

data.europa academy webinar ‘Open judicial data, AI, and transparency in the digital age’ 16/05/2025 - Q&A

Question	Answer
Are you planning to translate the HELP course in more languages?	Yes, we are translating the course once we have funding and interest expressed. We will be grateful for letting us know which languages are of interest.
What about the availability of this methodology?	I can share upon request, please contact me at elena.yurkina@coe.int
What about Spain regarding duties of publications and practices?	As far as we are aware Spain has a detailed regulation developed regarding publication of judicial decisions and privacy and personal data protection
Have anyone of you looked into the use of European Case Law Identifier (ECLI) to identify the judgments?	Yes, the TJENI project looked in the ECLI, especially from the point of view of categorisation of cases
Are published judicial decisions made available - in whole or in summary - in a language other than the national drafting language, maybe English, using AI?	We have not seen such solutions, but in the very rapidly developing landscape such solutions may appear soon. We tried to test solutions that would analyse the content (mainly facts of the cases) in different languages and find similar. More info: Home - Digital Future of Justice 2.0
Do you think judges in Norway are doing enough to protect the privacy of third parties and the accused, when they write up their publicly available non-anonymised judgements?	Not in Norway, but certainly in England and Wales. There they have a system for de-identifying judgments when they write them. In Norway, we don't have this system, which means that much effort is used afterwards to de-identify, resulting in few judgments being published. Whether England/Wales is doing enough to protect privacy at a broader level is another issue. They require less de-identification than in several civil law countries – mostly criminal cases and cases involving children. In England/Wales, there is a greater focus on transparency. See further: Baste, Øystein Flø and Cyndecka, Malgorzata Agnieszka and Esayas, Samson and Langford, Malcolm and Lison, Pierre and Weitzenboeck,

	Emily, <i>Open Justice Data in Europe: A Patchwork</i> (April 07, 2025). Available at SSRN: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5207840
How to guarantee that this AI model is not using the data made available on the original documents?	<p>This is a real issue when machine learning models are trained on original not de-identified data. It can be partly achieved through rule-based methods that constrain what sort of information the AI model reports. But it is challenging, as this can also compromise the accuracy and fairness of the model.</p> <p>See further: Hoch, H. et. al. (2024), 'Discrimination for the sake of fairness: Fairness by design and its legal framework', <i>Computer Law & Security Review</i> 52: 105916. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0267364923001267</p>
How are the different languages, dealt with?	<p>AI models may be both trained in different languages and report results in different languages. Global LLMs like ChatGPT and Perplexity are surprisingly good in generating text in many languages, but not all, as they have been trained on a wide variety of languages. But there are clear limitations (e.g. Greek) and in Norway, we have found that ChatGPT does not follow the Norwegian comma rule, which can be very important in a legal context. When benchmarking LLMs, attention should be thus paid to the quality of language. To improve performance in different languages, more diverse language material and language textbooks can be included in the training set, and LLMs can also be finetuned with RAGs (extra material and prompts),</p>
Could AI be used to detect absurd judgments? Who would object to that?	<p>Yes, this is a key part of AI methods in practice: anomaly detection. It finds patterns in text and structure that deviate from the standard. However, it also needs human review.</p> <p>For an example, see Esposito, A., Di Martino, B., Ammendolia, R., Lupi, P., Orlando, M., & Liang, W. (2023). Time anomaly detection in the duration of civil trials in Italian justice. <i>Connection Science</i>, 35(1), 2283394. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09540091.2023.2283394</p>