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 Slovenia

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
X☐ High
☐ Complete
Please explain if necessary:

Digital equipment of the judges includes:
- a desktop computer connected to a local area network (LAN) on a fiber-optic (FTTH) backbone,
- additional monitor (on request),
- a laptop with a docking monitor,
- a printer,
- a tablet and a work smartphone (on request),
- a dictaphone,
- a remote digital signature for the administrative judges,
- an institutional email account,
- a client for accessing the VPN with MFA,
- an access to the Microsoft Office 365 for Business account (on request).

Similarly, administrative staff are equipped with a desktop computer connected to a local area network (LAN) on a fiber-optic (FTTH) backbone, a printer, an institutional email account and a client for accessing the VPN with MFA.

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
X☐ 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
X☐ To a limited extent
☐ Moderately
☐ Extensively

Co-funded by the European Union

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

The technological infrastructure in Slovenian courts is not based on a classic cloud solution but rather on the closed network system called "HKOM". The latter consists of several servers, placed inside court buildings, and ensures that the data safely stays inside the local network. To ensure the functioning of the judicial information ecosystem, new hardware infrastructure was provided, comprising expanded server capacities, firewalls, equipment for performing security backups, and workstations.

The only cloud-based solution available to judges and court staff is "SOVD" application. It can be accessed with a personal digital certificate and it enables its users to transfer files too large to be send in email as attachments.

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.

To a limited extent. All judges and most court staff can use the available institutional equipment remotely via a VPN connection (ISL or Cisco AnyConnect). However, judges cannot hold public hearings or participate in panel sessions remotely. Supreme Court judges cannot sign documents remotely either (see below).

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.

Facilitating better interoperability with related IT systems of the Supreme Court is one of the key priorities that is taken into account during all system's upgrades.

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
X☐ 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:

Currently there are two parallel systems regarding court files since the vast majority of them exists in both paper and digital form. Nevertheless, this year (2026) the Supreme Court is planning to introduce "eCase File", a horizontal information component that,

Co-funded by the European Union

within an individual court case, enables users to view electronically stored content in various ways.

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:

Administrative judges have the option of digitally signing documents, and they use this option in their everyday working practice. This option is not yet available to Supreme Court judges, but it is planned to be introduced in the near future.

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%

X☐ 80–100%

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.

"Portal eSodstvo" is a public online gateway to Slovenia's judiciary. Within the framework of this digital gateway, citizens and businesses can access the electronic services of the judiciary. It is an integral part of the judicial information ecosystem and is therefore linked to other information building blocks (e.g. modules for managing electronic registers and electronic case files). The target group are citizens, businesses, and professional users (e.g. lawyers, notaries, public sector employees). The portal serves as a single access point, providing consolidated information on electronic judicial services, guidance on their use, and links to other judiciary websites.

An integral part of "Portal eSodstvo" is "eFiling", a core horizontal information component that supports electronic filing and the electronic service of documents. It has recently been upgraded as an essential part of the judicial information ecosystem and is directly involved in electronic operations in court proceedings. The upgrade covers improvements to electronic filing and electronic service, as well as the management of

Co-funded by the European Union

incoming and outgoing mail in judicial cases. The target group are internal users (Judges and Court employees) and external users Citizens, businesses, and professional users (e.g. lawyers, notaries, public sector employees). This investment facilitates the enhancement of electronic filing and service processes.

Use of "Portal eSodstvo" is in administrative disputes not mandatory yet but, as President of the Supreme Court pointed out in the yearbook "Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia in 2025", one of the key guidelines for the Slovenian judiciary for the coming years is working on accelerating digitisation and the eventual introduction of mandatory electronic filing and service for professional users.

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

☐ 0–20%

☐ 20–40%

☐ 40–65%

☐ 60–80%

X☐ 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.

The Supreme Court's working groups, which deal with the design, development and implementation of digital platforms and tools, always consist of lawyers (either Supreme Court employees or designated judges from other courts) as well as IT professionals. There is no formal participation of other legal professionals (such as attorneys), but they can be consulted at any time.

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
X☐ 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
X☐ Strongly agree

Please explain if necessary:

The Judiciary Security Framework is an information system that enables unified management of users and their rights across various judicial information systems. Its functions include client identification, registration within the Judiciary Security Framework, system login, authorization, and data modification. Electronic operations in judicial proceedings (such as the submission of electronic filings) are available only to users who are included in the Judiciary Security Framework. The new Judiciary Security Framework is also integrated with the SI-PASS login component – the national system for online identification and electronic signing, managed by the public administration of the Republic of Slovenia which is already widely used across key national e-services as well as by private providers. This simplifes digital transactions for individuals.

A.III.2 – Incident management and business continuity

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
☐ Frequently
X☐ 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

Co-funded by the European Union

Please add any additional information and explain if necessary:

All decisions made by the Supreme Court and the Administrative Court are available online. The only exceptions are Supreme Court decisions refusing leave for revision (extraordinary appeal). These are not published because they usually contain only a summary statement of reasons – an order dismissing the motion to admit a revision is considered sufficiently reasoned if the Supreme Court makes a general reference to the 'non-existence of the relevant conditions determined by law'.

Decisions are published on the "Sodna praksa" (case law) website, which is operated by the Supreme Court, as well as on some other privately owned legal research platforms. All personal data in the published decisions is anonymised.

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?

The GDPR rules are being respected, but there is no internal policy about it yet. However, one is in the process of being prepared. In accordance with the recently adopted New Courts Act, which will come into force in January 2027, the rules for the anonymisation of court decisions will be determined by the President of the Supreme Court, and this Act will be published on the Judiciary's website.

☐ 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
X ☐ 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.

Co-funded by the European Union

Digital technology trainings for judges and court staff are usually organised in the process of introducing a new application or technology into the work of judiciary and not on a regular basis.

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.

As mentioned, judges often sit on Supreme Court working groups dealing with the design, development and implementation of digital platforms and tools. Rather than offering technical support, they supervise the projects and contribute ideas from a substantive point of view.

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?

Currently, only two AI systems are used to assist with administrative activities: (1) a natural language processing system for anonymising court decisions and (2) an AI speech-to-text converter on a dictaphone. As their results are carefully supervised by administrative staff, both applications have a strictly supportive function.

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

☐ Chatbots

☐ Semantic search tools

X☐ Automated anonymisation of decisions

☐ Text analysis and assistance with legal research

X☐ 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

Co-funded by the European Union

X☐ Development phase
☐ Widespread use
☐ Full integration

Please explain if necessary:

The Supreme Court is currently developing a significant upgrade to the existing 'e-Sessions' application, which will be used as an AI tool to assist judges and their assistants in drafting reports on leave for revision. The new system is planned to incorporate three completely new AI-powered modules: (1) a search tool to facilitate judicial research in internal and external legal databases, (2) analysis of the relevant legal issues in documents submitted to the court, and (3) identification of the core of decisions and keywords to facilitate publication and subsequent searches of decisions in internal (e-Sessions) and external databases. The target group is judges and their assistants, and the goal is to provide the judiciary with efficient and secure AI tools that are expected to be particularly relevant in the field of legal research.

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

X☐ NO

If so, please specify which ones.

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

X☐ 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.

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

X☐ YES

☐ NO

If so, please provide details

Co-funded by the European Union

Drafts, prepared by the natural language processing system and speech to text converter are without exemptions subjected to a review, carried out by the administrative staff.

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.

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)

X☐ Process automation
X☐ System interoperability
X☐ Modernisation of existing systems
X☐ Advanced digital services for external users
X☐ 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
☐ Lack of specialised human resources
X☐ Organisational complexity
X☐ Resistance to change and digital skills gap
☐ Cybersecurity risks and challenges
☐ Other (please specify)

Co-funded by the European Union

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
X☐ Deployment of AI systems
X☐ Interoperability at European level
☐ 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.

The new 'e-Sessions' system supports the work of Supreme Court judges and their assistants by providing an overview of their caseload and facilitating access to and sharing of relevant documents among the judicial panel. It is therefore designed as an all-encompassing work environment tailored specifically to the needs of the judiciary. The system's development builds on seven years' experience of the judges using a more basic application to manage their workload. Unlike the current system, the new system is integrated with several horizontal and vertical judicial applications that support the functioning of the judiciary, primarily the registries, as well as other components that support the judicial workflow. The new system aims to centralise the storage of relevant documents, which are currently scattered across different applications. Recording the 'historical memory' of institutions is crucial for ensuring uniformity of case law. Overall, the system is designed to be a unique, comprehensive work environment that assists judges and facilitates their work..

Another planned good practice is the CDDC Information System, which is a new, unified digital solution that enables the centralised, standardised and certified digitisation of physical documents for all courts in the Republic of Slovenia. The system will provide the following:

- Digitisation of incoming mail,
- Assignment of document metadata,
- Transfer of digitised documents into judicial information systems,
- Support for validation,
- Integration with high-performance scanning equipment and workstation infrastructure,
- Monitoring and statistics,

Co-funded by the European Union

This new e-solution replaces the current DEVP system and introduces a centralised digitisation model for the entire judiciary for the first time. Accessible via the judiciary's internal network, the system operates within the Supreme Court's secure IT environment. It is intended for CDDC staff (scanning operators, validators and workflow coordinators), court registry clerks, judges, judicial assistants and the Centre for Informatics (CIF), as well as technical administrators and external stakeholders who access digitised documents via the e-case file or primary judicial information systems. The investment will enable fully centralised digitisation services for courts in Slovenia, the immediate availability of digitised documents within judicial information systems, and improved business continuity and operational resilience (addressing challenges identified during the period of the pandemic). It will also enable standardised and certified digitisation procedures in line with archival legislation (ZVDAGA) and internal rules; the elimination of fragmented digitisation processes across individual courts; reduced costs for equipment and maintenance due to centralisation; increased staff specialisation, resulting in fewer errors and higher-quality digital records; enhanced digital accessibility and usability of court documents; and a solid foundation for achieving NOO/RRF objectives for judicial digitalisation and the "digital by default" principle..

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

X☐ NO

A specific legal situation exists in Slovenian administrative law. Administrative bodies have used automated decision-making for more than ten years (e.g. for tax decisions), but there are only a few specific procedural rules dealing with the formal aspects of such decisions (e.g. how the signature of the person responsible for issuing them should be presented). There are also no legal provisions determining their special legal nature. Such "automated" decisions are, in principle, treated the same as all other administrative acts, and there are no rules dealing with the technical aspects of decision-making. The administration argues that, in these cases, only automation is in place ('adding numbers and calculations') and not artificial intelligence. However, it remains to be seen whether this is in accordance with the requirements of EU law mentioned in this questionnaire, since there is no relevant case law so far.

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?

Co-funded by the European Union

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

X☐ NO

If so,

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?

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?

Co-funded by the European Union

Not applicable.

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.

B.II – Judicial review of automated administrative decisions

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

☐ YES

X☐ 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

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ 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.

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

☐ YES
X☐ 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

X☐ NO

Co-funded by the European Union

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

X☐ NO

Slovenia has incorporated the AI Act into its national legislation through the Act on the Implementation of the Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence Supervision, which came into force in November 2025. The only provision of this Act that expressly refers to Annex III, point 8(a) of the AI Act is Article 10(1). This article sets out the authority competent to monitor compliance with the AI Act (the Data Protection Officer) but does not provide any specific measures regarding this matter.

In July 2025, the President of the Supreme Court circulated an informative note on the responsible use of generally accessible AI in court work, highlighting the main risks and obligations associated with AI use. However, the note was mostly aimed at providing information rather than setting new specific rules.

If so:

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

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:

Co-funded by the European Union

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

X☐ NO

Please explain if necessary:

As previously mentioned, plans are in place to introduce AI for document summarisation, jurisprudence analysis and the preparation of standard court documents. There also seems to be a general agreement among administrative bodies that, if AI is to be used in the judiciary, it will be of a proprietary design and used independently by the judicial IT service.

If so:

3.a What do they consist of?

3.b. What data sets are used?

Co-funded by the European Union

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

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?

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].

There is currently no general regulation or legal guidance regarding the introduction of AI into the work of the judiciary. Currently, the use of AI in the judiciary is based exclusively on the individual decisions of judges and other staff. While the use of general AI service providers is subject to limitations regarding data protection and direct use in decision-

Co-funded by the European Union

making, which must be carried out by judges, it is not prohibited or generally legally regulated.

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:

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

X☐ 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