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 **HIGH COURT OF CASSATION AND JUSTICE OF ROMANIA**

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:

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:

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**
☐ To a limited extent
☐ Moderately
☐ Extensively
☐ Completely
Please explain, where applicable, and, in the absence of cloud solutions, specify the alternative infrastructure solutions implemented:

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, they allow the performance of work tasks related to IT systems, legislative applications, and file servers.

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 information system specific to the courts ensures communication at their level with regard to the transfer of case files.

A.II – Digitalisation and dematerialisation of judicial administrative proceedings

Co-funded by the European Union

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:
The electronic file and TDS (secure document transmission) allow files to be consulted and summonses/notifications or other documents to be received electronically, but the file continues to exist in paper form.

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:

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%

Not applicable.

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.
Document submission form, Electronic File, TDS (secure document transmission)

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

☐ 0–20%

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ 20–40%

☐ 40–65%

☐ 60–80%

☒ 80 - 100%

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.

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

Judges and prosecutors have access to specialised training activities focused on the use of digital tools, including artificial intelligence–based applications, in the exercise of their professional duties.

These activities are delivered through two thematic seminars on the use of digital tools to enhance efficiency — one addressed to judges and one to prosecutors — as well as two webinars specifically dedicated to artificial intelligence.

The training address particularly the use of AI components integrated within the ReJust system, including functionalities for document summarization and anonymization in judicial practice. In addition, AI tools relevant to administrative and organizational tasks are presented, with emphasis on supporting workload management and improving operational efficiency.

The approach of these activities is primarily practical and application-oriented, aiming to familiarize participants with concrete use cases and to highlight both the benefits and limitations of AI tools in judicial and administrative contexts.

For 2026, the Institute envisages the organization of further seminars on digital tools for planning, organizing, and streamlining judicial activity, alongside webinars dedicated to artificial intelligence and to the use of MindApp as a tool for psychological support, assessment, and testing within the judicial system.

Furthermore, AI-related aspects are also integrated into broader training activities. In this regard, during the Themis conference organized on 3 February 2026, topics addressed included emerging challenges to the freedom of establishment in the digital market era, artificial intelligence in the service of criminal justice — opportunities, risks, and limitations — and predictive justice and generative AI as potential transformative elements in contemporary judicial practice.

In terms of support measures, the IT Service assists users either through user instructions posted on the website or via email, as needed.

Co-funded by
the European Union

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
☐ Somewhat agree
☒ **Strongly agree**
Please explain if necessary:

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**

Please add any additional information and explain if necessary:

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?

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ 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.

Judges and prosecutors have access to specialised training activities focused on the use of digital tools, including artificial intelligence–based applications, in the exercise of their professional duties.

These activities are delivered through two thematic seminars on the use of digital tools to enhance efficiency — one addressed to judges and one to prosecutors — as well as two webinars specifically dedicated to artificial intelligence.

The training address particularly the use of AI components integrated within the ReJust system, including functionalities for document summarization and anonymization in judicial practice. In addition, AI tools relevant to administrative and organizational tasks are presented, with emphasis on supporting workload management and improving operational efficiency.

The approach of these activities is primarily practical and application-oriented, aiming to familiarize participants with concrete use cases and to highlight both the benefits and limitations of AI tools in judicial and administrative contexts.

For 2026, the Institute envisages the organization of further seminars on digital tools for planning, organizing, and streamlining judicial activity, alongside webinars dedicated to artificial intelligence and to the use of MindApp as a tool for psychological support, assessment, and testing within the judicial system.

Furthermore, AI-related aspects are also integrated into broader training activities. In this regard, during the Themis conference organized on 3 February 2026, topics addressed included emerging challenges to the freedom of establishment in the digital market era, artificial intelligence in the service of

Co-funded by
the European Union

criminal justice — opportunities, risks, and limitations — and predictive justice and generative AI as potential transformative elements in contemporary judicial practice.

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 Superior Council of Magistracy is represented in the working groups established at the level of the Ministry of Justice.

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?

NO

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)

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

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

Co-funded by the European Union

Please explain if necessary:

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.

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

☐ NO

If so, please specify the terms of these assessments

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

Not applicable.

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

☐ YES

☐ NO

If so, please provide details

Not applicable.

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.
Not applicable.

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
☐ Modernisation of existing systems
☐ 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
☒ Insufficient financial resources
☒ Lack of specialised human resources
☒ Organisational complexity
☒ Resistance to change and digital skills gap
☒ 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)

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

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ 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.

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

If so:

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

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?

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

☐ YES

☒ NO

If so,

Co-funded by the European Union

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

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

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

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

Not applicable.

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?

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?

NO

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

NO

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:

If so:

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

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

7. Has national case-law ruled on the nature and legal classification of the algorithm or AI system used for administrative decision-making?
NO

8. What are the limits of the judicial review that administrative judges can exercise over automated administrative decisions?
Not applicable.

Co-funded by the European Union

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**

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

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

☒ **NO**

If so:

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

Co-funded by the European Union

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:

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)?

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)?

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:

If so:

3.a What do they consist of?

Co-funded by the European Union

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

If so:

4.a. What do these measures consist of?

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:

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

Co-funded by the European Union

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

☒ NO

Please explain if necessary:

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:

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