

EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR THE EFFICIENCY OF JUSTICE (CEPEJ)

MODEL TECHNOLOGY CURRICULUM FOR JUDGES



ADOPTED BY THE CEPEJ AT ITS 46TH PLENARY MEETING
(18-19 JUNE 2026)
CEPEJ(2026)8

French Edition :

Commission européenne pour l'efficacité de la justice (CEPEJ) programme de formation-type en matière de technologies à l'intention des juges.

The opinions expressed in this document are the responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

The reproduction of extracts (up to 500 words) is authorised, except for commercial purposes as long as the integrity of the text is preserved, the excerpt is not used out of context, does not provide incomplete information or does not otherwise mislead the reader as to the nature, scope or content of the text. The source text must always be acknowledged as follows “© Council of Europe, year of the publication”. All other requests concerning the reproduction/translation of all or part of the document should be addressed to the Documents and Publications Production Department (SPDP) or publishing@coe.int.

All other correspondence concerning this document should be addressed to the European Commission for the efficiency of justice (CEPEJ) or cepej@coe.int

Cover design and layout:

European Commission for the efficiency of justice (CEPEJ), Directorate-General for Human Rights and the Rule of Law, DG1, Council of Europe

Photo: Shutterstock

© Council of Europe, June 2026

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Objectives.....	4
3. Target groups	5
4. Principles	6
5. Judges' knowledge and skills needs	6
6. Methodology	7
Teaching methods	7
Continuous assessment and feedback	8
Accessible Training Materials.....	8
Considering the generational differences	8
Trainer selection	9
7. Content of the proposed training programmes	9
7.1. Basic knowledge: ICT	9
7.2. Intermediate knowledge: data and system security	10
7.3. Advanced knowledge: AI	10
7.4. Courses for heads of courts: leadership in digital justice	10
8. Training modules.....	11
8.1. Training module to provide basic knowledge	11
8.2. Training module to provide intermediate knowledge – security	12
8.3. Training module to provide advanced knowledge – AI	13
8.4. Training module for heads of courts - leadership in digital justice	14
8.5. Training modules to provide specialised training	15
Annex – Examples and good practice	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The rapid digitalisation of judicial systems and the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) have dramatically reshaped the role and responsibilities of judges. Recognising these profound changes and emerging challenges, the Council of Europe's European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) has developed a model new-technology curriculum¹ aimed at empowering judges to navigate and lead in digitally transformed environments

Digital transformation in judicial systems began decades ago, accelerating in recent years with the rise of AI. This shift demands more than operational competence with technological tools; it requires a re-examination of foundational principles of justice and requires judges to assess both the potential and risks of technological integration, especially AI, in judicial processes.

The Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and human rights, democracy and the rule of law and the EU AI Act, highlight the necessity of sufficient digital literacy among justice professionals. Training should therefore focus on the use of new technologies, whilst taking an ethical, legal and critical approach to them.

The model curriculum is designed to (1) provide judges with foundational knowledge needed to work in digital judicial environments, (2) offer ongoing training opportunities to seasoned judges on evolving digital tools, including AI-based solutions, and (3) support professional development and the creation of judicial leaders skilled in technology-driven court management.

The model curriculum rests on the key pillars of systematic, needs-based initial and continuous training; specialised learning for judicial leaders; use of blended, interactive, and experiential teaching methods; collaborative resource sharing across national and European training networks; and regular feedback and curriculum adaptation to keep pace with technological advances.

The model curriculum is divided in four tailored programmes:

1. *Basic Knowledge – ICT*: Understanding digital justice, privacy, data protection, court digital management systems, ethical and deontological standards, and accessibility for all.
2. *Intermediate Knowledge: Data & System Security*
Risk-based approaches to personal data, system security, and cybersecurity incident management tailored for the sensitive judicial domain.
3. *Advanced Knowledge – AI*: Technical fundamentals, ethical challenges, sources and consequences of algorithmic bias, and critical understanding of AI tools and their implications for judicial independence and human rights.
4. *Leadership in Digital Justice*: Training for heads of courts including change management, digital strategy, and the use of digital tools for organisational, communication, and performance management tasks.

The model curriculum provides practical and forward-looking guidance for judicial training in the digital era. It aims to balance the enhancement of technical competencies with the preservation of judicial independence, critical thinking, and ethical responsibility, thus supporting the rule of law amid digital transformation.

¹ The model curriculum is based on the work of Lorenza Calcagno and Maria Giuliana Civinini (Italy).

1. Introduction

1. The role of judges has evolved significantly in the digital age, with new challenges and responsibilities emerging in this rapidly changing environment. The introduction of technology to enhance the effectiveness of judicial systems began many years ago and has progressed at different rates in different countries. In most cases, this transformation has led to carrying out traditional judicial activities in new ways, from filing cases to conducting hearings.

2. In recent years, the gradual integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into judicial systems has marked a profound change in the administration of justice. Fundamental questions arise regarding the principles underpinning the judicial process: how can new technologies be integrated without undermining the core values of justice, and to what extent might they alter, or even replace, human involvement in judicial processes? This major challenge calls for reconsidering judicial training. First and foremost, it is essential to have a clear understanding of artificial intelligence and to know how to use its tools effectively.

3. Numerous documents emphasise the need for training adapted to the technological challenges faced by judges and justice professionals:

- The *Council of Europe's Recommendation Rec(2001)2, concerning the design and redesign of court and legal information systems in a cost efficient manner*, emphasised the importance of carefully assessing training needs from the earliest phases of any digitalisation strategy or project. The training programme should be planned in conjunction with user representatives whose 'front-line' experience is vital for drawing up an effective training regime and winning the support and cooperation of staff.
- In its *Opinion No. 26 (2023), Moving forward: the use of assistive technology in the judiciary*, the Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) recalls the importance of training and operability in ensuring that the judiciary and court administration can use assistive technology as efficiently and effectively as possible. It states that the judiciary and court administration should be properly informed about, and trained in, the nature and effective use of technology. This is crucial in enabling technology to support the work of judges and court staff efficiently and effectively.
- Article 20 of the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (CETS 225), states: "Each Party shall encourage and promote adequate digital literacy and digital skills for all segments of the population, including specific expert skills for those responsible for the identification, assessment, prevention and mitigation of risks posed by artificial intelligence systems."
- Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of June 13, 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (AI Act), requires that providers and deployers of AI systems should take measures to ensure a sufficient level of AI literacy – as defined in article 3(56) - of their staff and other persons dealing with the operation and use of AI systems on their behalf.
- The European Judicial Training Strategy 2025 – 2030 (COM(2025) 801 final), highlights that the digital transformation of justice should include the digital empowerment and capacity-building of its users and that special attention should be paid to training for justice professionals. In support of the aims of the DigitalJustice@2030 strategy (COM(2025) 802 final), this Judicial Training Strategy calls for specific measures to foster a supportive environment for upskilling justice professionals in the use of digital tools and infrastructure. These measures will build knowledge of substantive and procedural EU and national law

adapted to the needs of the digital economy and society, as well as developing an understanding of the need for digitalisation.

- The CEPEJ Guidelines on the use of generative artificial intelligence for courts, adopted in December 2025, reaffirm that “A continuous training policy should be developed for new generative AI tools as they emerge, as well as for advances that AI itself makes in different justice-related fields (image generation, videos, voices, etc.). Judicial institutions should establish systematic mechanisms to keep judicial professionals updated on emerging AI capabilities and their potential implications for the administration of justice. This should include understanding new forms of AI-generated evidence, detecting deepfakes and synthetic content, and adapting to evolving methods of digital manipulation that may affect judicial proceedings. Such training should be regularly updated to reflect the latest developments in generative AI technology and its applications in legal contexts. To ensure consistency in application, standardised training curricula could be considered.”

4. The institutions responsible for judicial training (Judicial Training Institutes, Academies or Centres, and Courts and Agencies), which are present in all member States, as well as the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN), have long since begun offering training activities, which are often focused on how to use the technological tools made available by the judiciary. In recent years, attention has been given to AI. A comprehensive strategy aimed at providing judges with guidance on how to understand and use this technology properly is still being developed.

5. The model curriculum does not cover technological training unrelated to the judicial system and the administration of justice. It focuses on various areas of the judicial system in which technology gives rise to new rights and duties or leads to a rethinking of existing legal situations. Examples include product liability, liability for damage caused by AI tools, increasingly widespread and sophisticated cybercrimes, and rethinking classic criminal law concepts (e.g. where the crime was committed and complicity).

6. The model curriculum is based on the following: the CEPEJ Ethical Charter on the use of AI in judicial systems and their environment;² the CCJE Magna Carta and Opinions, especially Opinion No. 4(2003) on training of judges and Opinion No. 26(2003) on the use of assistive technology in the judiciary;³ the CEPEJ tools that provide guidance and safeguards for member States and legal professionals using ICT and AI in judicial systems to enhance the efficiency and quality of justice;⁴ the caselaw of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR); in the experience of the EJTN and national judicial training institutes.

2. Objectives

7. The model curriculum is addressed to authorities that intend to fulfil their institutional commitment to ensuring the technological literacy of members of the judiciary. National institutions in charge of judicial training could find them a possible source of inspiration for delivering training according to common international standards, a prerequisite for effective judicial cooperation, and individual judges will find them a guide for carrying out their training duties.

8. The CEPEJ has developed the technology curriculum for judges, with the following objectives:

A. to provide at the start of a judicial career, targeted training on the digitalisation of the judicial system, covering the key technologies used to manage judicial activities;

² <https://rm.coe.int/ethical-charter-en-for-publication-4-december-2018/16808f699c>

³ <https://www.coe.int/en/web/ccje/ccje-opinions-and-magna-carta>

⁴ <https://www.coe.int/en/web/cepej/cepej-working-group-cyber-just>

B. to provide serving judges with the opportunity to receive training in technological tools, ranging from electronic filing systems to emerging AI-based solutions;
C. to support the ongoing professional development of all judges, including advanced, specialised training.

9. These objectives should be based on the following pillars:

- I. **Initial and continuous Training:** All judges should receive systematic training in digital literacy, covering the use of AI tools, data protection, and the ethical implications of technology in the administration of justice. This training should be tailored to the needs of both new and experienced professionals.
- II. **Specialised training for leaders:** Judicial leaders should receive targeted training in change management and communication to guide their institutions through digital transformation.
- III. **Methodology:** Training should combine e-learning, face-to-face modules, group discussions, and experiential learning, involving technical experts as well as legal professionals.
- IV. **Access to materials:** Training resources should be collected, curated, and made accessible for ongoing reference and self-study.
- V. **Collaboration and knowledge sharing:** Participation in national and European judicial training networks is encouraged to share good practices, experiences, and resources.
- VI. **Expert Groups:** A specialised group of expert judges should be established to guide broad-based training and identify the most effective AI tools for digital justice. This group would also play a central role in defining judicial guidelines for the proper use of AI.
- VII. **Feedback and adaptation:** Training programmes and guidelines should be regularly reviewed and updated to reflect technological advances, legal developments and practical experiences.

3. Target groups

10. The curriculum should be tailored to the specific needs and backgrounds of the various groups that make up the judiciary.

Newly appointed judges: Individuals at the start of their careers who require a solid understanding of digital systems and AI, and an awareness of the ethical and legal implications of technology in the justice system.

Experienced judges: Judges with significant experience in analogue environments who need to update their skills in order to use digital tools and AI effectively and understand the evolving risks and opportunities.

Judicial leaders and court administrators: Individuals responsible for managing change, implementing new technologies and communicating with stakeholders. They require advanced training in leadership, change management, digital strategy, and technology-driven court management.

Specialised judges: Judges who exercise their functions in areas involving extensive use of digital tools due to procedural particularities or the subjects dealt with (e.g. enforcement of civil decisions, payment orders, civil serial cases, complex criminal cases, etc.).

Specialist judges and legal experts: Those who will act as trainers, mentors or members of expert groups require in-depth knowledge of specific technologies, AI systems and regulatory frameworks.

4. Principles

11. In line with the principles set out in numerous international documents⁵ and in recognition of the fundamental role of judges and the judiciary in ensuring the rule of law,⁶ training should be guided by certain core principles.

- Training is both a duty and a right for every member of the judiciary; consequently, access to technological training should be guaranteed to all judges.
- Training, including technological training, should be provided by an organisation under the coordination and supervision of the judiciary, such as the Judicial Council or a Judicial Training Institute, in collaboration with a government body. Even where digitalisation and technological innovation in the justice system are primarily managed by the Ministry of Justice, judicial supervision of training should be guaranteed through appropriate collaborative instruments.
- The primary purpose of training is to enhance the professionalism of judges and provide them with the necessary tools to carry out their duties independently and impartially, rather than to provide them with solutions.
- Programmes should balance the development of technical competency with critical thinking skills to ensure that new information technology supports, rather than replaces, judicial reasoning and decision-making processes. As it is emphasised in the CEPEJ Guidelines on the use of generative artificial intelligence for courts (§ 2.2.1.3.) “Jurisdictional power lies exclusively with judges in accordance with constitutional and legal provisions. Decision-making, legal reasoning, and evidentiary assessment should not be delegated to generative AI systems; such systems may be employed solely for auxiliary or preparatory tasks that support, but never replace, the human judgment of the judicial body.”

5. Judges’ knowledge and skills needs

12. The administration of justice has undergone a process of digitalisation across all Council of Europe member states, albeit to varying degrees. In recent years, artificial intelligence tools have often been introduced as part of more complex digital resources, such as the automatic allocation of cases.⁷ Alongside the adoption of specific tools developed in-house or based on technical specifications provided by the administration, the provision of commercial AI tools to judges as part of software “packages” purchased by the administration has become widespread.⁸

13. The provision of these tools requires every judge to be proficient in the use of digital tools, to be able to use the systems without having to carry out specific activation procedures,⁹ and to

⁵ UN Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary – Bangalore declaration (1985), Council of Europe Recommendation N° R (94) 12 on the independence, efficiency and role of judges, Council of Europe European Charter on the Statute for Judges (1998), CCJE’s Opinion N° 4, ENCJ Minimum Standards regarding judicial training (2010-2011), CCJE Magna Carta of Judges (2010), EJTN Judicial Training Principles (2015), IOJT Declaration of Judicial Training Principles (2017), EJTN, State of Judicial Training in Europe, <https://ejtn.eu/news/a-new-study-sheds-light-on-the-state-of-judicial-training-in-europe/>

⁶ ECJ’s decision in case C-64/16, which establishes a close connection between judicial independence and the rule of law; ECHR, case of Guðmundur Andri Astráðsson v. Iceland (GC), SPANO, The Rule of Law as the Lodestar of the European Convention on Human Rights: The Strasbourg Court and the Independence of the Judiciary, Teisé, 202.

⁷ The CEPEJ Resource Centre on Cyberjustice and Artificial Intelligence contains information on 176 systems currently in use within justice administrations and provides a comprehensive overview of innovations within judicial systems. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/cepej/resource-centre-on-cyberjustice-and-ai> ; see also the CEPEJ AIAB – Artificial Intelligence Advisory Board - 1st AIAB report on the use of artificial intelligence (ai) in the judiciary based on the information contained in the Resource Centre on Cyberjustice and AI <https://rm.coe.int/cepej-aiab-2024-4rev5-en-first-aiab-report-2788-0938-9324-v-1/1680b49def> .

⁸ For example, in Italy, every judge works with the Microsoft Office package, negotiated and purchased by the Ministry of Justice, which includes Copilot.

⁹ See <https://rm.coe.int/cepej-2025-18final-en-draft-guidelines-on-the-use-of-generative-ai-for/48802a4ad1> , Guideline 2.1.7 point 43 “The implementation of AI in the administration of justice should be characterised by transparency and automation. To ensure certainty and consistency, judges should not need to perform specific operations to activate the system; its use should be predetermined by procedural laws. “

understand their effects, so as to detect and correct procedural errors caused by technology and to apply the appropriate remedies.

14. While the deployment of such AI based tools beyond the experimental stage remains limited, there is a real push to utilise generative AI within the justice system. The widespread availability of commercial generative AI applications and their potential inclusion in judges' official technological 'toolbox' makes specific training essential and urgent.

15. This training should start with a clear understanding of AI tools, including their capabilities and limitations, and the importance of ongoing critical evaluation. Judges should be able to recognise when AI can meaningfully support their work, and when it could introduce errors, bias, or overreach. To preserve the integrity of the justice system, training should reinforce critical judgement. Judges should remain vigilant against complacency and maintain their independence, ensuring that AI-generated outputs never substitute human reasoning. Although AI can provide assistance, responsibility for making decisions and evaluating evidence and arguments should always lie with the judge.

16. Legal professionals should also develop robust technical expertise, including fundamental prompt engineering skills and an in-depth understanding of how AI systems operate.

17. Training should equip judges with several essential skills:

Analyse and question: judges should critically evaluate AI-generated outputs, questioning their reasoning and identifying potential biases to ensure they meet legal standards and evidential requirements.

Assess AI Use: judges should assess when it is appropriate to use AI tools for tasks such as to improve efficiency or for information retrieval, and recognise when their use could risk undermining fairness, due process or human judgment.

Navigate Sources: Judges should integrate traditional legal sources with AI-based tools and validate AI outputs by cross-checking them against authoritative conventional sources to ensure coherence.

Avoid Bias: To prevent overreliance ("bubble effect") and maintain impartiality, judges should treat AI as an assistant, prioritise human-driven reasoning, and actively recognise and mitigate cognitive biases.

6. Methodology

18. When it comes to technological training, the choice of method is crucial. This is due to its dual nature. Firstly, it covers subjects that are not part of judges' cultural heritage. Secondly, it aims to develop new skills and working methods that differ from those of the past. Support and efficiency should be balanced with critical control. Therefore, the method should be engaging and experiential, enabling forms of self-assessment.¹⁰

Teaching methods

19. The effectiveness of the curriculum depends on the adoption of modern, flexible, and interactive teaching methods:

¹⁰ For examples see the Judicial Training Methods handbooks under <https://ejtn.eu/publications/> and Scuola Superiore della Magistratura, Quaderno n. 28 -Research report The medium-to long-term evaluation of the initial and continuous training courses organised by the Italian School for the Judiciary in <https://www.scuolamagistratura.it/web/portalesm/nuovi-quaderni-ssm-frontend>

Blended learning: Combines e-learning modules with face-to-face sessions to accommodate different learning styles and schedules.

Experiential learning: Uses case studies, simulations, role plays and practical exercises to reinforce theoretical knowledge.

Peer learning and networking: Encourages group discussions, collaborative projects, and exchanges between professionals from different jurisdictions.

Use of technology in training: Uses digital tools such as virtual reality, online platforms, and interactive presentations to enhance engagement.

Hands-on labs and tool demonstrations: Participants will use real software tools, experiment with AI systems, and practice digital procedures in a controlled environment.

Scenario-based assessments: Participants respond to simulated incidents (e.g. AI responses involving bias or fake information, manipulated documents, a data breach or an AI system failure) and their decision-making and response strategies are discussed and assessed by a group of peers and a specialist trainer.

Video and tutorials: Turns traditional training materials into engaging video content by creating clear, informative and informative video presentations. A variety of e-tools are available to assist with scripting, filming, editing and distributing educational videos.

Mentoring and microteaching: Experienced judges mentor peers, providing feedback, and delivering short teaching sessions to practice instructional skills.

Study visits and international exchanges: Participants visit courts or institutions with advanced digital systems, observe practices, and exchange knowledge with international peers.

Continuous assessment and feedback

20. The curriculum should be regularly evaluated, with self-assessment tools and feedback mechanisms being used to adapt it to evolving needs. Evaluations should be collected at the end of each course or training session. Moreover, efforts should focus on an analysis covering a longer period.¹¹

Accessible Training Materials

21. All resources should be available in accessible formats that can be reused for local training or on-the-job training and updated as technology evolves. All courses organised by topic could be uploaded to the training institute's website or a dedicated platform, together with relevant rules, regulations, documents, and presentations. With the addition of user interfaces, the website or platform can be used to prepare for a course or for self-training.

Considering the generational differences

22. The generational factor should be considered when selecting methods. While age is not a reliable predictor of ability, it does correlate with different learning preferences, cognitive patterns, and levels of technological exposure. These differences should be acknowledged when designing effective training, with adaptations made accordingly.

23. Some learners have advanced digital literacy skills and prefer exploratory, self-paced, interactive learning. They are also willing to experiment and solve problems.

¹¹ See for example : [“Medium- to long-term evaluation of judicial training”](#), EJTN 2023.

24. Other learners may be less exposed to rapid technological changes and structured guidance. Clearly, step-by-step demonstrations may be preferred in such cases. They may adopt a risk-averse approach in technological environments due to concerns about potential malfunctions. Providing safe sandboxes where mistakes can be made without any negative consequences is essential. Supportive and non-judgemental learning environments should be encouraged, ensuring that jargon is only used if it has been explained.

25. To ensure accessibility for all it is essential that training tools adhere to relevant standards, such as providing large, high-contrast visuals; clear audio; simple navigation; keyboard alternatives; and adjustable pace.

Trainer selection

26. Two factors should be considered when selecting trainers: the need for specialist knowledge and the importance of peer-to-peer knowledge transfer. This will create the necessary environment to acquire non-legal knowledge in potentially contentious or mistrusted fields.

27. Ideally, trainers should be judges with specific experience in new technologies, who have participated in dedicated training courses or pilot activities in courts.

28. To ensure the transfer of adequate technological knowledge, trainers should also include computer scientists or other relevant specialists. Training institutions should ensure that scientific trainers have an adequate understanding of judicial systems and the interplay between justice and technology. They should facilitate this by providing dedicated workshops and blended training courses for judges and scientific trainers alike.

7. Content of the proposed training programmes

7.1. Basic knowledge: ICT

29. The basic training programme should engage as many judges as possible and may include, as an optional component, a module devoted to **software solutions employed in different judicial systems**.

30. The protection of **privacy and the safeguarding of personal data** within digital judicial systems are fundamental principles of justice administration, particularly given the growing reliance on digital tools for processing sensitive information. Therefore, training should emphasise the legal obligations of judicial personnel when handling personal data, ensuring full compliance with supranational instruments such as the Council of Europe Convention for the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data (Convention 108+) and the Regulation (EU) 2016/679, General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), as well as domestic legislation.

31. From both a legal and technical perspective, the use of electronic court files has become standard practice in numerous jurisdictions. Therefore, it is essential that judicial personnel have a clear understanding of the relevant **technologies and regulatory frameworks governing the digital management of court documents**. This will enhance efficiency and ensure the effective functioning of the justice system.

32. Providing access to justice through **digital immediacy and remote services** is becoming increasingly important, as it enables judicial processes to be carried out in a timely and efficient manner via mechanisms such as online hearings and electronic submissions. The accelerated shift towards non-face-to-face services, particularly in the aftermath of the pandemic, highlights the importance of providing thorough training on the technologies that facilitate digital accessibility.¹²

¹² To support states and judicial institutions in transitioning towards digital justice in accordance with European standards, most notably Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, the CEPEJ has developed key reference documents.

33. Knowledge of ethics, **deontology and the potential disciplinary implications** of the misuse of technology is essential.

7.2. Intermediate knowledge: data and system security

34. Once the foundational elements have been acquired, training should progress to matters concerning data and system security within a digital environment. This component should reflect the specific nature and sensitivity of the data processed within judicial systems, as well as addressing the opportunities and challenges arising from the use of AI.

35. A thorough examination of risk-based approaches is required, including determining which activities may be considered 'high-risk'¹³ and which do not fall into this category.

7.3. Advanced knowledge: AI

36. Training on artificial intelligence should be considered in the context of a significant transformation of the justice system. While the emerging challenges are highly specific, it is crucial to recognise that AI is an evolving set of technologies that the legal system should learn to harness effectively, while remaining fully aware of the risks involved. In this regard, training should cover the following areas:

- The fundamental elements of AI technologies, including an understanding of the essential characteristics, potential, and limitations of big data systems.
- An examination of cloud computing and related technologies, following a logical structure consistent with data analysis, and an explanation of how algorithms connect data inputs to AI functionality.
- The main machine learning techniques and their relationship to AI.
- The core ethical principles at stake and an integrated perspective on the challenges associated with using AI tools, such as respect for human dignity, freedom, civil rights, non-discrimination, reducing inequality and promoting social cohesion.¹⁴
- The protection of judicial independence and the potential risks posed by AI in this regard.
- The potential development of new technologies, their impact on the functioning of the justice system, and their broader social implications.¹⁵

37. Judges who have completed the advanced training could be assigned to study groups to promote continuous learning. They could also serve on expert panels that institutional bodies can consult when evaluating the suitability of artificial intelligence tools for use in the justice sector. Furthermore, they will contribute to disseminating digital competence at a local level by training their colleagues and supporting the wider development of digital literacy.

7.4. Courses for heads of courts: leadership in digital justice

38. Heads of courts should receive technological training covering these topics, enabling them to make optimal use of the available tools.¹⁶ In the current digital transformation of justice, this means acquiring of the following:

These include the 2021 Guidelines on Videoconferencing in Judicial Proceedings, the 2015 Guide on the Use and Development of Remote Hearings, and the 2021 Guidelines on Electronic Court Filing (E-filing) and the Digitalisation of Courts. These instruments should be systematically applied when designing and implementing training programmes.

¹³ 'High-risk' should be understood in the specific context of the EU AI ACT, as well as in the broader context of the impact of AI tools on the judicial system and the work of judges.

¹⁴ Essential knowledge should include the CEPEJ Guidelines on the use of Generative AI in courts (2025).

¹⁵ It should build on the 'Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights' course, which was developed by the Human Rights Education for Legal Professionals (HELP) Programme in 2024.

¹⁶ Relevant CEPEJ tools could be used as training materials, such as the Guidelines on Electronic Court Filing (e-filing) and the Digitalisation of Courts, the Handbook on Court Dashboards and the Backlog Reduction Tool.

- Awareness of the meaning, content and evolutionary lines of this transformation.
- Knowledge of the systems and tools made available by the judicial governing authority (the Judicial Council or the Minister of Justice).
- The ability to communicate and engage authoritatively with peers, reluctant or sceptical audiences, representatives of civil society and users.
- Knowledge of systems for planning, monitoring, verifying and controlling the organisation of the court, the overall results of the judicial office, and the productivity results of individual judges.
- The ability to use these systems to improve service quality while ensuring the independence of office judges.
- Skills in data quality, security, operational protocols, testing criteria, output control practices and reducing opacity.

8. Training modules

8.1. Training module to provide basic knowledge - ICT

8.1.1. Learning objectives

- Build foundational digital literacy
- Build a solid understanding of the key elements of digitalisation in the justice system and the technologies behind the tools used
- Introduce core concepts of AI and technology in justice
- Develop the ability to critically evaluate the implications of AI's use in the justice sector
- Promote awareness of ethical, legal and rights-based considerations

8.1.2. Elements: four sub-modules/blocks

8.1.2.1. Digital Justice and Digital Tools in Practice

- Overview of digital transformation in justice
- Remote working
- Identification, authentication and electronic signatures
- Electronic court file
- Data-driven information management and processing
- Cross-border digital procedures

8.1.2.2. Privacy and data protection

- Knowledge of data processing regulations at supranational and national levels
- Ethical and legally responsible behaviour
- Introduction to data
- Application of privacy and personal data protection.

8.1.2.3. Access to Justice

- Equal and inclusive access to justice.
- Digital points of access to justice, including awareness-raising, information and citizen services.
- Digital immediacy and online services.
- Accessibility for persons with disabilities
- Digital content creation and editing.

8.1.2.4. Introduction to AI

- Introduction to AI systems: glossary.

- Essential elements of technology for jurists.
- Principles and ethical values: a critical approach to AI tools; use of AI in line with the core values of justice and ethical rules; protection of judicial independence; the Ethical Charter.
- Knowledge of AI regulation including the Council of Europe's Convention on AI, human rights, democracy and the rule of law, and the EU AI Act (Regulation 1689/2024).

Table 1: Overview module basic knowledge - ICT

Module	Topics	Methodology
1. Digital Justice and Digital Tools in practice	✓ What is Digital justice ✓ Digital tools	Interactive lectures, e-learning, Hands-on workshops, Simulations
2. Privacy and data protection	✓ GDPR and national laws ✓ Ethics and personal data	Case studies, group discussions, guided discovery of European courts case-law
3. Access to Justice	✓ Digital inclusion	Role-play, scenario analysis
4. Introduction to AI	✓ What is AI? ✓ AI in judicial processes ✓ Ethics, human rights, rule of law	Expert talks, video tutorials, hands-on workshop, scenario analysis, peer learning

8.1.3. Additional elements for the example modules on basic training - ICT

39. For **initial training**, the various methods should be accompanied by **Mentoring** and **Microteaching**.

40. Experienced judges mentor peers and newly appointed judges, provide feedback, and deliver short teaching sessions to practice instructional skills, supporting skill transfer and building a culture of continuous improvement.

8.1.3.1. Implementation

- Combine methods within modules for maximum engagement.
- Use technology (virtual reality, online platforms) to enhance interactivity.
- Encourage feedback and adapt methods to participant needs.
- Ensure accessibility and inclusivity in all training formats

8.1.3.2. Assessment

- Short quizzes
- practical exercises,
- final group project

8.2. Training module to provide intermediate knowledge – security

8.2.1. Learning objectives

At the conclusion of the course, participants will have developed a comprehensive understanding of the risks inherent in an era marked by pervasive cyber threats, recognising the paramount importance of safeguarding the confidentiality of judicial information.

8.2.2. Module content

- Security and protection of systems and devices
- Security and confidentiality of information
- Security incident management and reporting
- Sustainable use of ICTs
- The risk approach to technology

Table 2: Overview module intermediate knowledge - security

Module	Topics	Methodology
Data Security & Cyber Risks	✓ Cybersecurity ✓ Incident management	Tabletop exercises, expert panels, case study

8.3. Training module to provide advanced knowledge – AI

8.3.1. Learning objectives

- Understand the challenges associated with the use of artificial intelligence by engaging with the underlying logic of such systems, gain knowledge of the AI tools currently employed in judicial environments worldwide and reflect on technological developments and their implications for the protection of fundamental rights.
- Foster the developing of a critical thinking and ethical reasoning enabling judges:
 - o to assess new technologies through established legal and ethical lenses.
 - o to recognise and critically assess bias in AI-generated outputs.
- Foster understanding of the sources and consequences of algorithmic bias.
- Equip judges with strategies to identify, question, and mitigate AI bias in judicial processes.
- Reinforce the principle that human oversight and responsibility are essential when using AI tools.

8.3.2. Elements: five sub-modules/blocks

8.3.2.1. Technical knowledge for jurists

- *What artificial intelligence is (and what it is not)*

General overview of AI as a set of computer techniques aimed at automated information processing.

Distinction between traditional rule-based systems and machine learning systems. Clarification of the role of the model in relation to software and algorithms. Conceptual delimitation of AI in relation to legal decision-making: absence of intentionality, semantic understanding and responsibility.

- *Data, learning and reliability of AI systems*

Essential description of the life cycle of an AI system: data collection and selection, training phase, validation and operational use. Introduction to the concepts of error, generalisation and uncertainty. Discussion of the main factors affecting the reliability of systems (data

quality, context of use, updating over time), with references to bias phenomena and their implications in the judicial context.

8.3.2.2. AI and Justice: the current situation

- National and supranational legislation, soft law, comparative regulatory models and international guidelines.
- Operational AI-driven tools and practices at national and international level. The CEPEJ Resource Centre on AI and cyberjustice.
- Lessons learned: which tools are improving the quality of justice
- Ethics and human rights
- The use of AI and the protection of human rights. ECHR and ECJ case law

8.3.2.3. AI and judicial reasoning

- AI in the decision-making process
- Generative AI in Justice
- LLM and legal reasoning

8.3.2.4. AI and evidence

- AI in the reconstruction of facts
- Digital evidence

8.3.2.5. AI and legal research

- Legal research in the AI era
- Use of digital jurisprudence database

Table 3: Overview module advanced knowledge - AI

Module	Topics	Methodology
1. Technical knowledge for jurists	✓ Machine learning basics ✓ Algorithmic biases	E-learning, expert talks, workshops, tool demonstrations, scenario analysis
2. AI and Justice. The current situation	✓ Legislation, regulations, guidelines	E-learning, expert talks, hands-on workshop, peer learning
4. AI and judicial reasoning	✓ At the core of the judicial function	Hands-on workshop, scenario analysis, peer learning
4. AI and evidence	✓ Technology and introducing knowledge in the trial	Expert talks, case studies, hands-on workshop, scenario analysis
5. AI and legal research	✓ Traditional research v. digital/automated research	Workshop, peer learning

8.4. Training module for heads of courts - leadership in digital justice

8.4.1. Learning objectives

- Understanding the changes that technology brings to the courts
- Learning how to manage these changes in the interests of the efficiency of the judicial system

8.4.2. Module contents

- The regulatory framework: Powers of the head of the court and digitalisation of justice
- Digital justice: The state of play
- Digital tools to support management
- Support for measuring the performance of the office and judges
- Guiding the court towards technological transformation

Table 4: Overview module digital leadership

Module	Topics	Methodology
1. Leadership in Digital Justice	✓ Change management	E-learning, leadership workshops, hands-on workshop, peer learning highlighting concrete professional utility

8.5. Training modules to provide specialised training

41. Judges who complete advanced training can be involved in technology implementation or mentoring and in training as trainers, at both national and local levels. Specific training modules should support these judges.

42. A network of trainers with expertise in technology training should be established at national and supranational level to promote the exchange of good training practices, pilot projects, experimental activities, and AI tools evaluation.

8.5.1. Learning objectives

- Develop deep expertise in specific technologies and AI systems.
- Prepare participants to act as trainers, mentors, or advisors.

8.5.2. Module contents (not exhaustive)

- Sector-specific tools (e.g. e-auctions, digital support systems)
- High-risk AI systems
- Planning and implementing new information technology tools
- Adult learning principles
- Designing and delivering tech training
- Comparative studies
- Networking with European peers
- Evaluating new technologies
- Participating in pilot projects

Table 5: Overview module specialised training

Module	Topics	Methodology
1. Specialist AI Applications	✓ Sector-specific tools (e.g. e-auctions, digital support systems) ✓ High-risk AI systems ✓ Planning and implementing new information technology tools	Hands-on labs, project-based learning, microteaching
2. Training the Trainers	✓ Adult learning principles ✓ Designing and delivering tech training	E-learning, Audio-visual tools, simulations, peers-to-peers, feedback sessions

3. International Best Practices	✓ Comparative studies ✓ Networking with European peers	Study visits, expert exchanges
4. Research & Innovation	✓ Evaluating new technologies ✓ Participating in pilot projects	Research projects, collaborative platforms

Annex – Examples and good practice

1. Continuous assessment and feedback

Like various judicial training institutes, EJTN uses the MENTIMETER¹⁷ software to assess participants' knowledge and ideas at the beginning and end of courses. The same multiple-choice questions are asked to evaluate the impact of the training.

Examples of questions asked in AI and justice courses in 2024 and 2025:

- What is your reaction to the increasing importance of technology and AI?
- How would you evaluate the use of new information technology in the justice sector?
- Do you use generative AI applications?
- What do you consider to be a positive aspect of AI?
- What should the relationship between technology and judges be?
- What is the main idea of Article 22 of the GDPR for AI in justice?
- When do the GDPR and the Law Enforcement Directive apply?
- Why is data protection so important when using AI in court?
- Are biased AI systems unlawful?
- What is 'explainable' AI?
- What personal data can be shared with a chatbot?

2. Modularised knowledge development path

The French National School for the Judiciary (École Nationale de la Magistrature) offers a Digital In-depth Cycle comprising 13 days of training, divided into five modules. These modules include a study visit abroad and are aimed at judges, court clerks, and Ministry of Justice officials.

Module 1: Fundamentals. Digital culture ecosystem.

Module 2: Skills for leading a high-level project.

Module 3: Exploring digital technology.

Module 4: Comparison with a foreign system.

Module 5: Investigation, jury and conclusions.

The Italian School of Magistrates is organising a multi-module course focusing on the techniques of drafting judgments in the context of artificial intelligence and electronic proceedings. From a technological perspective, the course will explore judicial reasoning, legal interpretation, appropriate language and style, the obligation to provide reasons and database construction based on merits. The course consists of three webinars and one final day of in-person classes.

Another series of courses focuses on criminal law and technology:

1. The technological basis for using artificial intelligence systems in the criminal sector: how they work, the opportunities they present and the risks they pose
2. Criminal law in the age of artificial intelligence
3. Investigations and criminal procedural law in the age of artificial intelligence

The Spanish Judicial School offers a course comprising 13 modules: Introduction to AI; Ethical principles and the assessment of ethical and fundamental rights impacts; Non-discrimination, gender bias and inclusivity in AI; The European AI Regulation, the Spanish Sandbox and AESIA; AI governance; and Judicial oversight of the use of public algorithms. The course also covers algorithmic jurisprudence, AI in the workplace, civil liability and artificial intelligence, the impact of AI on criminal investigations, the Charter of Digital Rights and the European Declaration on Digital Rights and Principles, intellectual property and AI, AI applied to public administration, AI in commercial law and neuro-rights.

¹⁷ <https://www.mentimeter.com>

3. Mentoring in initial training

In Italy, initial training consists of 18 months out of which six, even if not continuous, take place at the Scuola Superiore della Magistratura (Higher School of the Judiciary).

The courses dedicated to new judges MOT – Magistrati di Tribunale (Court Magistrates) – are attended by a tutor, an experienced judge, who works alongside the School's board and the judge responsible for managing the course with the specific task of monitoring training activities and supporting participants, even outside teaching hours, by answering questions, providing materials and helping to resolve specific cases or ethically complex situations. Even after the course, the tutor remains a point of reference, providing help and inspiration.

4. Example workshop traditional research vs digital/automated research

Traditional research v. digital/automated research

Participants are presented with a legal problem or legal classification of facts and are asked to conduct research in paper archives, digital archives with literal and semantic search systems, digital archives with AI search systems, and commercial AI applications. At the end, participants should compare the results, reflecting on the differences between them and the reasons for those differences, as well as evaluating exhaustiveness, quality, and reliability.

The consistency of research findings with fundamental legal principles and with the rules for interpreting one's own legal system should be assessed.

In a peer-to-peer guided discussion, participants will be asked to consider the differences between various types of research and the most effective and secure ways to conduct research when using AI-driven tools.

The method was applied by the working groups at the JUST fAIr II seminar, which was organised by the École Nationale de la Magistrature (ENM) and held in Paris from 11 to 13 February 2026. Various high-risk artificial intelligence systems were asked to apply maintenance law to a specific case involving a minor residing in a Member State with parent A. The financial situation of parent A was described, while parent B, residing in another Member State, had visiting rights on alternate weekends and during school holidays. Following the formulation of various prompts, multiple artificial intelligence systems were asked to apply the legislation of the relevant Member State to the case in question, given a set of data. Meanwhile, the judges participating in the working group continued the legal discussion based on a 'human approach' to the same scenario. The results were then compared.

5. Courses for heads of courts

The Italian School for the Judiciary regularly organises courses for court presidents and aspiring managers. The courses aim to strengthen participants' legal and managerial competencies and focus on deepening understanding of legal principles, organisational dynamics, and the relationship between central and peripheral judicial structures. A major goal is to enhance the managerial capabilities of judges, including their responsibilities in areas such as technology, resource management, and emerging challenges. Each course dedicates several sessions/modules to technological innovation. For example, during the second semester of 2023, two modules were held on Information and Communication Technologies, the first dedicated to knowledge of all application systems deployed in judicial offices, the second dedicated to an in-depth study of digitalisation in the civil and criminal sectors, as well as modules dedicated to judicial statistics, performance indicators and project management, including the preparation of the organisational programme on the JC online platform.

6. A network of trainers

The **EJTN Digital Ambassador Programme 2026**, promoted by the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN), is a strategic initiative aimed at supporting the digital transformation of justice systems across the European Union through the development of a shared and sustainable digital culture within the judiciary. Building on the positive outcomes of the 2025 edition, the programme seeks to strengthen digital competences, enhance cooperation, and promote structured knowledge dissemination among European judges and judicial practitioners.

The programme pursues the objective of equipping justice professionals with advanced knowledge and skills aligned with European standards in key areas of judicial digitalisation, while fostering cross-border dialogue and mutual learning. Emphasis is placed on ensuring a multiplier effect at national level, whereby trained participants contribute to the dissemination of best practices and support capacity-building initiatives within their respective judicial systems. In this context, the programme contributes to the harmonisation of digital approaches across criminal, civil and administrative justice, reinforcing consistency and mutual trust among national systems. The 2026 edition focuses on priority themes relevant to the digital evolution of justice, including the application of digital rights, secure electronic identification and authentication, inclusive access to justice in digital environments, data-driven information management, and cybersecurity, with particular attention to the management and reporting of security incidents. Through these thematic areas, the programme addresses both the opportunities and challenges associated with the increasing digitalisation of judicial activities.

Within the framework of the programme, EJTN Digital Ambassadors are expected to act as facilitators of change, promoting awareness of digital issues, supporting the effective implementation of digital practices at national level, strengthening professional networks and encouraging the exchange of experiences across jurisdictions.

7. Thematic case studies

Remote Hearings and Access to Justice

Scenario:

Due to a pandemic, a court shifts to remote hearings. A litigant with a disability struggles to access the digital platform, resulting in missed deadlines and inability to participate fully.

Discussion Points:

- Identify accessibility challenges and legal obligations.
- Recommend solutions to ensure equal access.
- Reflect on the balance between efficiency and fairness.

Data Protection & Privacy

Scenario:

A court is preparing to implement a new electronic case management system. During a pilot, a judge discovers that sensitive personal data (including medical records) is accessible to all court staff, not just those assigned to the case.

Discussion Points:

- Identify legal and ethical risks under GDPR and national laws.
- Propose technical and procedural safeguards.
- Discuss the judge's responsibility in protecting privacy.

Data Privacy Dilemma

Scenario:

The Generative AI tool requires uploading full case files, including sensitive personal data, to a cloud service.

Exercise:

- Identify privacy and data protection risks.
- Discuss compliance with GDPR and judicial confidentiality.
- Recommend secure data handling practices.

Cybersecurity Incident**Scenario:**

A ransomware attack targets the court's digital infrastructure, locking access to case files and threatening to release confidential information unless a ransom is paid.

Discussion Points:

- Outline immediate steps for incident management.
- Discuss legal and ethical considerations in responding to cyber threats.
- Evaluate long-term strategies for improving cybersecurity.

AI in Judicial Decision-Making**Scenario:**

A court introduces an AI-powered tool to assist with bail decisions. The tool uses historical data to predict flight risk. After several months, concerns arise that the tool disproportionately recommends denial of bail for certain demographic groups.

Exercise:

- Analyse potential sources of algorithmic biases.
- Evaluate the judge's role in reviewing AI recommendations.
- Suggest ways to ensure fairness and transparency.

Critical Thinking & Generative AI**Scenario:**

A court is piloting a Generative AI tool that drafts preliminary versions of judicial decisions based on case files and legal databases. Judges are encouraged to review, edit, and finalise these drafts. In one case, a judge notices that the AI-generated draft contains references to legal precedents that do not exist and includes reasoning that, while plausible, is not supported by the facts of the case.

Exercise:

- Explore how to verify the accuracy and reliability of the AI's suggestions
- Identify the questions judges should ask themselves about the AI process and outcome?
- Propose safeguards and best practices for the use of Generative AI tools?
- Discuss the responsibility of the judge when using generative AI tools

Over-Reliance on AI

Scenario:

A judge, pressed for time, accepts the AI's draft with minimal review, resulting in a factual error in the final judgment.

Exercise:

- Debate the ethical, deontological and disciplinary aspects of this behaviour
- Debate the risks of automation biases.
- Define the limits of delegation to AI.
- Develop a checklist for responsible AI use.

Hallucinated Precedents**Scenario:**

The AI-generated draft cites three cases as precedent. Upon review, you discover two of them do not exist.

Exercise:

- Identify the risks of relying on AI-generated citations.
- Discuss verification protocols.
- Propose a workflow for cross-checking AI outputs.

Biased Reasoning**Scenario:**

The AI's draft consistently recommends lenient sentences for men accused of domestic violence against the wife or partner having an affair.

Exercise:

- Analyse possible sources of biases in training data.
- Discuss the judge's duty to recognise and correct biases.
- Suggest methods for auditing AI outputs for fairness.

Digital Evidence**Scenario:**

In a civil dispute, parties submit digital evidence including emails, chat logs, and video recordings. One party claims the evidence was tampered with.

Exercise:

- Assess the admissibility and authenticity of digital evidence.
- Explore methods for verifying digital documents.
- Discuss the impact of digital evidence on procedural rights.