AI AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: TRANSFORMING GOVERNANCE WITH CAUTION[*] [**]

JAN NEŠPOR, ADAM JAREŠ, ELIŠKA KLIMENTOVÁ

Abstract: The European Union has taken a leading role in setting regulatory standards for artificial intelligence, including its use in public administration. While the principle that public authority should remain human-led remains formally upheld, this article explores how current European practices – from Estonia to Denmark, Poland, and the Czech Republic – already challenge its application. Adopting a comparative perspective, it examines whether the precautionary principle and the concept of a *humanity reserve* can guide responsible AI governance in public administration. This article explores how generative AI is being tested and deployed across various levels of public administration, with a focus on both international developments and emerging Czech initiatives. Particular attention is given to institutional use cases, potential risks, and the evolving role of AI in decision-making processes.

Keywords: AI in public administration; generative AI; administrative decision-making

DOI: 10.14712/23366478.2026.7

INTRODUCTION

With its adoption of AI Act, the European Union has re-established its status as a leader in regulating cutting-edge technologies. The legislative initiative is the first worldwide effort to lay down conceptual principles for deploying AI in a wide variety of areas, including, but not limited to, public administration.

There is a broad, recognized academic and international agreement that public administration must be rooted in a human-centred approach as one its fundamental values. Public authority should not, at least for the time being, be vested in non-human actors such as AI.[1] Nevertheless, it would seem this agreement is more theoretical than absolute, as can be deduced from the following factors.

[*] The work was supported by the grant SVV no. 260750 "International and supranational regulation of autonomization and automatization of human and machine decision-making".

[**] The AI generative language model Chat GPT was used in the processing of the paper for the purpose of text proofreading.

[1] Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence, OECD/LEGAL/0449. In: *OECD Legal Instruments* [online]. Paris: OECD, 2019, Rev. 3. 5. 2024 [cit. 2025-05-25]. Available at: https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/oecd-legal-0449; or SCHOENHERR, J. R. – ABBAS, R. – MICHAEL, K. –

To begin with, broad use of AI in public administration does not qualify as high-risk, as compared with its application in judicial decision-making, which is specifically banned and as such has a lower level of regulation in this use case.[2] Only specific parts of public administration such as law enforcement, asylum procedures, or welfare services have been highlighted as high-risk areas in the law.[3]

Second, and more importantly, some member states, for example Sweden or Estonia already have complete automated solutions for particular administrative agendas within public administration.[4] Helberger et al. even found that, certain age groups perceive automated decision making fairer than human decision-making.[5]

The rationale behind maintaining human-led public authority is anchored in principles of democratic legitimacy and accountability. Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union enshrines the right to good administration, including the right to be heard and to know the identity of the decision-maker. Full automation risks undermining these guarantees unless clear frameworks for human oversight and appeal are preserved.

The dimensions and scope of AI integration into public administration continue to expand, and how AI could end up substituting traditional administrative frameworks is a question still open. That is going to be determined by what happens in national experiments with AI in public administration.

In this context, the Czech Republic ranks as a below-average performer with respect to digitalization, eGovernment infrastructure, as well as adoption of disruptive technologies within the public sector.[6]

RIVAS, P. – ANDERSON, T. D. Designing AI Using a Human-Centered Approach: Explainability and Accuracy Toward Trustworthiness. *IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society* [online]. 2023, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 9–23.

2 Comparison of the recitals 60 and 61 of the 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).

3 See Annex III of ibid.

4 KAUN, A. – LARSSON, A. O. – MASSO, A. Automating public administration: citizens' attitudes towards automated decision-making across Estonia, Sweden, and Germany. *Information, Communication & Society* [online]. 2024, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 314–332 [cit. 2025-05-25]. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2023.2205493#d1e274.

5 HELBERGER, N. – ARAUJO, T. – DE VREESE, C. H. Who is the fairest of them all? Public attitudes and expectations regarding automated decision-making. *Computer Law & Security Review* [online]. 2020, Vol. 39 [cit. 2025-05-25]. Available at: https://dare.uva.nl/search?identifier=d169dc1f-787d-4fa0-939f--58df802ecb8b.

6 Report on the State of the Digital Decade 2024: Annex – Short Country Report 2024: Czechia. In: *European Commission: Shaping Europe's digital future* [online]. Brussels: European Commission, 2024 [cit. 2025-06-27]. Available at: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/report-state-digital-decade-2024; or Capgemini – Sogeti – IDC – Politecnico di Milano. eGovernment Benchmark 2023: Executive Summary: Connecting Digital Governments. In: *European Commission: Shaping Europe's digital future* [online]. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2023 [cit. 2025-06-27]. Available at: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/egovernment-benchmark-2023.

In light of this background, the aim of this article is to explore current developments and trends in AI usage in public administration, both from an international perspective and within the Czech Republic. Particular emphasis is placed on the institutional adoption of generative AI, its application in different stages and forms of administrative tasks, and the implications for the exercise of public authority. This analysis is followed by examples of national practices that already challenge the above said assumption that public administration should not be vested in non-human actors. Concurrently, we chart the course in the Czech Republic, where interest in AI is increasing, but practical implementation is modest and uneven. Drawing on international examples and domestic strategies, we seek a better understanding of opportunities as well as threats AI present for public administration and contribute toward the still-maturing debate on how such technologies can be responsibly as well as effectively implemented into administrative processes.

THE POTENTIAL OF AI IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

In this article, we shift the focus to the **organisational level** of generative AI adoption in the public sector. Our aim is to examine how public administrations are beginning to formally experiment with and integrate generative AI tools as part of broader efforts to optimise administrative processes. At the **organisational level**, public administrations are piloting systems that incorporate generative AI models and are preparing user manuals to support their implementation.[7]

Czech academic writing describes public administration as part of the government's executive branch charged with implementing public interest through public authority action.[8] These authorities not only decide on matters that impact individuals' and companies' rights and duties but also provide public services for citizens as well as other actors.

Similarly, internal administrative procedures through which these functions are exercised are regulated, controlled, and optimized to facilitate decision-making, service delivery, as well as efficient accomplishment of other administrative tasks.[9]

All these interconnected actions come under the theoretical framework of what is known in a broader sense as the administrative process.

According to this framework, we categorize use of AI in public administration into three different types:

I. **Internal use** – where AI is only utilized for internal streamlining of processes as well as internal productivity and agent/staff efficiency on behalf of the administration.

---

7 TANGI, L. – COMBETTO, M. et al. The potential of generative AI for the public sector: current use, key questions and policy considerations. In: *JRC Publications Repository* [online]. 11. 12. 2024 [cit. 2025--05-25]. Available at: https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC139825.

8 HENDRYCH, D. *Správní právo: obecná část* [Administrative law: General part]. 9th ed. Academia iuris. Prague: C. H. Beck, 2016, pp. 2–3.

9 Act No. 500/2004 Sb., Code of Administrative Procedure (Czech Republic).

II. **External use** – where AI is used to enhance interactions with the public without affecting individual rights and obligations, such as in the provision of public services.
III. **Quasi-external use** – where AI is deployed towards, or even substitutes, functions interfering with, directly, human rights and duties, like administrative decision-making.

Internal uses encompass automated document processing, content creation, internal resilience augmentation (for example, within cybersecurity), or forecasting systems assisting with administrative planning and decision-making.

Germany's F13 project streamlines document processing and content generation,[10] whereas Spanish authorities deployed predictive models in response to COVID-19 for public health planning.[11] In a similar manner, the United Kingdom illustrates the application of AI capabilities in terms of content generation and profiling consumers in order to enhance the administrative efficacy in service delivery.[12] AI tools like ChatGPT, Claude, or Copilot can also be useful on a variety of tasks (composing texts, summarizing information, handling data, or research on basic matters) potentially enhancing efficiency as well as service delivery. Nevertheless, such an unbridled usage also brings with it concerns regarding openness, accountability, as well as safeguarding data. Recent survey statistics indicate 30% of public managers are already employing these tools in their processes, with a further 44% on course to do so in the future; the other 26% are reticent.[13]

Externally, AI is becoming more prevalent as chatbots, virtual helpers, and other information services. They are typically included within one-stop-shop portals as well as public administration portals. Importantly, AI use in streamlining local and provincial administrative agendas, ordinarily under smart city initiatives, must not be ignored.

AI is also being used more frequently in public administration via chatbots, virtual agents, and information services integrated into one-stop-shop solutions, making citizens more interactive as well as improving service delivery.[14] As notable examples could serve the Estonian's Bürokratt[15] or the "Finnish trio" – Kamu, PatRek. and VeroBot serving as three separate virtual assistants for immigration, tax, and patent administration processes.[16]

---

[10] GovTech Campus Deutschland, STACKIT, and Aleph Alpha create a platform for AI applications for the German administration: New F13 goes live in Baden-Württemberg. In: *ALEPH ALPHA* [online]. 25. 7. 2024 [cit. 2025-05-26]. Available at: https://aleph-alpha.com/govtech-campus-deutschland-stackit-and-aleph-alpha-create-a-platform-for-ai-applications-for-the-german-administration-new-f13-goes-live-in-baden-wurttemberg/.

[11] MARX, W. Valencia Uses AI and Telecom Data to Combat COVID-19. In: *WIRED* [online]. 8. 9. 2021 [cit. 2025-05-26]. Available at: https://www.wired.com/story/valencia-ai-covid-data.

[12] HETHERINGTON, L. Transforming Public Sector Content with AI. In: *GOSS* [online]. 29. 1. 2024 [cit. 2025-05-26]. Available at: https://www.gossinteractive.com/article/15235/Transforming-Public-Sector-Content-with-AI.

[13] TANGI – COMBETTO, *c. d.*

[14] AI for Modern City Administration: Revolutionising Public Sector Efficiency. In: *TOMORROW.CITY* [online]. 14. 10. 2024 [cit. 2025-06-02]. Available at: https://www.tomorrow.city/ai-for-modern-city-administration-revolutionising-public-sector-efficiency/.

[15] DREYLING III., R. – TAMMET, T. – PAPPEL, I. Technology Push in AI-Enabled Services: How to Master Technology Integration in Case of Bürokratt. *SN Computer Science* [online]. 2024, Vol. 5 [cit. 2025-05-26]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-024-03064-0.

[16] Have you met Kamu, PatRek and VeroBot? Chatbots join forces to offer advice to foreign entrepreneurs in Finland. In: *Maahanmuuttovirasto Migrationsverket* [Finnish Immigration Service] [online]. 19. 11.

The quasi-external category addresses perhaps the most delicate issue of AI application in public administration. It involves AI in certain phases of decision-making procedures, data processing, or other activity with a potential impact on legal rights and duties. In a number of theoretical frameworks, this even involves fully automated administration procedures from initiation until the issuance of the final decision.

Such automated systems are continuously being created, like Estonia's refugee relocations system[17] or Austrian's automated tax assessment.[18]

It is a particularly sensitive field with regard to the heightened concerns created by AI use in government. They encompass dangers of discriminatory results in processing public information, particularly where that information underpins legally enforceable actions, as well as more general concern with the so-called "black box" gaps in clarity and, most critically, explainability of decisions made using fully automated systems.[19]

Some of these "delicacies" are also discussed in this article within the framework of some member states' AI initiatives.

PRACTICAL EXAMPLES OF AI USE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE)

This section does not offer a country-by-country comparison or ranking; rather, it presents an illustrative, theory-driven set of examples chosen to demonstrate concrete mechanisms by which the human-led boundary in public administration is being preserved or strained. The cases collectively span the spectrum from internal uses (process and productivity tools), through external service interfaces (assistive chat/voice systems), to quasi-external applications that can affect rights and obligations. Each example was selected because it is sufficiently documented to trace governance design (oversight, reasons-giving, contestability), combines practical benefits with identifiable risk points (e.g., opacity, bias, over-reliance), and offers transferable lessons for administrations considering generative or automated tools. The aim is to demonstrate (not to exhaust or compare) how specific design choices either uphold meaningful human control or allow it to blur.

The comparative overview below illustrates diverse approaches to AI adoption in European public administrations. The selected countries – Estonia, Denmark, Poland, and

---

2018 [cit. 2025-06-02]. Available at: https://migri.fi/en/-/tunnetko-kamun-patrekin-ja-verobotin-chatbotit-neuvovat-yhdessa-ulkomaalaista-yrittajaa.

17 MASSO, A. – KASAPOGLU, T. Understanding power positions in a new digital landscape: perceptions of Syrian refugees and data experts on relocation algorithm. *Information, Communication & Society* [online]. 2020, Vol. 23, No. 8, pp. 1203–1219 [cit. 2025-06-02]. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1739731#abstract.

18 NEUBAUER, V. Country report on Austria. In: KRÖNKE, CH. – FERNÁNDEZ, P. V. (eds.). *Buying AI* [online]. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2025, pp. 160–201 [cit. 2025-06-27]. Available at: https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/gbp/buying-ai-9781035311729.html?srsltid=AfmBOoq2MVK9PMf_TMAok1Bh8ctTEpqDvaoP6y4WJl_6KFlj_tNfoIuv.

19 NEŠPOR, J. Automated Administrative Decision-Making: What is the Black Box Hiding? *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Iuridica* [online]. 2024, Vol. LXX, No. 2, pp. 69–83.

the Czech Republic – were chosen to reflect varying levels of digital maturity and governance culture. Estonia and Denmark represent frontrunners with institutionalized and transparent AI systems, Poland illustrates an emerging, language-specific model, and the Czech Republic remains a developing case with limited but promising initiatives.

Among European countries, **Estonia** stands out as a leader in the strategic implementation of AI in public administration. Its approach combines cross-sectoral cooperation linking the public sector with private enterprises and the academic community with a strong emphasis on national branding that fosters public understanding and trust.

One of the flagship initiatives is Kratt AI, a national-level framework for the development and deployment of interoperable AI solutions within the public sector. Kratt AI serves as a general-purpose platform for automation, optimisation, and predictive analysis across a range of administrative tasks and public services. What makes the Estonian case particularly notable is the use of folklore-based branding to enhance public communication: the term "Kratt" refers to a mythological creature from Estonian folklore, a straw doll brought to life to assist with household tasks. This metaphor of a loyal, helpful servant has been intentionally employed to increase public familiarity and comfort with AI-powered services, highlighting the role of trust in successful implementation.[20]

A practical example of Kratt AI in action is already mentioned **Bürokratt**, an interoperable network of chatbots integrated into public authority websites. This system allows citizens to obtain information and, increasingly, access simple public services through a conversational interface. As of 2023, the functionality of Bürokratt is being extended to include basic transactional services, with a strong emphasis on expanding the network through institutional participation. This evolution reflects Estonia's ambition to build a unified digital assistant that can interact with users across agencies in a seamless and coordinated manner.

Poland is currently developing its own AI-powered *Virtual Assistant* for the government mObywatel application, based on a proprietary Polish language model (PLLuM). Although in its early stages the system functions as a relatively simple chatbot, it is designed to support citizens in navigating public administration by answering questions in plain Polish. The assistant draws knowledge primarily from official content on gov.pl and info.mobywatel.gov.pl and aims to help users understand procedures, locate the right forms, and clarify bureaucratic steps without visiting an office. What makes this initiative particularly noteworthy is the decision to build the assistant on a *native Polish language model*, rather than relying on existing foreign LLMs. This localized approach underscores the importance of linguistic and contextual relevance in AI-supported public services and allows for improved handling of user input in natural, colloquial Polish.[21]

---

[20] Detailed information about the Kratt AI initiative is available on the official website maintained by the Ministry of Justice and Digital Affairs and the Information System Authority of Estonia (*Republic of Estonia: Information System Authority* [online]. [cit. 2025-06-05]. Available at: https://www.ria.ee/en; Virtual Assistant Bürokratt. In: *AI* [online]. [cit. 2025-06-05]. Available at: https://www.kratid.ee/en/burokratt).

[21] Wirtualny Asystent: mObywatel 2.0. In: *gov.pl: Serwis Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* [online]. [cit. 2025-06-05]. Available at: https://www.gov.pl/web/cyfryzacja-badania-i-projektowanie-mobywatel20/wirtualny-asystentGov.pl.

The **Dutch** government established **SyRI** (System Risk Indication) as a system to detect welfare fraud through automated data analysis from government databases including tax authorities and social security agencies and immigration services to create risk profiles for suspected fraudulent individuals.[22]

The system faced criticism because it focused on low-income urban areas with many migrant residents which led to discrimination and social stigma concerns. The system functioned as a "black box" because it lacked clear explanations about risk profile development and failed to provide adequate oversight or appeal procedures. The District Court of The Hague declared in 2020 that SyRI infringed Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) because the system lacked transparency and human oversight and proper safeguards.[23]

The SyRI case established a significant legal precedent which connected data protection standards to human rights while demonstrating the requirement for transparent and accountable automated decision systems.

In Denmark, AI plays a central role in the property valuation system, which employs a structured, four-step process to estimate the market value of residential properties. This system begins by calculating an area's square meter price based on a set of comparable, recently sold reference properties of the same type such as detached houses or flats preferably located near the property being assessed. The prices of these 10 to 15 reference properties are adjusted using localized market indices to reflect values as of January 1st of the valuation year. AI-powered statistical models ensure accurate selection and comparison, excluding atypical sales or properties significantly different in size or price. In the second step, the system refines the area price by adjusting for differences between the subject property and its references, accounting for factors such as floor area, year of construction, materials, proximity to transportation, and environmental features. These adjustments produce a property-specific square meter value. The third step applies this value to the property's weighted area (giving different parts of the building proportional importance based on their contribution to value) to calculate a preliminary property estimate. In the final step, any unique or exceptional features not previously captured are reviewed manually, allowing for case-specific corrections. The Danish model thus combines AI-driven automation with legal safeguards for individualization, aiming to deliver accurate, transparent, and equitable property assessments.[24]

AI in public administration presses on accountability and transparency. It is not enough to say that AI should only "assist": fully automated decisions can be acceptable if strict cumulative conditions are met. There must be a clear legal basis that delineates both the scope of automation and the applicable decision criteria. The task should be

---

[22] APPELMAN, N. – FATHAIGH, R. Ó. – VAN HOBOKEN, J. Social Welfare, Risk Profiling and Fundamental Rights: The case of SyRI in The Netherlands. *Intell. Prop. Info. Tech. & Elec. Com. L.* 2021, Vol. 12, No. 4, p. 257.

[23] District Court of The Hague. Judgment of 5 February 2020, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2020:1878 (SyRI case). In: *de Rechtspraak* [online]. 2020 [cit. 2025-06-05]. Available at: https://uitspraken.rechtspraak.nl/details?id=ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2020:1878.

[24] Public property assessment and property tax. In: *Vurderingsportalen* [online]. [cit. 2025-06-05]. Available at: https://www.vurderingsportalen.dk/ejerbolig/english/.

low-discretion and governed by predefined, verifiable rules. Each outcome must include individualized reasons tied to the case file, rather than generic descriptions of how the system works. Logging and audit trails must be sufficient to permit meaningful ex post review. Effective remedies must be available, including a guaranteed right to human review. Deployment should follow an *ex ante* impact assessment and be subject to ongoing quality monitoring with thresholds, alerts, and a fallback to a human, and a named official remains responsible for the decision. These safeguards do not shift responsibility to a machine, they define the legal frame within which AI may decide legitimately.

USE OF AI WITHIN THE CZECH PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Following text addresses the current state of use of AI within the Czech public administration. It first focuses on government strategic documents – the National AI Strategy and the Digital Czechia Program – then it discusses specific use cases of AI in public administration.

NATIONAL AI STRATEGY

On 24 July 2024, the Czech government adopted the National AI Strategy (hereinafter as "the Strategy"). The main coordinator of the Strategy's preparation was the Ministry of Industry and Trade. The main motive for the Strategy was to respond to the dynamic technological development and the increase in international AI initiatives. The Strategy presents the following vision for development in the Czech Republic: *"The Czech Republic is a significant center of AI with innovative enterprises and top-tier research and development outcomes, creating a suitable environment for the ethical use of this technology to address the challenges that the economy, state, and society face in the 21st century."*[25]

This vision is linked to seven key areas, within which goals are identified to help achieve this vision. Each goal contains specific measures supported by a follow-up Action Plan that includes concrete intentions, responsible institutions, and financial resources.

The seven key areas are:

- AI in research, development, and innovation
- Education and expertise in AI
- AI skills and the impact of AI on the labor market
- Legal and ethical aspects of AI
- Security aspects of AI
- AI in industry and business
- AI in public administration and public services[26]

---

[25] Ministerstvo průmyslu a obchodu [Ministry of Industry and Trade]. Národní strategie umělé inteligence České republiky 2030 [National Artificial Intelligence Strategy of the Czech Republic 2030] [online]. 2024, p. 28 [cit. 2025-06-16]. Available at: https://www.mpo.gov.cz/assets/cz/rozcestnik/pro-media/tiskove-zpravy/2024/8/AI_strategie_1.pdf.

[26] Ibid., p. 31.

THE VISION FOR AI IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC SERVICES

The relevant key area for this article is the key area number 7, "AI in public administration and public services". The vision for this key area is: *"A modern and efficiently functioning public administration utilizing AI, whose employees possess the necessary skills and adhere to ethical and security standards, thereby ensuring the provision of quality and efficient services in the Czech Republic."*[27]

The ideal target of this area involves using AI to support decision-making, reduce errors, and ensure that services provided to citizens are more user-friendly. Moreover, this area aims to simplify processes, improve the efficiency of public administration activities, and reduce the personnel and administrative burden of executing certain agendas.

According to the Strategy partial goals shall help to achieve this vision and target. The public administration must possess both high-quality data and a robust digital infrastructure (goal 1). This also involves educating public administration employees so that they understand the possibilities and limitations of AI utilization (goal 2). High security standards are emphasized, linking this area to key area number 5, "Security aspects of AI" (goal 3). Given the implementation of AI in authoritative administration, it is crucial to focus on the ethical and transparent use of AI while maintaining equal opportunities (goal 4). The Strategy also emphasizes the rational use of AI within the public administration system, where appropriate and with consideration of the potential to reduce personnel and administrative demands (goal 5).

THE DIGITAL CZECHIA PROGRAM

The area of Czech eGovernment is generally governed by the government's Digital Czechia program. On 2 April 2025, Government Resolution No. 237 was adopted concerning the implementation plans of the Digital Czechia program for 2025.

AI utilization is primarily reflected in the pillar of this program called "Digital Economy and Society". However, the AI field also intersects with the other three pillars: "Czechia in Digital Europe", "Information Conception of the Czech Republic", and "Digital Education".

Below, we will focus on the Information Conception of the Czech Republic, as it is a crucial document for the development of digitalization in public administration.

The Information Conception of the Czech Republic is legally regulated by Act No. 365/2000 Sb., on information systems of public administration. According to the Act, the Information Conception of the Czech Republic is approved by the government. This document sets out the goals of the Czech Republic in the area of public administration information systems and the general principles of acquiring, architecturally changing, creating, managing, operating, using, and developing public administration information systems in the Czech Republic for a period of 5 years. It is not merely a non-binding strategic document. The Digital and Information Agency, within the mandatory assessment of public administration information system projects, evaluates

[27] Ibid, p. 57.

whether these projects meet, among other things, the requirements of the Information Conception of the Czech Republic.

Although the Information Conception does not directly address AI, it aims at similar goals as the Strategy. The goal of eGovernment, according to the conception, is to provide simple and effective services to public administration clients, facilitating their rights and entitlements and fulfilling their obligations to public administration.[28] Considering the goals of the Strategy mentioned earlier, it can be stated that they reflect some of the goals of the Information Concept of the Czech Republic. Specifically, the goal of "user-friendly and effective digital services for citizens and companies" (goal 1), "increasing the capacities and competencies of public administration employees" (goal 4), "effective and flexible digital office" (goal 6), and "high-quality data management and utilization" (goal 7).[29]

The Information Conception directly addresses AI within the architectural principle of "Freedom of choice". According to this principle, everyone should have the opportunity to make decisions on the internet based on their own information. This applies to interactions with AI and algorithms as well. According to this principle, it should be possible to freely choose which online services clients will use, based on objective, transparent, and reliable information. However, in the public administration environment, the situation is different in the sense that state services logically do not compete with each other, and their use is not voluntary in many cases. In such cases, according to this principle, it is necessary to ensure the client's freedom to choose between automatic or self-service processing of the service or assisted interaction.[30]

AI PROJECTS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Within the Czech state administration and self-government, various partial projects can be identified to optimize the internal functioning of offices using AI. These are aimed at utilizing AI tools to optimize administrative processes, create or review internal regulations, or prepare internal chatbots to help navigate internal regulations or processes. For example, the Ministry of the Interior has prepared a chatbot to assist users working with the eLegislation system, which will gradually be used for preparing all legal regulations in the Czech Republic or for submitting comments on regulations within the legislative process. However, this chatbot, unfortunately, does not assist legislatures in preparing legal regulations but provides advice on how to perform specific tasks within the system based on user documentation, training, and other materials.

The Digital and Information Agency, within a proof-of-concept project, tested the integration of AI into the legislative procedure. The intention was to test the use of AI in amending various legal regulations. The AI tool was first supposed to find the provisions

---

[28] Vláda ČR [Government of the Czech Republic]. Informační koncepce České republiky [Information Conception of the Czech Republic]. 2025, p. 5.

[29] Ibid., p. 7.

[30] Ibid., p. 30.

according to the previous assignment and then generate the amendment points of the amending regulation.[31]

For public administration clients, chatbots were launched on various portals. An example is the Justína chatbot, which should provide advice on submitting a proposal to the registry court. The Justína chatbot provides answers to the most frequently asked questions previously asked to court staff and the Ministry of Justice or the public registry information system provider. However, it appears that AI might have been used at most in its preparation. Otherwise, it functions as a decision tree within predefined questions. If a user wants to ask a question other than a predefined one, they are referred to email communication with the ministry's staff.

AI also helps with client submissions, for example, on the Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare portal Jenda. Here, an AI tool called VISOR is deployed, which checks whether the client has uploaded an incorrect document as an attachment.

PROJECT AI AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION CONTACT CENTER

A specific project for broader AI utilization in public administration is the "Public Administration Contact Center" project (project "Public Administration Contact Center", reg. no. CZ.31.5.0/0.0/0.0/24_112/0011231, funded by the National Recovery Plan, component 1.7 Digital Transformation of Public Administration).

The project focuses on preparing the so-called Public Administration Contact Center (hereinafter as "PACC") with AI-supported services. These primarily include:

- Preparing a chatbot, voicebot, and mailbot to support PACC clients
- Preparing a knowledge base containing methodological materials to support AI functioning and LLM model integration
- Storing, extracting, and reviewing data on user support services provided by PACC

The project aims to address the current situation, where there is no single central point providing comprehensive assistance and information about public administration services and their solutions when using digital services. Citizens and entrepreneurs often have difficulty finding the necessary information and frequently have problems working with state information systems. The PACC project offers a solution in the form of a universal multichannel Public Administration Contact Center with an emphasis on AI utilization. This central point will allow users to quickly and efficiently obtain the necessary information and support. The project aims to automate routine queries through AI voicebots and chatbots, speeding up and streamlining request processing and reducing the human resources needed to handle routine repetitive queries.

The PACC will also serve as an important tool for data collection and analysis of eGovernment service user needs, contributing to more efficient planning and improvement and modernization of public administration services.

---

[31] DIA testuje zapojení umělé inteligence do legislativního procesu [DIA tests the involvement of artificial intelligence in the legislative process]. In: *Digitální informační agentura* [Digital Information Agency] [online]. 2024 [cit. 2025-06-16]. Available at: https://www.dia.gov.cz/cs/legislativa/zakon-c-12-2020-sb-o-pravu-na-digitalni-sluzby/dia-testuje-zapojeni-umele-inteligence-do-legislativniho-procesu.

The project is being implemented by the Digital and Information Agency, which anticipates connecting and providing PACC support for all services it provides to citizens and public administration, such as the Public Administration Portal, Portal of Citizen and navigation in the Public Administration Service Catalogue, Contract Register, Authorization Representation Information System, National Identification and Authentication Point, etc.

From the above text, it is evident that the project is divided into four layers. Two of them represent PACC clients. The PACC should provide support to both citizens and public administration officials. The basis for these services for clients must be sufficiently extensive and high-quality data to create a robust and high-quality source for the functioning of AI model. However, PACC utilization will not only leverage the data but it will also create data when it is used. This data will include information on the use of state digital services, questions asked, problems addressed, user satisfaction with the service, etc. This data and its evaluation form this fourth layer can serve not only to improve the PACC itself but also to evaluate state digital services and their quality or efficiency, which can be used in considerations about further development of Czech eGovernment.

CLOSING REMARKS

Our analysis suggests that while European legislation and value frameworks still adhere to the principle that public authority must remain fundamentally human-driven, the practical deployment of AI in public administration has already begun to blur these boundaries. The experiences of countries such as Estonia and Denmark demonstrate that provided certain conditions are met, particularly in terms of transparency, reviewability, and institutional oversight, AI can be used not only to optimize routine tasks but also to support decision-making processes. Our contribution is demonstrative, not comparative: selected cases show how AI design choices preserve or blur human leadership in administration.

International experience also demonstrates that the implementation of AI in public administration is far from risk-free. It is crucial to anticipate and mitigate these risks even at the cost of some trial and error.

Caution, in our terms, is procedural, it is not a pause button. It must be clear and documented how the AI reached the outcome and on what inputs and rules (link to the case file, data sources, applied rules, model version, and a decision trail). On that basis, safeguards include a clear legal basis; individualized, reviewable reasons tied to the case facts, human override at decision points, logging and audit. We recommend starting fully automated decisions in low-discretion, highly standardized domains (e.g., formula-based entitlements) using "automation by default, review on demand", with guaranteed access to human review upon request.

In comparison, and despite the existence of various strategic documents and initiatives, the level of AI integration into administrative procedures in the Czech Republic remains limited. However, projects such as the Public Administration Contact Center

(PACC) indicate that there is real potential for building a more efficient, user-friendly, and data-driven public sector. As a well-known Czech idiom says, *"Bez práce nejsou koláče"* roughly equivalent to *"No pain, no gain"*. In this context, realizing the transformative potential of AI in the Czech Republic will require continued development of digital infrastructure, systematic capacity-building among public officials, and the establishment of robust ethical and legal frameworks. For the Czech Republic, we recommend proceduralized precaution (*ex-ante* assessment, phased rollout, auditability, redress) and a narrow reserve of humanity for non-delegable functions, so that AI assists without displacing human responsibility.

Finally, the true value of AI in public administration does not lie merely in cost savings or automation, but in its potential to enhance procedural fairness, administrative quality, and ultimately, public trust in state institutions. Ultimately, the comparative analysis demonstrates that the boundary between human-led and AI-assisted public authority is becoming increasingly porous. The challenge ahead lies not in resisting automation, but in embedding the principle of caution.

JUDr. Jan Nešpor
Charles University, Faculty of Law
nesporjan@prf.cuni.cz

JUDr. Adam Jareš, Ph.D.
Charles University, Faculty of Law

JUDr. Eliška Klimentová, Ph.D.
Charles University, Faculty of Law
klimentova@prf.cuni.cz