making or administrative activities in courts.

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)

N/A

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

☐ Occasional or isolated use
☐ Trial phase
☐ Development phase
☐ Widespread use
☐ Full integration

Please explain if necessary:

N/A

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

A.VII.1 – Internal guidelines and regulatory compliance

Co-funded by the European Union

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?

X YES

☐ NO

If so, please specify which ones.

Internal guidance has been issued for court staff on the safe use of artificial intelligence tools, focusing on confidentiality, information security and compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and internal data protection rules in courts. The guidance emphasises that personal data, case materials and confidential information must not be entered into AI tools and that responsibility for the final result remains with the court employee.

18. Are AI systems subject to prior risk assessments?
☐ YES

NO

If so, please specify the terms of these assessments

N/A

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

N/A

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

☐ YES

☐ NO

If so, please provide details

N/A

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.

N/A

A.VIII – Innovation, prospects and future needs

A.VIII.1 – Current innovation projects

Co-funded by the European Union

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

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

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

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)

X Modernisation of infrastructure
X Cybersecurity
X Training and skills development
☐ Deployment of AI systems
X Interoperability at European level

Co-funded by the European Union

X Complete digitalisation of administrative procedures
☐ Other (please specify)

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

One notable good practice in the digitalisation of the Lithuanian judiciary is the implementation and continuous development of the Lithuanian Court Information System (LITEKO) and its public interface, the Lithuanian Courts Electronic Services Portal (e.teismas.lt).
These systems enable electronic communication between courts and users of the justice system, including members of the public, lawyers and public authorities. Through the portal, users can submit procedural documents electronically, receive notifications from courts, monitor the progress of their cases and access case-related information online.
The system also supports internal case management within courts and facilitates the publication of anonymised court decisions in a public database. The development and maintenance of these digital services are coordinated by the National Courts Administration of Lithuania.
This digital infrastructure contributes to improving accessibility, efficiency and transparency of judicial proceedings.

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?

X YES

☐ NO

If so:

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

Co-funded by the European Union

Lithuanian legislation allows public administrations to use state information systems, registers and electronic public service platforms in administrative procedures, as provided for in the Law on Public Administration of the Republic of Lithuania and the Law on State Information Resources Management of the Republic of Lithuania.
The main objectives are to improve efficiency of administrative procedures, facilitate electronic public services and ensure effective management and exchange of administrative data, in compliance with applicable data protection requirements, including the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

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?

Digital technologies and information systems may be used by public administrations in Lithuania for processing applications, managing administrative data and issuing administrative acts through electronic systems, as provided for in the Law on Public Administration of the Republic of Lithuania and the Law on State Information Resources Management of the Republic of Lithuania.
Lithuanian legislation does not contain specific provisions authorising the use of algorithms for adopting administrative decisions involving discretionary powers. Administrative authorities must exercise discretion in accordance with the principles of legality, proportionality and reasonableness.
Where personal data are processed, the safeguards established by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), including rules on automated decision-making, apply.

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

☐ YES

X ☐ NO (no specific national provisions)

If so,

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

Lithuanian legislation does not currently contain specific national provisions governing the design, deployment or use of artificial intelligence systems by public administrations. Public authorities may use digital information systems in administrative activities under the Law on Public Administration of the Republic of Lithuania and the

Co-funded by the European Union

Law on State Information Resources Management of the Republic of Lithuania, but these acts do not specifically regulate artificial intelligence systems.
Where AI systems involve the processing of personal data, general legal requirements apply, including those established by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). In addition, the Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (Artificial Intelligence Act) establishes an EU-level regulatory framework applicable in Member States.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

In particular:

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

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

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

Co-funded by the European Union

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

N/A

B.II – Judicial review of automated administrative decisions

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

X YES

☐ NO

Please explain if necessary:

Lithuanian law allows the use of automated tools in certain administrative procedures, although their role differs depending on the regulatory context.

In administrative offence proceedings, automated systems may lead to fully automated administrative decisions. For example, traffic offences detected by automated enforcement systems (such as speed cameras) may result in the automatic generation of an administrative offence protocol and an automated administrative order proposing the minimum statutory fine. Under Article 611 of the Code of Administrative Offences, an administrative offence protocol and administrative order may be automatically generated in the Administrative Offences Register on the basis of data recorded by automated enforcement systems. Such automatically generated documents are not signed by an official. If the person concerned accepts the administrative order, the procedure is concluded without further institutional assessment. However, proceedings concerning administrative offences in Lithuania are not reviewed by administrative courts. Instead, they fall within the sphere of minor criminal (quasi-criminal) justice and are examined by courts of general jurisdiction.

In other areas of public administration, automation usually plays a more limited role and supports administrative procedures rather than replacing the decision-maker. For example, certain construction procedures are carried out through the state information system "Infostatyba". In these procedures several procedural elements are automated, including the electronic submission and automatic registration of applications, automated notifications and reminders to officials, and the generation of procedural outcomes within the system.

Lithuanian administrative court case-law has addressed situations where such systems generate automatic procedural outcomes. In its ruling of 13 April 2022 in administrative case No. eA-1881-492/2022, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania examined a situation where the information system "Infostatyba" automatically generated an approval because the competent authority failed to provide its position within the

Co-funded by the European Union

prescribed time limit. The court clarified that such automatically generated outcomes do not in themselves replace the final administrative decision. The competent authority must still verify whether all statutory requirements for issuing the permit have been fulfilled. Accordingly, the automated element is treated as part of the administrative procedure, while the final decision remains attributable to the competent public authority.

As a result, the case-law of Lithuanian administrative courts has not yet established a specific doctrinal framework governing fully automated administrative decision-making.

If so:

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

The case-law of Lithuanian administrative courts has not yet established specific doctrinal criteria governing fully automated administrative decisions.

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

Lithuanian administrative law does not allow administrative authorities to fully delegate their decision-making powers to automated systems.

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)

The case-law of Lithuanian administrative courts has not yet established specific criteria governing fully automated administrative decisions.

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

Co-funded by the European Union

The case-law of Lithuanian administrative courts has not yet addressed the legal nature or classification of algorithms or artificial intelligence systems used for administrative decision-making.

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

Lithuanian administrative courts have not yet developed a specific doctrine regarding judicial review of automated administrative decisions.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

X NO

If so, please specify which ones

Co-funded by the European Union

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))?

☐ YES

X ☐ NO

If so:

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

N/A

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)

Please explain if necessary:

N/A

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)?

N/A

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)?

N/A

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?

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ YES

X NO

Please explain if necessary:

If so:

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

X NO

At present, there are no specific national measures or programmes aimed at ensuring artificial intelligence literacy specifically for judges in connection with Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (Artificial Intelligence Act). Artificial intelligence systems are not currently

Co-funded by the European Union

used to support judicial decision-making in Lithuanian courts. General judicial training is organised within the judicial training system, but no dedicated AI literacy measures for judges have been formally established.
If so:

4.a. What do these measures consist of?

N/A

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

X NO

Please explain if necessary:

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?

No.

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].

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

☐ YES

X NO

Please explain if necessary:

To date, Lithuanian case law has not addressed issues concerning the interpretation or application of EU Regulation 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?

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ YES

X NO

Please explain if necessary:

To date, Lithuanian courts have not submitted any preliminary rulings to the Court of Justice of the European Union regarding EU Regulation 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