

A European Handbook on the Impact of AI on Lawyer Training: a look back at the Bucharest Study Visit

As part of the LITEL 2 project, the third and final Study Visit was held in Bucharest, hosted by UNBR and INPPA in the prestigious setting of the Palace of Justice. Designed around the challenges of AI, GDPR and digitalisation for institutions responsible for lawyer training, the visit allowed project partners and guests to validate the structure of the *Handbook on the Impact of AI on Lawyer Training*, LITEL 2's flagship deliverable. Opened by Dan Oancea, Director of INPPA, and marked by the keynote of Professor Elena Lazăr on AI in justice, the visit gathered insights from twelve European institutions to bring together legal content, ethical requirements and pedagogical methodology. A decisive milestone for the project!

LITEL 2 in Bucharest: from theory to practice in the age of AI



 20-21 April 2026

 Bucharest

Hosted by the National Association of Romanian Bars (UNBR) and the National Institute for the Training and Improvement of Lawyers (INPPA) on 20–21 April 2026, the third Study Visit of LITEL 2 was conceived around two converging ambitions: deepening the legal challenges raised by AI, GDPR and digitalisation, and giving partners the methodological tools to translate those challenges into training. The visit opened with a keynote by Professor Elena Lazăr on AI in justice, setting the tone for two days at the crossroads of efficiency, fundamental rights and pedagogy.

The first afternoon brought together three INPPA experts to map the regulatory and operational landscape lawyers will increasingly have to navigate. Cristina Radu tackled *data scraping* at the crossroads of the GDPR and the AI Act, while Mihaela Rotund detailed the conditions for a *legal-grade* use of AI: human oversight, professional boundaries, GDPR-aligned design. Arcadia Hinescu closed the day by showing how AI is already reshaping daily practice, drawing on the very real uses of young Romanian lawyers. Together, these contributions revealed how concrete the questions have become for European bars: where to draw the line on training data, how to anchor confidentiality in the design of tools, and how to support lawyers who already use AI without always knowing the limits.

The second day shifted from content to method. Facilitated by Sarah Nafaa, *Learning Experience Design consultant*, the workshop invited participants to step into the shoes of their learners and rethink the architecture of their training programmes. Through learner personas, the "*How might we...?*" exercise, prototyping and individual action plans, partners explored what a *human-centred* training looks like in the age of AI, and what the emerging "Trainer 4.0" profile actually requires. The exchanges confirmed a shared appetite for learner-centred pedagogy, at a time when European training institutions are rethinking their offer to integrate digital tools sustainably.

In addition to the project partners (EFB, OFAB, CICAC, Czech Bar Association, Law Society of Ireland, UNBR), representatives from the Netherlands and Italy also took part reflecting the European resonance of the work being carried out.

For further reading:

Key resources on AI, GDPR and lawyer training

- [EU Artificial Intelligence Act](#)
- [General-Purpose AI Code of Practice \(European Commission\)](#)
- [CCBE Guide on the use of generative AI for lawyers](#)
- [OECD – Intellectual property issues in artificial intelligence trained on scraped data \(2025\)](#)

FOCUS : Validating the European Handbook

The Bucharest visit centred on a participatory workshop dedicated to validating the structure of the *Handbook on the Impact of AI on Lawyer Training* and gathering a final round of good practices from partners and guests.

On the GDPR-AI side, participants noted that ten years after its entry into force, the GDPR remains imperfectly mastered by lawyers, and that generative AI now amplifies long-standing data protection questions. Concrete examples of data inadvertently exposed when entered into AI systems made clear that AI literacy cannot be separated from a refresher on data protection fundamentals. Inclusivity and algorithmic bias were also discussed, illustrating why critical reading of AI outputs belongs in every lawyer's toolkit. The gap in access to AI tools between large and smaller firms, particularly in rural areas, was flagged as another challenge for the years ahead.

On the pedagogy side, the workshop highlighted a structural shortage of trainers equipped to teach both legal and technical aspects of AI. Effective training requires pairing AI specialists with legal professionals, articulating theory and hands-on practice, and embedding professional obligations into every module. The need for dedicated train-the-trainer programmes was widely shared.

Beyond these thematic insights, partner and guest institutions also shared innovative practices that will feed directly into the Handbook's "Good Practices" sections:

- in the Netherlands, an assessment method asks students to report on their actual use of AI: which tools, which prompts, with what results, and what they learned, encouraging reflective and ethical use rather than prohibitions or unconditional adoption;
- in Romania, a locally developed AI application includes a "prompt enhancement" feature that automatically improves user queries, illustrating how the tools themselves can support better lawyer-AI interaction;
- in Belgium, a training tool designed to help lawyers recognise when AI fails was presented as a way to build critical reading reflexes from the start of training.

INSIGHTS FROM THE **Scientific Committee**

Mihail Dinu, INPPA — Member of the LITEL 2 Scientific Committee.



Attorney-at-law and advocate for the development of advanced legal practice skills, Mihail is a dedicated researcher of the unseen mechanisms underlying everyday judicial work. He is member of the Bucharest Bar, trainer at The National Institute for the Training and Improvement of Lawyers (INPPA) and author of several scholarly works in the field of law.

Q

You are a member of the LITEL 2 Scientific Committee on behalf of UNBR. Could you briefly tell us about your role in the project, the Romanian Bar's strategy regarding AI, and how LITEL 2 contributes to that strategy?

Within the LITEL 2 Scientific Committee, my mandate on behalf of UNBR is to ensure that the project's outputs translate into concrete curricular decisions at INPPA, the institution responsible for both the initial and the continuous training of Romanian lawyers. The strategic position of the Romanian Bar is deliberately measured: rather than reacting to each new tool that reaches the market, we have chosen to consolidate the professional fundamentals — independence, confidentiality, competence, personal accountability — and to read every AI-related question through that lens. This is why, beginning with 2026, INPPA has introduced a dedicated subject on the „Ethics of Artificial Intelligence Use in Legal Practice” in the initial training programme, and why our trainers in European Law and in Civil and Criminal Procedure have been instructed to integrate the 15 directions of the European Commission's Judicial Training Strategy 2026–2030 into their teaching. LITEL 2 is, for us, a multiplier of this work: it provides comparative benchmarks, validated practices from partner Bars, and a structured framework that allows Romania to align with — and contribute to — a genuinely European approach to lawyer training in the AI era.

Q

You are co-authoring two modules of the future training kit: the introductory module on the history and key concepts of AI, and the module on professional obligations and ethics. In a few words, what is the essential message you wish to convey to lawyers through each of these two modules?

The introductory module on the history and key concepts of AI is built around a single conviction: a lawyer cannot reason responsibly about a technology he or she does not understand. We therefore aim to give colleagues a clear, non-technical map of what these systems actually do, where they come from, and — most importantly — what they cannot do. A lawyer who grasps the probabilistic nature of generative models will instinctively treat their outputs with the scrutiny that the profession demands.

The module on professional obligations and ethics rests on a complementary conviction: AI does not create a new deontology — it tests the resilience of the existing one. Confidentiality, the duty of competence, the independence of judgment, and the lawyer's personal responsibility for the work product apply identically whether the draft was prepared by a junior colleague, a paralegal, or an algorithm. Together, the two modules deliver one unified message to the profession: learn the technology thoroughly but never let it stand between you and your professional duty.

Q As a practising lawyer, what has AI concretely changed in your daily practice, and what is your vision for the future of the profession?

In my own practice, AI has become a working assistant for clearly delimited tasks: preliminary research, structuring of documentation, summarising voluminous files, comparative reading of legislation. It saves time, but it also imposes a stricter discipline of verification, because every reference, every citation, every assertion produced by such a tool must be confirmed against the primary source before it leaves my desk. Hallucinations are real, and the appearance of authority is not a substitute for accuracy.

My vision for the years ahead is one of a profession that uses AI without being defined by it. The mechanical layer of legal work will continue to migrate towards these tools, but the core of our profession — judgment, strategy, the personal trust that binds a lawyer to a client, the courage of advocacy — will remain irreducibly human, and indeed will become the lawyer's principal differentiator. The Romanian Bar, through INPPA and through projects such as LITEL 2, is preparing precisely this profile: a lawyer who is technologically literate, ethically anchored, and fully accountable for every word that bears his or her signature.

VOICES FROM THE FIELD

AI changemakers in the legal world

Anna Drozd, Senior legal adviser, CCBE



She is a Senior Legal Advisor at the Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe (CCBE), representing Bars and Law Societies from 46 countries. She works closely with CCBE experts on issues related to the digitalisation of justice, new technologies (including AI), their use in legal practice and the justice system, and related ethical and professional obligations, including professional secrecy and legal professional privilege.

Before joining the CCBE, Anna Drozd worked as a policy adviser to the UK Law Societies in Brussels, focusing on data protection, technology, professional regulation, ethics, and trade policy.

Q The **CCBE technical guide on the use of AI tools and models by lawyers** insists that lawyers have a professional duty to understand the essential functioning of the technologies they use, in line with the CCBE Charter and Article 4 of the EU AI Act. In practice, what minimum level of “AI literacy” should every European lawyer have today, and what role do training institutions have to play in achieving it?

It is difficult to provide a definitive answer to this question in a context where AI technologies are evolving rapidly and new use cases are constantly emerging.

Lawyers have an obligation of professional competence, which applies not only to their knowledge of the areas of law they practise, but also to their awareness of the benefits and risks of the technologies they use. In practice, this means that lawyers should undertake regular training and other professional activities to ensure that their knowledge remains up to date.

Crucially, lawyers must understand that generative AI (GenAI) systems produce new content (text, images, audio, or video) based on probabilistic predictions drawn from training data, rather than on reasoning or legal authority.

Their outputs are statistically plausible but not necessarily true: GenAI systems can “hallucinate”. This means they may fabricate case law, invent judicial opinions, misattribute quotes, or construct plausible but entirely fictitious legal arguments. These are not hypothetical scenarios - there are already numerous examples worldwide where false citations have appeared in court submissions. Lawyers must therefore always verify outputs generated by AI tools.

Furthermore, lawyers must be aware of how data is processed by AI systems: whether it is reused for training, shared with third parties, and how long it is retained. These aspects have significant implications for maintaining the confidentiality of communications between lawyers and their clients.

Lawyers should also understand that AI models can reproduce societal biases embedded in training data. In addition, they may generate responses that align with users’ apparent expectations (a phenomenon often referred to as “sycophancy”). Both factors pose a challenge to maintaining professional objectivity. Lawyers who rely on such tools risk internalising these biases, which may influence their conduct and undermine their duty to provide independent and impartial advice.

As these technologies have become an integral part of legal practice, education and training in the field of AI (and other technologies) must be treated as a structural priority. Bars and Law Societies have an important role to play in ensuring that their members have access to relevant training resources. However, this role must be supported with adequate resources, including financial support. In its [position paper on the European Judicial Training Strategy](#), the CCBE advocated for a coherent and well-funded EU framework for the training of lawyers.

Q

The technical guide identifies four deployment models, ranging from on-premises solutions to fully managed SaaS. Where do you see the main confidentiality risks for lawyers today, and are there situations in which certain technologies should simply not be used?

Our guide identifies the on-premises model as the most secure option in terms of protecting confidentiality. However, this approach also requires lawyers to assume responsibility for the entire infrastructure, including maintenance and cybersecurity. This entails additional costs and necessitates additional technical skills and organisational capacities within a law practice.

At the other end of the spectrum is the software-as-a-service (SaaS) model, which is easy to use and provides access to the most advanced models. However, it also presents significant drawbacks in terms of confidentiality, data control, and the ability to influence how a model is configured or updated.

Where a matter is particularly sensitive, lawyers may need to rely on more controlled deployment models. Their professional obligations, especially professional secrecy and client confidentiality, depend on who can access the data and whether it can be copied or reused. In certain situations, this may mean that some technologies should simply not be used.

Q

With these two guides published in quick succession, what would you say are the next priorities the CCBE intends to address on AI, and where does the profession's voice still need to be strengthened at European level?

One of the key priorities in the coming months will be to monitor the implementation of the AI Act and the uptake of AI tools in the justice system. The European Commission has recently published its [draft guidelines on the classification of high-risk AI systems](#), which are open for consultation until 23 June.

The CCBE previously [contributed to the consultation](#) that preceded these guidelines and outlined several scenarios in which the use of AI systems may present higher or lower risks.

Another important strand of work will be to monitor the implementation of the [Digital Justice Strategy 2030](#), which includes several actions specifically related to the use of AI in the justice system.

It will be essential for the legal profession to remain actively engaged throughout this process and to bring its perspective on both the risks and benefits of AI use, not only from the standpoint of lawyers, but also from that of their clients.

In parallel, the CCBE will continue to monitor how lawyers are using AI in practice, what lessons can be drawn from this use, and what new concerns may arise. This will help identify the type of support that the CCBE and its member Bars can provide. The situation remains dynamic, with many organisations, including Bars and Law Societies, continuously updating their professional standards and expanding their training offer to respond to the growing need to keep pace with technological developments.

Looking further ahead, two broad policy discussions are likely to gain prominence. The first concerns the increasing use of tools, including AI, that assist in decision-making and other functions within the public sector. The boundary between assistance and the replacement of human decision-making will be one of the key tensions regulators will need to address.

The second concerns technological sovereignty. In light of recent geopolitical developments, discussions on how Europe can reduce its dependence on technologies and resources from third countries are expected to intensify.

**next
STEPS**

**5-6
OCTOBER**

Training of trainers, Barcelona

**9-10
NOVEMBER**

Pilot Training, Paris



Let's get connected for our latest news & updates

in Follow us on LinkedIn !

