EUROPEAN LAWYERS
EUROPEAN BARS
CCBE
BARREAUX EUROPÉENS
AVOCATS EUROPÉENS

Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe
The voice of European Lawyers

Rue Joseph II, 40/8 - B-1000 Brussels
+32 (0)2 234 65 10 | ccbe@ccbe.eu | www.ccbe.eu

CCBE guide on the use of **generative AI by lawyers**

2 October 2025

This image, titled *Unity in Diversity*, was generated by Perplexity.

Table of contents

Executive summary

The aim of the present guide is to raise awareness of what generative AI (GenAI) is, to explain its current uses in legal practice and to highlight potential opportunities and risks associated with its use. The guide also aims to highlight considerations for lawyers' compliance with their professional obligations. It addresses the current uses of GenAI, its benefits and most urgent issues for consideration for the legal profession. As such, it deals only with professional ethics and regulations applying to legal practice. This guide may be used by lawyers, Bars and Law Societies or law firms / law practices in their efforts to ensure responsible use of GenAI.

The **key characteristic** that differentiates GenAI systems from other AI systems is the production of new content in the form of text, image, audio or video.

Concerning the **definition of GenAI**, the EU legislation, namely the AI Act, does not specially define or address GenAI. Instead, GenAI is a subset of 'AI systems' and presumably most often also 'general purpose AI systems' as defined in the Article 3 of the AI Act. The definition of an AI system used by the OECD refers directly to GenAI systems: 'Generative AI systems that produce 'content' —including text, image, audio, and video [...].'

GenAI falls within the scope of **various regulations** or policy initiatives. In the EU, the AI Act (2023) establishes a risk-based framework that applies to all providers and users of AI systems in the EU market, regardless of origin. AI systems are classified into four categories each of which attracts different levels of regulation and obligations. In the US, the regulatory approach is mixed with the combination of federal Presidential Executive Order and federal agencies' guidance, State-level laws and sector-specific guidance. Internationally, the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy, and the Rule of Law is the first legally binding international treaty on AI, aiming to ensure AI activities are consistent with human rights, democracy, and the rule of law.

The take up of GenAI tools among lawyers has increased in the past several years and includes areas such as legal research, analysis and summary of documents or translation. Among the expected **benefits** are improvements in efficiency, enhanced legal research and better quality of work. This can lead to potential cost savings, faster processing of cases, better allocation of resources within legal practice, and an increased focus on qualitative rather than routine tasks. It can also improve access to justice for those currently underserved.

While there is potential for the GenAI tools to improve efficiency and support the delivery of legal advice and services, it is important to consider the **risks** associated with their use and their implications on lawyers' professional obligations. These include:

- **Privacy and data protection:** Users interacting with GenAI tools may unknowingly contribute input data that retrains the model. Without clear disclosures from system

operators, individuals could unintentionally expose confidential or sensitive information, unaware of the potential risks

- **Hallucinations:** So-called hallucinations occur when GenAI and other AI systems generate factually inaccurate or illogical answers. In the context of legal services the GenAI output might produce entirely fictional case law, create non-existent court cases or judicial opinions, falsely attribute quotes to judges or legal scholars or construct seemingly plausible but entirely invented legal arguments.

- **Bias and sycophancy:** Bias in GenAI refers to systematic errors or skewed representations that emerge from the training data, model design, or algorithmic processes. These biases can inadvertently reproduce or amplify existing societal prejudices, leading to unfair or inaccurate outputs. Sycophancy in GenAI refers to the tendency of AI systems, particularly large language models, to generate responses that align with the user's perceived preferences or biases, often excessively agreeing or providing overly positive feedback. The AI may therefore prioritise generating agreeable responses over providing accurate or critical information, potentially leading to misleading or unbalanced outputs.

- **Lack of transparency:** Transparency in AI systems refers to the clarity and openness with which these systems operate, enabling users to understand how decisions are made. This involves making the algorithms, data sources, and decision-making processes fully accessible and comprehensible. At present, virtually all GenAI systems exhibit what is known as the 'black box' phenomenon, where their internal reasoning processes are opaque and difficult to interpret. For lawyers, this makes it harder to verify the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated content, which may compromise the quality of legal advice or submissions.

- **Intellectual property:** The ownership of input and output data is a key concern when using GenAI tools. Copyrighted and/or unlicensed data may be used to train these tools and there is also potential for copyright infringement if input data containing copyright works results in recognisable outputs.

- **Cybersecurity:** As with all digital technologies, using GenAI tools can introduce and exacerbate cybersecurity risks, including the potential for malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities.

- **Fraud:** Fraud involving GenAI can include deepfakes, synthetic identities, or AI-driven scams which can pose significant challenges to lawyers. For example, deepfakes could produce several risks such as impersonation or manipulating facial recognition systems which can result in reputational harms for the lawyer or leaking of sensitive information.

Key professional obligations

The use of GenAI tools engages several core principles of the legal profession, as set out in the CCBE Charter of Core Principles of the European Legal Profession and by way of examples in the

CCBE Model Code of Conduct, the most important of which are confidentiality and professional competence. However, as this paper aims to show, such use also raises considerations with regard to other core principles, such as those relating to interactions with courts and with professional colleagues.

- **Confidentiality:** The use of GenAI tools can pose risks of exposing confidential client information. This is mainly because some of these tools can be set up to use prompts, uploaded documents, pictures or audio files for its further training. Therefore, lawyers should refrain from entering any personal, confidential or other data related to the client into the user interface of the GenAI, for example as prompts/queries, unless there are appropriate safeguards in place. In addition, lawyers should understand the nature of data processing operations by the GenAI provider, such as further use of prompts for training the AI model or sharing data with third parties.

- **Professional competence:** The duty of competence of the lawyer is not only restricted to law and regulation, but encompasses the obligation to become knowledgeable about a technical product to be used for professional activities. To avoid or mitigate the risks posed by the use of GenAI tools in legal practice, lawyers should verify the output of a GenAI before it is utilised in their work (where the use case requires), understand the capabilities and limitations of all technological solutions they use for their work, including GenAI and understand the different contexts in which they use GenAI as well as the implications and risks that arise from such use. Lawyers should also follow relevant training activities and refer to available advice and guidance from their respective Bars or Law Societies on the use of GenAI in legal practice (if available).

- **Independence:** Lawyers' use of Gen AI poses challenges in relation to maintaining professional objectivity. These arise in the context of bias and sycophancy whereby an AI system can produce recommendations that perpetuate bias and may lack the necessary nuance and due regard for client's particular circumstances and needs. Lawyers relying on such tools risk internalising these biases, which could influence their conduct thereby eroding their duty to provide impartial advice.

- **Transparency and information to the client:** As with other technologies and tools, if it can reasonably be assumed that an informed client would object, make conditions, or otherwise have reservations in respect of use of GenAI for the purpose in question, the lawyer should make sure to be transparent with the client.

- **Other core principles:** Lawyers using AI-generated content without appropriate verification could face sanctions for professional misconduct and/or contempt of court, malpractice lawsuits, damage to their clients' interest and the client's trust in their lawyer, as well as for damage to lawyer's reputation. In this context, lawyers should also be mindful of other core principles included in the Charter such as the dignity and honour of the legal profession, and the integrity and good repute of the individual lawyer, loyalty to the client and respect for the rule of law and the fair administration of justice. Furthermore, lawyers using GenAI can create risks with regard to adhering conflicts of

interest obligations, because AI systems may be trained on, or have access to, confidential information from multiple law firms and clients, potentially leading to inadvertent information sharing or conflicts of interest.

Future considerations

The guide concludes by mentioning several considerations that are already becoming apparent and which will merit future reflection and careful monitoring, such as self-regulation of the profession and its independence in the context of market dominance by few technology companies, education and professional development of lawyers, as well as the use of publicly available lawyers' data for training GenAI and its implications for intellectual property rights, or fraud.

1. Introduction

The aim of the present guide is to raise awareness of what generative AI (GenAI) is, to explain its current uses in legal practice and to highlight potential opportunities and risks associated with its use. The guide also aims to highlight considerations for lawyers' compliance with their professional obligations using the CCBE Charter of Core Principles of the European Legal Profession,[1] as well as inspiration from the CCBE Model Code of Conduct[2], and, lastly, the EU AI Act.[3] This guide may support lawyers, Bars and Law Societies or law firms / law practices in their efforts to ensure responsible use of GenAI.

The CCBE is aware that the field of GenAI is moving and evolving fast. Therefore the observations regarding current technology, made in this guidance are likely to become outdated and indeed may even be superseded prior to publication. To this end, the CCBE has tried to focus on the consistent professional obligations and the core opportunities and risks associated with GenAI.

The CCBE is aware of the broader implications of the use of AI in legal practice and beyond, as well as its societal impact. A number of these considerations are mentioned at the end of this paper without further analysis. Similarly, this guide will also not cover the use of AI tools in the wider justice system but will focus on how lawyers use them and what they should and should not do.

Moreover, this guide does not explore the basic terminology of AI tools, such as natural language processing (NLP), benchmarks for performance or training datasets, as these are analysed extensively in the CCBE's earlier publications and in particular in the CCBE 'Guide on the use of AI-based tools by lawyers and law firms in the EU' (2022).[4]

[1] Charter of Core Principles of the European Legal Profession and Code of Conduct for European Lawyers: https://www.ccbe.eu/fileadmin/speciality_distribution/public/documents/DEONTOLOGY/DEON_CoC/EN_DEON_CoC.pdf

[2] Model Code of Conduct for European Lawyers (2021): https://www.ccbe.eu/fileadmin/speciality_distribution/public/documents/DEONTOLOGY/DEON_CoC/EN_DEONTO_2021_Model_Code.pdf

[3] Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence [...], OJ L, 2024/1689, 12.7.2024, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj

[4] Guide on the use of AI-based tools by lawyers and law firms in the EU' (2022): https://www.ccbe.eu/fileadmin/speciality_distribution/public/documents/IT_LAW/ITL_Reports_studies/EN_ITL_20220331_Guide-AI4L.pdf

2. Generative AI – the basics

2.1 Key characteristics of generative AI

The key characteristic that differentiates GenAI systems from other AI systems is the production of new content in the form of text, image, audio or video.

GenAI systems work by analysing input data in their context and recognising patterns, which causes them to generate outputs. This contextual awareness enables them to produce content that aligns with the desired tone, style, and subject matter. They can adapt to various styles, such as artistic styles, tone or musical genres.

GenAI models work on the basis of probabilistic features which come from mathematical principles of probability and statistics. This allows the GenAI models to make predictions and generate content based on learned data distributions. Models like GPT-4o use probability distributions to determine the next word in a sentence, ensuring that the generated text is coherent and contextually appropriate. This involves calculating the conditional probability of a word given the preceding words, which helps in producing fluent and natural-sounding text.[5]

These systems are constantly evolving through iterative training on large and varied datasets. As these systems are exposed to more or different data, their ability to generate content changes.[6]

As with every other AI system, GenAI systems are also machine-based, operate with varying amounts of autonomy, and infer from input and/or data how to generate output. Most GenAI models use deep learning techniques, particularly neural networks, to process and generate data.

2.2 How is generative AI legally defined?

In the EU, the AI Act does not specially define or address GenAI; instead, GenAI is a subset of "AI systems" and often also "general purpose AI systems" as defined in Article 3 of the AI Act.[7]

The AI Act uses the definition of an AI system which is heavily based on the definition of 'AI' by the OECD: '*a machine-based system that is designed to operate with varying levels of autonomy and that may exhibit adaptiveness after deployment, and that, for explicit or implicit objectives, infers, from the input it receives, how to generate outputs such as predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions that can influence physical or virtual environments*' (Article 3(1)).

Article 3 of the AI Act in its point 63 defines a general purpose AI model (GPAI model) as: '*an AI model, including where such an AI model is trained with a large amount of data using self-*

[5] Adam Zewe, Explained: Generative AI, How do powerful generative AI systems like ChatGPT work, and what makes them different from other types of artificial intelligence?, https://news.mit.edu/2023/explained-generative-ai-1109, retrieved on 24 Feb 2025.
[6] This can work both ways – high-quality data will lead to more high-quality generated content and vice versa.
[7] Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act), OJ L, 2024/1689, 12.7.2024, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj

supervision at scale, that displays significant generality and is capable of competently performing a wide range of distinct tasks regardless of the way the model is placed on the market and that can be integrated into a variety of downstream systems or applications, except AI models that are used for research, development or prototyping activities before they are placed on the market.'

Article 3(66) defines a GPAI system as '*an AI system which is based on a general-purpose AI model and which has the capability to serve a variety of purposes, both for direct use as well as for integration in other AI systems*.'

The AI Act also defines high impact capabilities, which apply to the most powerful GPAI models, as '*capabilities that match or exceed the capabilities recorded in the most advanced general-purpose AI models*.'

Beyond the EU, in the Explanatory Memorandum on the updated OECD definition of an AI system the OECD refers directly to Generative AI systems: *"[g]enerative AI systems that produce "content" —including text, image, audio, and video—have gained significant momentum. Although one could, for example, view the generation of text as a sequence of decisions to output particular words (or predictions of words that would be likely to appear in a specific context), content generation systems have become such an important class of AI systems that they are included as their own output category in the present revised definition."*[8] Following from these considerations the OECD updated its AI system definition outputs from 'predictions, recommendations, or decisions' to 'predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions.'

The definition of an AI system of the OECD was also used as the basis for the drafting of Article 2 of the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence, Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law.[9]

Similar considerations are to be found in the European Commission guidance on the definition of AI, which also states that *content, as a category of output, may be understood from a technical perspective in terms of a sequence of 'predictions' or 'decisions', due to the prevalence of this output in generative AI systems, although it is listed in recital 12 AI Act as a separate category of output*.[10]

2.3 Regulatory approaches to GenAI

GenAI falls within the scope of various regulations and policy initiatives. First of all, there may be laws which focus on specific aspects of AI. Secondly, since the use of AI is by now widespread, there may be other laws that apply, such as privacy and data protection laws, and laws governing the use of AI in education, employment or in medical research.

[8] OECD, Explanatory Memorandum on the updated OECD definition of an AI system (March 2024), page 9: https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/explanatory-memorandum-on-the-updated-oecd-definition-of-an-ai-system_623da898-en.html

[9] Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law: https://rm.coe.int/1680afae3c

[10] European Commission (2025), Guidelines on the definition of an artificial intelligence system established by Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (AI Act) C(2025) 924 final, point 56: https://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/dae/redirection/document/112455

According to Stanford University's AI Index, 37 of 126 countries have taken action through AI regulations in 2024, up from just one in 2022.[11] According to Mind Foundry, at least 69 countries proposed over 1,000 AI-related policy initiatives or laws.[12]

The best-known piece of legislation is the EU AI Act which was adopted in 2023 and entered into force in August the same year. The AI Act establishes a risk-based framework that applies to all providers and users of AI systems in the EU market, regardless of origin. AI systems are classified into four categories each of which attracts different levels of regulation and obligations:

- unacceptable risk (prohibited practices), high risk such as social scoring, manipulative or exploitative AI, or certain biometric identification in public spaces;
- high risk where AI systems would be subject to numerous requirements, including conformity assessments, transparency, human oversight, data quality, and registration in an EU database. Among the potential high-risk use areas is the use of AI in the justice system;
- limited risk where AI systems would be subject to transparency obligations for example, disclosure when interacting with AI or when content is AI-generated, such as deepfakes;
- minimal risk which would cover most AI systems and which would face no additional regulation beyond general EU law.

The AI Act also includes specific rules applying to GPAI systems whereby they would be subject to transparency and documentation requirements, with stricter rules applying to high capability models. As such, the AI Act includes both the rules on the AI systems themselves, such as data governance and management, risk assessment and mitigation, technical documentation and record keeping, as well as the rules on the concrete applications of the AI systems, such as AI intended to be used as a product or the security component of a product covered by specific EU legislation.

In the US, the regulatory approach was a mix of federal Executive Orders, sector-specific rules, and State-level laws (notably in Colorado and California). However, following the change of US administration at the beginning of 2025, the regulatory approach is now under question, especially given the ten-year ban on State-level regulation of AI.[13]

Internationally, the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law is the first legally binding international treaty on AI, aiming to ensure AI activities are consistent with human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. Its regulated aspects include such principles and areas as human dignity and autonomy, equality and non-discrimination, privacy and data protection, transparency and oversight, accountability and responsibility, reliability and safe innovation, as well as risk assessment and mitigation. The Convention is open for signature by countries worldwide and aims to set common standards for

[11] AI: Will governance catch up with the tech in 2024? World Economic Forum, 1 March 2024 : https://www.weforum.org/stories/2024/03/ai-advances-governance-2024/

[12] AI Regulations around the World – 2025, MindFoundry, 25 January 2025, accessed 16 April 2025: https://www.mindfoundry.ai/blog/ai-regulations-around-the-world

[13] President Trump's Executive Order for Removing Barriers to American Leadership in AI, 23 January 2025 (that rescinds President Biden's Executive Order for the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of AI): https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/removing-barriers-to-american-leadership-in-artificial-intelligence/

trustworthy AI.[14] Thus far, the Convention was signed by Andorra, Georgia, Iceland, Norway, Moldova, San Marino, UK, Israel, the US and the EU.[15]

The use of AI systems, including GenAI, by lawyers is usually subject to the professional obligations applicable in a given jurisdiction and to other laws to which lawyers would normally be subject.

In addition, there are several sectoral initiatives that address the judiciary's use of AI, most notably the European Ethical Charter on the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial systems and their environment adopted by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) of the Council of Europe.[16]

Other initiatives include issuing guidelines for justice system professionals and for lawyers (see Annex 1 for the list of relevant guidelines).

[14] Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law: https://rm.coe.int/1680afae3c

[15] Council of Europe opens first ever global treaty on AI for signature, 5 September 2024: https://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/-/council-of-europe-opens-first-ever-global-treaty-on-ai-for-signature

[16] CEPEJ European Ethical Charter on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in judicial systems and their environment: https://www.coe.int/en/web/cepej/cepej-european-ethical-charter-on-the-use-of-artificial-intelligence-ai-in-judicial-systems-and-their-environment

3. Generative AI in legal practice – take up, benefits and risks

3.1 Take up of GenAI tools by lawyers

One does not need to have a strong interest in new technology to notice the significant rise in the use of AI, particularly GenAI tools, both in general and within legal practice. According to the International Legal Generative AI Report by LexisNexis (surveys conducted in March and July 2023 in the US, UK, France and Canada), 89% of lawyers were aware of GenAI, 41 % have used it for any purpose and 15% have used it for legal purposes.[17]

A recent survey from Thomson Reuters Institute suggested that the top five use cases for law firms using or planning to use GenAI are legal research, document review, briefing or memo drafting, document summarisation and correspondence drafting.[18]

Recently more and more AI features are integrated by regular updates in everyday software. Users may not be aware that a functionality interacts with a GenAI model as this information is not made readily available in the options (menu) or elsewhere.

Providers of AI systems have increased the output of new systems/models significantly. Many AI solutions are being marketed as specialised tools for legal practitioners to enable more efficient work practices. Most notably those include specialised research and drafting tools trained on or linked to legal data.

3.2 Benefits of generative AI in legal practice

The use of GenAI in legal practice carries a long a list of potential benefits, provided it is set up and used correctly and safely. These include improvements in efficiency (for example, automated document creation, quick analysis of large volumes of documents or streamlined client communication), enhanced legal research (e.g. faster and more accurate finding of relevant case law, database analysis or identification of legal trends) and better quality of work (e.g. through error reduction, compliance checking or standardised processes).

This can lead to potential cost savings, faster processing of cases, better allocation of resources within the legal practice, and an increased focus on qualitative rather than routine tasks. Lastly, it can also lead to improved client service through potentially: faster response times, better cost estimation (e.g. of the expected workload on the basis of analysing a large amount of documents),

[17] LexisNexis, International Legal Generative AI Report (22 August2023), page 6: https://www.lexisnexis.com/pdf/lexisplus/international-legal-generative-ai-report.pdf
[18] 2024 Generative AI in Professional Services, Thomson Reuters Institute: https://www.thomsonreuters.com/en/reports/2024-generative-ai-in-professional-services

better client support as well as better access to lawyers for the underserved. As such, GenAI has the potential to change the daily work routine of lawyers, making it possible, for example, to focus on strategic consulting and developing new specialisations. Indeed, the survey by Thomson Reuters reported that the respondents from the legal sector pointed to 'GenAI's potential for cost savings, its ability to allow professionals to spend more time on high-value tasks, and its potential to aid in quality control checks.'[19]

3.3 Risks of using generative AI

While there is potential for GenAI tools to improve efficiency and support the delivery of legal advice and services, it is important to consider the risks associated with their use and their implications for lawyers' professional obligations. The risks discussed below depend on the use case, where some use cases involve significant risks (e.g. asking for legal advice) while others may pose lesser risks.

3.3.1 Privacy and data protection

GenAI systems rely on vast datasets for training, creating a primary risk: users interacting with these tools for specific tasks may unknowingly contribute input data that retrains the model. Without clear disclosures from system operators, individuals could unintentionally expose confidential or sensitive information, unaware of the potential risks.

Another potential risk arises from the possibility that providers or vendors of GenAI tools may have access to both the input and output data. Personal and other confidential information may be knowingly or unknowingly included in the datasets used to train the AI system or generated during its operation.

At present, it is technologically unclear whether such data could be deleted and how data protection laws would navigate the exercise of data subject rights in the context of GenAI and personal data. This could also raise data protection concerns both regarding what personal data was used, as well as whether such personal data may be present in the outputs.

3.3.2 Hallucinations

So-called hallucinations occur when GenAI and other AI systems generate factually inaccurate or illogical answers. [20] This may arise from several factors such as training data limitations, probabilistic nature of the AI models, contextual misunderstanding, overgeneralisation or synthetic data generation.[21]

[19] Ibidem
[20] Glossary of Terms: Generative AI Basics: https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/basics/glossary/; IBM: What are AI hallucinations?: https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/ai-hallucinations; AI Hallucination: A Guide With Examples, Data Camp: https://www.datacamp.com/blog/ai-hallucination
[21] When AI Gets It Wrong: Addressing AI Hallucinations and Bias, MIT Management: https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/basics/addressing-ai-hallucinations-and-bias/; Hallucinations: Why AI Makes Stuff Up, and What's Being Done About It, CNET, 1 April 2024: https://www.cnet.com/tech/hallucinations-why-ai-makes-stuff-up-and-whats-being-done-about-it/

In the context of legal services the GenAI output might produce entirely fictional case law, create non-existent court cases or judicial opinions, falsely attribute quotes to judges or legal scholars or construct seemingly plausible but entirely invented legal arguments. They can also produce fictitious statutory interpretations, invent legal principles, misrepresent the current state of law in specific jurisdictions or create false connections between legal concepts. [22]

3.3.3 Bias and sycophancy

Bias in GenAI refers to systematic errors or skewed representations that emerge from the training data, model design, or algorithmic processes. These biases can inadvertently reproduce or amplify existing societal prejudices, leading to unfair or inaccurate outputs.

Sycophancy in GenAI refers to the tendency of AI systems, particularly large language models, to generate responses that align with the user's perceived preferences or biases, often excessively agreeing or providing overly positive feedback.[23] This behaviour arises because the AI models are trained on vast datasets that include patterns of human communication, where agreeing and positive reinforcement are common. Consequently, the AI may prioritise generating agreeable responses over providing accurate or critical information, potentially leading to misleading or unbalanced outputs.

3.3.4 Lack of transparency

Transparency in AI systems refers to the clarity and openness with which these systems operate, enabling users to understand how decisions are made. This involves making the algorithms, data sources, and decision-making processes fully accessible and comprehensible.

At present, virtually all GenAI systems exhibit what is known as the 'black box' phenomenon, where their internal reasoning processes are opaque and difficult to interpret. This means that even the developers and providers of these systems cannot fully explain how outputs are produced. For lawyers, this poses significant challenges: first, it makes it harder to verify and trust the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated content, which may compromise the quality of legal advice or submissions. Second, it raises concerns about the confidentiality of client information provided to AI systems, particularly if such data is stored, re-used, or inadvertently incorporated into the system's ongoing training, potentially breaching professional secrecy obligations.

3.3.5 Intellectual property and related rights

The ownership of input and output data is a key concern when using GenAI tools. Copyrighted and/or unlicensed data may be used to train these tools and there is also potential for copyright infringement if input data containing copyright works results in recognisable outputs.

---

[22] See for example: New York lawyers sanctioned for using fake ChatGPT cases in legal brief | Reuters: https://www.reuters.com/legal/new-york-lawyers-sanctioned-using-fake-chatgpt-cases-legal-brief-2023-06-22/; No. 42 law firm by head count could face sanctions over fake case citations generated by AI (ABA Journal, 10 February 2025): https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/no-42-law-firm-by-headcount-could-face-sanctions-over-fake-case-citations-generated-by-chatgpt

[23] Sycophancy in Generative-AI Chatbots, NN Group, 12 January 2024: https://www.nngroup.com/articles/sycophancy-generative-ai-chatbots/

Furthermore, there may be challenges around ownership clauses within terms of services and agreements. GenAI tool agreements may contain provisions allowing the AI vendor to reuse input data to refine their system. Some agreements may note that the AI provider and vendor retains ownership of the output data. Even greater issues regarding lack of transparency can arise when GenAI providers invoke trade secret protections to withhold information about their systems.

3.3.6 Cybersecurity

As with all digital technologies, using GenAI tools can introduce and exacerbate cybersecurity risks, including the potential for malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities.

These include the production of more frequent and sophisticated phishing and cybersecurity attacks (cyber criminals using GenAI tools to streamline their own attacks).

GenAI tools may also introduce new attack vectors. For example, one such method is 'prompt injections', where certain commands are subtly inserted into the tool during input to manipulate or bypass tool restrictions on data inputs or outputs to perform previously restricted activities.

Other cybersecurity risks include data or source corruption (called data poisoning) or model poisoning, both of which may compromise the GenAI tool's behaviour and outputs (e.g. feedback loops).

3.3.7 Fraud

Fraud involving GenAI is a growing threat, with deepfakes, synthetic identities, and AI-driven scams posing significant challenges to security systems.[24] For example, deepfakes powered by GenAI have become a powerful tool for identity theft. Potential risks include producing fake documents, impersonation or manipulating facial recognition systems which can result in reputational harms or leaking of sensitive information.

[24] Understanding Generative AI Fraud: Risks and Prevention Strategies, Inscribe, 19 June 2024: https://www.inscribe.ai/fraud-detection/generative-ai-fraud

4. The use of generative AI in legal practice and lawyers' professional obligations

The use of GenAI tools engages several core principles of the legal profession, as set out in the CCBE Charter of Core Principles of the European Legal Profession ('Charter')[25] and by way of examples in the CCBE Model Code of Conduct[26], the most important of which are confidentiality and professional competence. However, as this guide aims to show, such use also raises considerations with regard to other core principles, such as interactions with courts and with professional colleagues. Some of the implications discussed in this guide may only be seen in the longer term, such as the impact on the independence of the legal profession or on the future training and continuing professional development of lawyers.

Moreover, lawyers will also need to comply with applicable legislation in the jurisdictions where they operate. For example, in the EU, starting from 2 February 2025, the AI Act (under Article 4) requires all organisations to ensure their staff are knowledgeable about AI, regardless of whether they are involved in the AI value chain as providers or users (also referred to as 'deployers' in the EU AI Act).

4.1 Confidentiality

Lawyers are required to keep confidential their communications with, information received from, and advice given to their clients. The confidentiality of communications between a client and their lawyer is protected by the principle of professional secrecy (also known as legal professional privilege).[13] The core principle (b) of the Charter concerns '*the right and duty of the lawyer to keep clients' matters confidential and to respect professional secrecy'* (and the resulting need to make reasonable efforts to prevent the unauthorised or unlawful access to confidential information).' This obligation is one of the most important professional duties and is the basis for the relationship of trust between lawyer and client in a state governed by the rule of law.

The CCBE Model Code of Conduct's Article on Confidentiality reads that: '*The lawyer is bound by confidentiality. It is a duty of the lawyer, and may also be a right of the lawyer.*' (point 2) The same Article clarifies that confidentiality applies to information about a client or a client matter. Such information can either be given to the lawyer by his or her client or received by the lawyer in the course of the lawyer´s professional activities (point 4). Confidentiality also applies to documents prepared by the lawyer, to all those delivered by the lawyer to their client and to all communications between them (point 5). Lastly, the Model Article obliges the lawyer to respect

[25] CCBE Charter of core principles of the European legal profession : https://www.ccbe.eu/fileadmin/speciality_distribution/public/documents/DEONTOLOGY/DEON_CoC/EN_DEON_CoC.pdf

[26] CCBE Model Code of Conduct: https://www.ccbe.eu/fileadmin/speciality_distribution/public/documents/DEONTOLOGY/DEON_CoC/EN_DEONTO_2021_Model_Code.pdf

the confidentiality of all information that becomes known to the lawyer in the course of his or her professional activity.

The obligation of confidentiality applies in situations where lawyers incorporate GenAI tools in the course of their legal practice. Given the risks associated with the use of GenAI outlined in earlier sections, lawyers must be aware that:

- the users themselves (i.e. lawyers) are responsible for the information they provide as an input to the system, and may be in breach of their professional obligations and/or relevant data protection laws already at the point of inputting the data into a system, for example as prompts.[27]
- data that is entered into the user interface may be stored and re-used by the provider for purposes such as training or refining and improving the AI model, unless stipulated otherwise. This includes using the input and conversation history of its users and users' personal information, including log/usage data, analysing, improving and/or developing the model further;[28]
- this problem may become particularly acute where the same AI system is also used by other law firms;
- data supplied to or entered into a GenAI tool may also be accessed by the AI provider, its employees, or shared with third parties or vendors for various other purposes. In most cases, the data entered through the user interface is processed by a third party operating the AI system, often via cloud services or AI-as-a-Service (AIaaS). This data can include personal information and confidential client details. The transfer of personal and client data must comply strictly with data protection laws and professional confidentiality obligations;[29]
- the AI providers may not be aware of the nature of the data provided by the user and that its nature may be personal data or client confidential data. Hence, the AI provider may be unintentionally treating the data as ordinary data;
- GenAI tools have increasingly been incorporated into many everyday tools which lawyers often use, such as translation tools, PDF readers, text editors or navigation apps. It may be that users (lawyers) do not realise that the tools use AI. Most, if not all, of these tools are cloud-based.[30] The same care should be taken with confidential information when using these tools.

When contemplating the use of GenAI for client work, law firms and lawyers must take into account the data protection laws applicable to every business, other laws that govern the protection of intellectual property, trade secrets or non-personal data and the professional rules that govern the legal profession. The professional rules apply to all client data.

---

[27] 'Confidentiality of conversations with AI: what happens to the data we enter as prompts?' Stefanelli & Stefanelli, 20 January 2025: https://www.studiolegalestefanelli.it/en/insights/confidentiality-of-conversations-with-ai-what-happens-to-the-data-we-enter-as-prompts/

[28] See for example: Stefanelli & Stefanelli (above), Docusign FAQs for AI (updated December 2024, accessed 20 February 2025): https://support.docusign.com/s/document-item?language=en_US&bundleId=fzd1707173174972&topicId=uss1707173279973.html&_LANG=enus, OpenAI Privacy Policy (4 November 2024, accessed 20 February 2025): https://openai.com/en-GB/policies/privacy-policy/ or Anthropic Privacy Policy (19 February 2025, accessed 20 February 2025): https://www.anthropic.com/legal/privacy

[29] CCBE guidelines on the use of cloud computing by Bars and lawyers 27/02/2025: https://www.ccbe.eu/fileadmin/speciality_distribution/public/documents/IT_LAW/ITL_Guides_recommendations/EN_ITL_20250227__CCBE-guidelines-on-the-use-of-cloud-computing-by-lawyers.pdf

[30] Ibidem

Summarising the above, law firms and lawyers should adhere to the following basic rules:

- refrain from entering any personal, confidential, or other data related to the client into the user interface of the GenAI (e.g. as prompts/queries), unless there are appropriate safeguards in place. These can include, for example:
    - contractual obligations for the GenAI provider to treat data as confidential[31] or apply zero data retention periods;
    - concluding a data protection agreement (DPA) according to which the data entered will only be used for the purposes of the law firm or lawyer; or
    - setting up relevant technical safeguards or setting up AI systems to run locally or within a secured environment controlled by the law firm in question.
- analyse terms and conditions of the AI provider to understand how data entered into the tool is used. If available, the AI system setting should be set accordingly to avoid access and sharing; and
- in order to protect the information they hold, meet cybersecurity standards, relevant data protection laws, and deontological obligations, including processing data in the EU/EEA, where that is appropriate.

4.2 Professional competence

Lawyers are responsible for their work, the advice they give and the representations they make (to the courts or other authorities). To this end, they are required, among other things, to update and maintain their knowledge and professional skills and keep abreast with the technological developments affecting their practice.

The requirement of professional competence is included in one of the core principles (g) of the Charter which stresses that: '*A lawyer should be aware of the benefits and risks of using relevant technologies in his or her practice*.' This principle is reflected in the Model Article on Relations with Clients, point 2.2 reads that: '*Lawyers shall maintain their professional skills through continuing education in legal and other practice-related subject matters*.' The commentary further specifies that: '*Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation. Lawyers are only able to provide such competent representation by keeping pace with the continuous rapid change of the law and technological environment in which they operate*.'

The duty of competence of the lawyer is not only restricted to law and regulation, but encompasses the obligation to become knowledgeable about a technical product to be used for professional activities. In the present context, such knowledge can effectively help the lawyer to assess and mitigate the risks related to the use of GenAI tools.

To avoid or mitigate the risks posed by the use of GenAI tools in legal practice set out in sections above, lawyers should:

- where the use case requires, verify the output of a GenAI before it is utilised in their work;[32]

[31] Ibidem

[32] There may only be certain categories of tasks where it may be appropriate to utilise the output without the necessary verification. This is for example if it concerns a task that does not carry or potentially cause risks or if the recipient of the output or the work based on the output is comprehensively informed about the utilisation of unverified AI-output and the risks associated with it.

- understand the capabilities and limitations of all technological solutions they use for their work, including GenAI;
- understand the different contexts in which they use GenAI and the implications and risks that arise from such use;
- follow relevant training activities (or other materials) to understand the opportunities and limitations of the AI tools and the risks such use may pose to their professional obligations;
- refer to available advice and guidance from their respective Bars or Law Societies on the use of GenAI in legal practice (if available).

Lawyers using AI-generated content without appropriate verification could face sanctions for professional misconduct and/or contempt of court, malpractice lawsuits, damage to their clients' interest and the client's trust in their lawyer, as well as damage to the lawyer's reputation. In this context, lawyers should also be mindful of other core principles included in the Charter, namely:

- (d) the dignity and honour of the legal profession, and the integrity and good repute of the individual lawyer. The commentary on the Charter states that: '*[…] the lawyer must do nothing to damage either his or her own reputation or the reputation of the profession as a whole and public confidence in the profession*.' Using unverified outputs, especially with incorrect, false or misleading information, may undermine the trust in the lawyer's ability to provide competent and reliable advice.
- (e) loyalty to the client. The commentary on the Charter states that: '[…] *The client must be able to trust the lawyer as adviser and as representative*. […]' Model Article on Relations with Clients states that: '*A lawyer must always act in the best interests of the client*.' Using unverified outputs in lawyers' work, especially with incorrect, false or misleading information, may hinder the interests of the client; and
- (i) respect for the rule of law and the fair administration of justice. The commentary on the Charter states that: '[…] *A lawyer must never knowingly give false or misleading information to the court, nor should a lawyer ever lie to third parties in the course of his or her professional activities*. […]'

Furthermore, it should be mentioned that clients are increasingly conscious of the opportunities and risks resulting from the use of GenAI by their lawyers. While some clients may demand the use of AI tools from their lawyers, other clients may demand from their lawyers not to use any AI tools at all, in particular not GenAI.

4.3 Independence

Lawyers' independence is one of the fundamental principles of the legal profession and as such is included in the Charter under principle (a). The commentary on the Charter states that: '[…] *The lawyer must also remain independent of his or her own client if the lawyer is to enjoy the trust of third parties and the courts. Indeed without this independence from the client there can be no guarantee of the quality of the lawyer's work*. […]'

Model Article on Independence point 1.2 states for example that: '*In the exercise of his or her profession, the lawyer shall be independent, free from influence, including influence which may*

arise from his or her personal interests or as a result of external pressure. A lawyer must therefore avoid any impairment of his or her independence and should not compromise his or her professional standards in his or her dealings with the client, the court, third parties and public authorities. [...]'

The lawyers' use of Gen AI poses challenges in relation to maintaining professional objectivity. These arise in the context of bias and sycophancy, described in earlier sections, whereby an AI system can produce recommendations that perpetuate bias as well as may lack the necessary nuance and due regard for client's particular circumstances and needs. Lawyers relying on such tools risk internalising these biases, which could influence their conduct thereby eroding their duty to provide impartial advice. Another risk that arises in this context is overreliance on outputs, which can lead to 'automation complacency' and substituting human judgment with automated conclusions. The risk is amplified where there is insufficient quality control and verification of the accuracy of the output, and insufficient independent legal analysis by the lawyer. It may also lead to dependence on the (few) providers of quality AI tools and their legal opinions.

4.4 Transparency and information to the client

As with other technologies and tools, if it can reasonably be assumed that an informed client would object, make conditions, or otherwise have reservations in respect of use of the GenAI for the purpose in question, the lawyer should make sure to be transparent with the client.

4.5 Conflict of interest

Lawyers should be mindful of Principle (c) of the Charter of Core Principles of the European Legal Profession which deals with the avoidance of conflicts of interest: '*For the proper exercise of his or her profession, the lawyer must avoid conflicts of interest. [...]*' This principle is reflected in the Model Article on Conflicts of Interest of the CCBE Model Code. The use of GenAI by lawyers can create risks for maintaining conflicts of interest obligations because AI systems may be trained on or have access to confidential information from multiple clients within the law firm, potentially leading to inadvertent information sharing or conflicts.[33]

[33] This may happen even if the AI system is only using the client data of a single law firm, for example, if client A is represented in a case against B and client B is not currently, but has previously been, a client of the law firm years ago. If the client data of client B is still stored in the law firm and used by the AI system, it may be that its own client data is used in a case against them.

5. **Considerations** for the future

The advice presented in these guidelines addresses the most immediate concerns related to lawyers' use of Gen AI. However, these tools will most likely evolve as a result of technological changes and as new use cases emerge. This will undoubtedly have long-term effects on how lawyers should interpret their professional obligations in new contexts.

Among the future considerations, there are several that are already becoming apparent and which will merit future reflection and careful monitoring:

- self-regulation of the profession and its independence: Gen AI tools, and other technologies, are to a large extent developed and marketed by a relatively small number of technology providers that together hold considerable market power and can impose conditions on the use of their services. Therefore, there arises a question whether the independence of the profession as a whole could be affected;
- education and professional development of lawyers: AI tools can provide a great deal of assistance in performing legal tasks. However, the tools should not be used without a proper understanding of the tasks which they are asked to perform. Therefore, it is essential that the training of lawyers in the performance of the underlying tasks should not be neglected. Some AI tools may require complex training to make sure they are used correctly. Additionally, some skills attached to the use of AI, such as knowing how to question GenAI in order to reach the correct answer, and also knowing how it works in order to avoid its mistakes, might be considered essential training in the future.
- erosion of professional skills: If the work which was traditionally given to junior lawyers to train them in drafting and review is automated, a new light is thrown on training such lawyers, and consideration should be given to ensuring that their training is reinforced in those areas where their skills might otherwise be eroded.
- use of publicly available lawyers' data for training GenAI and its implications on intellectual property rights: the training process for GenAI models, in some cases, involves comprehensive information crawling and systematic scraping of any accessible information. For law firms, this means their intellectual assets – such as case analyses, legislative guides, and specialised research publications – are being harvested and integrated into AI training datasets.
- this process also transforms professionally generated content into training material that could ultimately be used to create competitive technological solutions, effectively turning law firms' intellectual labour into the raw material for AI companies. These may in the future develop solutions that would challenge the services provided by lawyers while not being subject to the same professional obligations and in effect, remaining unregulated. Therefore, lawyers should remain vigilant about how the information they publish on their websites or make publicly accessible elsewhere can be used in developing potentially competing solutions. At the time of writing, there have been intense discussions and

protests led by the representatives of the media and creative industries, opposing the unauthorised use of their original material to train GenAI models. [34]

- fraud: just as deepfakes of celebrities are already possible, will it be possible for a deepfake of an existing law-firm to defraud clients? Or of persons which lawyers need to identify within the framework of due diligence activities? How would lawyers detect and respond to deep-faked online live testimonies of witnesses? What steps should be taken to prevent it?

The use of Gen AI also raises more general questions that lawyers may want to be aware of. These include the questions related to procurement of AI tools used by lawyers, where and how such tools were developed and what considerations lawyers and law firms must be aware of when buying such systems for professional use.

[34] For example, there are twelve copyright lawsuits filed against OpenAI and Microsoft in New York and California which will be combined and heard in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. This consolidation brings together a range of claims alleging that the defendants' use of books, articles, and transcripts to train AI tools does not qualify as protected fair use. See: https://www.theguardian.com/books/2025/apr/04/us-authors-copyright-lawsuits-against-openai-and-microsoft-combined-in-new-york-with-newspaper-actions Earlier in February 2025, Thomson Reuters has won against Ross Intelligence in the first significant AI copyright case in the United States. The company initiated a lawsuit in 2020 against the legal AI startup Ross Intelligence in which it accused Ross Intelligence of copying content from its legal research service, Westlaw. The court ruled in favour of Thomson Reuters, determining that Ross Intelligence had indeed infringed on the company's copyright. See: https://www.wired.com/story/thomson-reuters-ai-copyright-lawsuit/. In June 2025, a coalition of professional organisations representing the collective voice of creative industry professions has called on the European Parliament to address several unresolved issues around copyright and AI: https://composeralliance.org/news/2025/6/joint-letter-to-the-european-parliament-s-juri-committee-on-the-upcoming-own-initiative-report-on-copyright-and-generative-ai/

6. Conclusion

While lawyers' core professional obligations remain unchanged, the context in which they are applied is rapidly evolving due to technological advancements like GenAI. This shifting landscape requires continuous reflection and adaptation to ensure that the core values of the legal profession are upheld amid new challenges and opportunities in legal practice.

This guidance has attempted to highlight the key professional obligations which are engaged when Gen AI tools are used by lawyers. It also attempted to point out several emerging considerations which have implications for the future in light of the core values of the legal profession. It is not intended as an overarching set of principles but rather an overview of those that as of the time of this guide represent the most discussed issues connected to the use of AI by legal professionals.

Annex 1 - Resources on the use of generative AI by lawyers and/or judicial professionals

Country	Title
Argentina	Protocol for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Judiciary (November 2024)
Australia (New South Wales)	Generative AI: Resources on the responsible use of generative artificial intelligence (Gen AI) in Supreme Court proceedings (including a briefing for the legal profession) Law Society of New South Wales: AI and legal professionals
Australia (Queensland)	Using Generative AI
Australia (Victoria)	Guidelines for litigants: responsible use of artificial intelligence in litigation (Supreme Court) Responsible use of artificial intelligence in litigation: guidelines for litigants (County Court)
Belgium	Guidelines on lawyers' use of generative AI (FR/NL)
Brazil	Brazilian Bar Association (OAB) (November 2024)
Canada	CBA - Ethics of Artificial Intelligence for the Legal Practitioners
Canada	College of Patent Agents & Trademark Agent - Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Patent and Trademark Agent Practices - ethical an Practical Considerations
Canada (Alberta)	The generative AI Playbook – How Lawyers Can Safely Take Advantage of the Opportunities Offered by Generative AI
Canada (British Columbia)	Practice Resource Guidance on Professional Responsibility and generative AI
Canada (Manitoba)	Generative artificial intelligence - Guidelines for use in the Practice of Law
Canada (Newfoundland & Labrador)	Artificial intelligence in your practice
Canada (Ontario)	White Paper April 2024 - Licensee use of generative artificial intelligence Law Society of Ontario - additional practice notes
Canada (Quebec)	Quebec Bar - Practical Guide for a responsible use of generative AI
Canada (Saskatchewan)	Guidelines for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Practice of Law

	Using Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) Tools to Obtain Legal Information (Law Society of Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan Access to Legal Information (SALI)) (June 2025)
China (Hong Kong)	The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Legal Profession Professional Obligations in the Use of GEN AI
Colombia	ACUERDO PCSJA24-12243 16 de diciembre de 2024, "Por el cual se adoptan lineamientos para el uso y aprovechamiento respetuoso, responsable, seguro y ético de la inteligencia artificial en la Rama Judicial" ('Whereby guidelines are adopted for the respectful, responsible, safe, and ethical use and application of artificial intelligence in the Judicial Branch.') (Spanish only) (December 2024)
Czech Republic	Stanovisko k užívání umělé intelligence (AI) PŘI poskrytování právních služeb (Opinion on the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the provision of legal services) (Czech only) (September 2023)
United Arab Emirates (Dubai)	Practical Guidance Note No. 2 of 2023 Guidelines on the use of large language models and generative AI in proceedings before the DIFC Courts, Dubai International Financial Courts
EU (CCBE)	CCBE Considerations on the legal aspects of artificial intelligence, 2020
EU (CCBE)	Guide on the use of Artificial Intelligence-based tools by lawyers and law firms in the EU, 2022
EU (CJEU)	Artificial Intelligence Strategy (November 2023)
EU (FBE)	Federation of European Bars 'Guidelines on how lawyers should take advantage of the opportunities offered by large language models and generative AI'
Europe (Council of Europe)	Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) by judicial professionals in a work-related context (2024)
Estonia	Tehisaru juhend advokaatidele (Guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence by lawyers), December 2024 (in Estonian only)
France	Conseil National des Barreaux, Utilisation des systèmes d'intelligence artificielle générative (septembre 2024) Conseil National des Barreaux, Grille de lecture – Synthèse des consultations effectuées par le groupe de travail sur l'intelligence artificielle (juin 2025) Cour de Cassation 'Préparer la Cour de cassation de demain - Cour de cassation et intelligence artificielle' (avril 2025)
International Bar Association (IBA)	The Future is Now: Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Profession (September 2024)
Italy	Charter of Principles for the Conscious Use of AI Systems in the Legal Field (HOROS), Milan Bar Association (December 2024)

Ireland	Ethical Toolkit: Ethical Use and Use Cases for Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice, The Bar of Ireland (29 April 2025)
Malaysia	Bar Council Malaysia, The Risks and Precautions in Using Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Profession, Specifically ChatGPT, November 2023
New Zealand	Guidelines on the use of generative AI in courts and tribunals – lawyers, Courts of New Zealand, December 2023
Nigeria	Guidelines for the use of artificial intelligence by the legal profession in Nigeria, Nigerian bar Association (August 2024)
Poland	AI in the work of an attorney-in-law: recommendations on how attorneys-at-law should use AI-based tools, May 2025
Republic of South Africa	Draft Ethics Guidelines for Legal Practitioners in South Africa on the Use of Generative AI (in progress as of June 2025)
Singapore	(forthcoming) Public Consultation on Guide for Using Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Sector (1 September 2025)
Spain	Libro blanco sobre la IA-White book on IA (forthcoming October 2025)
Sweden	Vägledning om användning av generativ AI i advokatverksamhet (Guidance on the use of generative AI in legal practice) (Swedish only) (June 2025)
UK (England and Wales)	The Law Society of England and Wales: Generative AI – the essentials, 17 November 2023 Solicitors Regulation Authority : Risk Outlook report: The use of artificial intelligence in the legal market The Bar Council of England and Wales: Considerations when using ChatGPT and generative artificial intelligence software based on large language models (January 2024)
UK (Scotland)	Law Society of Scotland: Guide to Generative AI
US	MIT Computational Law (AI) (Task Force on the responsible use of generative AI by lawyers)
US (ABA)	Navigating AI in the Judiciary: New Guidelines for Judges and Their Chambers, February 2025, The Sedona Conference Journal, Volume 26, Forthcoming 2025
US (ABA)	American Bar Association - standing committee on ethics and professional responsibility (Opinion 512)
US (Arizona)	Arizona Code of Judicial Administration - Chapter 5: Automation - Section 1-509: Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Technology and Large Language Models

US (California)	The State Bar of California (Standing Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct): Practical guidance for the use of generative artificial intelligence in the practice of law Model Policy for Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence
US (Connecticut)	State of Connecticut Judicial Branch, The Judicial Branch's Policies and Procedures Concerning Artificial Intelligence February 2024
US (Delaware)	Interim Policy on the Use of Generative AI by Judicial Officers and Court Personnel, October 2024
US (Florida)	The Florida Bar Proposed Advisory Opinion 24-1 Regarding lawyers' use of generative artificial intelligence – Official Notice The Florida Bar Guide to Getting Started with AI
US (Illinois)	Illinois Supreme Court policy on artificial intelligence, 1 January 2025 Illinois Supreme Court policy on artificial intelligence, Judicial Reference Sheet, 1 January 2025
US (Kentucky)	Kentucky Court of Justice, Generative Artificial Intelligence Standard, March 2024
US (Louisiana)	Louisiana Supreme Court's Letter Discussing the Emergence of Artificial Intelligence Technology January 2024
US (Maryland)	Maryland Judiciary, Guidelines for the Acceptable Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools and Platforms, 15 April 2024
US (Michigan)	Opinion JI-155 (duty of technological competence), Michigan Bar, 27 October 2023
US (New Jersey)	New Jersey State Bar, Preliminary Guidelines on the Use of Artificial Intelligence by New Jersey Lawyers January 2024 Statement of Principles for the New Jersey Judiciary's Ongoing Use of Artificial Intelligence, Including Generative Artificial Intelligence
US (New York)	Report and Recommendations of the New York State Bar Association Task Force on Artificial Intelligence, April 2024 New York City Bar, Artificial Intelligence and the New York State judiciary: a preliminary path, June 2024
US (South Dakota)	Unified Judicial System Generative Artificial Intelligence Guidance, June 2024
US (Utah)	Interim rules on the use of generative AI, October 2023
US (West Virginia)	Judicial Investigation Commission, Advisory Opinion 2023-22
UNESCO	Global toolkit on AI and the rule of law for the judiciary (2023)

UNESCO	Draft UNESCO Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals (2024)