bipart The art of public administration

Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration in Belarus: Opportunities and Risks in an Authoritarian Context

Andrew Sushko

2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Belarus already has much of the digital infrastructure needed to deploy artificial intelligence (AI) across the public sector. During the 2010s and early 2020s, the government set up state information systems and registers, established mechanisms for interagency data exchange, and introduced digital identification tools; these elements provide the foundations for more advanced and intelligent public services. The main barrier to wider AI adoption is less the level of digitalisation than the absence of a comprehensive AI governance framework. Although policymakers increasingly refer to AI in strategic documents and public statements, Belarus still lacks dedicated AI legislation, risk-based regulatory mechanisms, and independent oversight arrangements.

The Belarusian case is shaped by the country's authoritarian system of governance. The extensive integration of government data offers opportunities to improve public services and administrative efficiency. At the same time, the absence of effective oversight increases the risks that AI will be used for digital surveillance, citizen profiling, and other practices that could facilitate human rights violations. International sanctions create constraints by limiting access to advanced technologies and international cooperation in the field of AI.

The future deployment of AI in the public sector in Belarus should be accompanied by stronger safeguards for transparency, accountability, and upholding human rights. It will also be essential to develop a comprehensive AI governance framework based on international standards. Without such safeguards, while AI may increase the efficiency of public administration and improve public services, it could also strengthen digital control and exacerbate existing human rights concerns.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 4

1. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE GOVERNANCE 6

1.1 Approaches to Understanding AI in Public Administration 6

1.2 AI Governance as a Concept in the Regulation of Artificial Intelligence 6

1.3 Risks of AI Use in Public Administration 7

2. DIGITALISATION IN BELARUS: FROM DIGITAL SERVICES TO AI INFRASTRUCTURE 10

2.1 A Retrospective of Public Sector Digitalisation: From Informatisation to e-Government 10

2.2 The Current Infrastructure of Electronic Services 11

2.3 Government Data Infrastructure 12

3. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN BELARUS 13

3.1 Belarus: Features of the Emerging National AI Governance Model 13

3.2 National Standardisation in the Field of AI in the Republic of Belarus 14

3.3 AI Development Plans and Potential Areas for AI Integration to Improve Public Services in Belarus 15

3.4 Risks of Integrating Government Data and AI Systems in Belarus for Repressive Practices 17

3.5 The Belarusian State's Use of Chatbots as an Example of Automation 18

3.6 State Information Monitoring System 20

3.7 The Use of AI Systems in Different Sectors in Belarus 20

CONCLUSION 22

RECOMMENDATIONS 23

Appendix No. 1. Main Areas of AI Application in Public Administration Worldwide 24

Appendix No. 2. Potential Directions for Integrating AI into Public Service Delivery in Belarus 26

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, artificial intelligence (AI) has established itself as one of the main drivers of change in public administration worldwide. AI offers new opportunities to improve the quality and accessibility of public services, automate administrative processes, support decision-making, and increase the efficiency of government institutions. For example, Estonia's tax authorities now use AI to identify tax risks and analyse large volumes of data, while public services in Kazakhstan are gradually moving towards proactive service delivery and citizen engagement through intelligent assistants. On the other hand, AI introduces new challenges related to human rights, transparency, personal data protection, and the accountability of automated decision-making. These concerns underpin the European Union's approach, reflected in the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (EU AI Act), which establishes requirements that aim to mitigate the risks. They regulate the use of AI in public administration, law enforcement, migration management, and social services.

Against this backdrop, Belarus presents a particularly interesting case. Over the past 15–20 years, the country has experienced both the consolidation of an authoritarian political system and the gradual development of the infrastructure of a digital state. In respect of the latter, the government has created a wide range of information systems and state data resources, and established mechanisms for interagency electronic cooperation. In 2011, the government launched its National Automated Information System (OAIS) to facilitate data exchange between public institutions and support the delivery of many services electronically. Today, OAIS integrates dozens of government registers and information systems, including population, tax, customs, migration, law enforcement, and other state databases. The government also developed a Unified Portal of Electronic Services, which serves as the main entry point for citizens seeking access to digital public services.

Significantly, Belarus's digitalisation model has evolved within a highly centralised and authoritarian system of governance. This model combines a high degree of data concentration with limited opportunities for public participation and independent oversight. Following the presidential election of 2020, and the subsequent large-scale repression, concerns about digital monitoring, indiscriminate surveillance practices, and the potential use of AI for repressive purposes have grown. Belarus lacks both dedicated AI legislation and a comprehensive AI governance framework. As a result, the development of digital infrastructure has outpaced the creation of mechanisms needed to regulate AI and address its risks, including those of a political nature.

This study examines the relationship between the evolution of the digital state in Belarus and the prospects for AI adoption in public administration, taking into account the country's political context. In particular, it explores how government data infrastructure, mechanisms for interagency information exchange, and the integration of state information systems create the foundations for future AI applications in public services. The study also analyses the risks of concentrating citizens' data in state hands and how, when combined with AI technologies, this may strengthen digital control and contribute to further human rights violations.

For these purposes we examine both existing digital systems and initiatives associated with the use of AI technologies in Belarusian public administration, as well as potential future applications that could emerge from the country's established digital infrastructure. We also explore the emerging field of AI governance and the legal and institutional conditions needed to deploy AI in the public sector in a safe and accountable manner that is compliant with human rights norms.

The research draws on legislation, government programmes, strategic policy documents, and national standards related to digitalisation and AI in Belarus. It also examines government information systems and state data resources. In addition, the study draws on academic literature, international standards, and policy documents addressing digital government and artificial intelligence.

To assess the prospects for AI adoption in Belarus, the study uses a semantic model of government data[1] that reflects the structure of, and relationships between, state information resources. We used ChatGPT, a large language model developed by OpenAI, as a research support tool to analyse and interpret this data. The model assisted in examining the structure of government information systems, identifying connections between them, and developing hypotheses regarding potential applications of AI in Belarusian public administration.

[1] The **Unified Semantic Data Model of e-Government** provides a standardised description of the entities, processes, and relationships used across government information systems, ensuring interoperability and data integration between different state information resources. The existence of such a model creates the foundation for automated information exchange, the analysis of government data, and the development of AI-enabled and other intelligent services within public administration. More information is available at: https://e-pasluga.by/home/unified-data-model.html.

1. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE GOVERNANCE

1.1 Approaches to Understanding AI in Public Administration

International policy documents generally view AI as both a tool and a driver of change in the public sector. On the one hand, governments use AI to automate specific processes and improve the quality of public services. On the other, AI influences public administration structures, decision-making processes, data governance, and interactions between governments and citizens. This perspective is consistent with the approach of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which considers AI a transformative technology with the potential to reshape public institutions as a whole.

For the purposes of this study, however, a different perspective is relevant: one that views AI not as a standalone technology or a set of software solutions, but as the next stage in the development of the digital state. From this perspective, the focus extends beyond AI systems themselves to the broader conditions that enable their effective deployment, including government data, mechanisms for inter-agency information exchange, and the legal and institutional frameworks governing the digital environment.

The effective use of AI in public administration depends not only on data availability but also on effective integration across government information systems. A semantic data model plays a particularly important role because it helps to establish stable relationships between different information resources and creates the conditions for AI systems capable of identifying patterns and analysing large volumes of data. In international practice, semantic interoperability is considered one of the key prerequisites for the effective use of digital technologies and AI in the public sector.

1.2 AI Governance as a Concept in the Regulation of Artificial Intelligence

As AI technologies spread, policymakers and researchers have increasingly recognised that national regulation cannot rely solely on the adoption of dedicated legislation. International policy documents and academic literature therefore introduced the concept of AI Governance. Although no universally accepted definition exists, the term generally refers to the set of mechanisms and institutions that support the responsible development and use of AI.

Some experts view AI Governance as a comprehensive concept that brings together different approaches to governing AI. It serves as a framework within which legislation, technical standards, data governance, risk assessment, and the development of AI systems constitute interconnected elements. Government institutions, transparency and accountability mechanisms, ethical principles, and cooperation among different stakeholders – including public authorities, businesses, researchers, and users – play a central role.

In contemporary approaches to AI Governance, particular attention focuses not only on regulatory frameworks for AI but also on issues such as the responsibility for AI-assisted decisions, algorithmic transparency, the prevention of discrimination, personal data protection, cybersecurity, and the impact of automated systems on human rights and democratic institutions. As AI use expands across the public sector, these issues increasingly shape academic and policy debates globally.

Today, the European model represents the most developed AI governance framework. It relies on a risk-based approach established by the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (EU AI Act). This framework

is complemented by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence.

One of the most controversial issues during the drafting of the EU AI Act concerned the use of remote biometric identification and facial recognition technologies in public spaces. The European Parliament and human rights organisations advocated for a broad ban on these technologies, citing the risks of mass surveillance and violations of fundamental rights. Several EU member states, by contrast, argued for exceptions that would allow law enforcement authorities to use these systems when searching for missing persons, preventing imminent terrorist threats, or investigating certain serious crimes. The final text established a general prohibition on the use of real-time biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces while preserving these limited exceptions.

1.3 Risks of AI Use in Public Administration

This study uses the risk-based approach established by the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (EU AI Act) to assess the potential risks associated with AI in public administration. The core principle of this approach is that regulatory requirements depend not on the type of technology but on its potential impact on human rights and safety. As a result, the same technology may face different regulatory requirements depending on the context in which it operates. Based on their potential impact, AI systems fall into four risk categories (see Table 1).

- **Unacceptable Risk.** This category includes technologies whose use is considered incompatible with fundamental human rights. The EU AI Act largely prohibits systems that manipulate human behaviour, exploit the vulnerabilities of specific groups, conduct social scoring (rating people based on their behavior), or perform real-time biometric identification in public spaces. AI technologies create opportunities for the continuous monitoring of citizens' behaviour, categorisation of individuals, assessments of their social reliability, and automated restrictions on access to services. The main risks involve mass surveillance, infringement of privacy, and creating mechanisms for digital control.
- **High-Risk AI Systems**. High-risk AI systems are particularly important in public administration. Governments use them in areas such as social protection, migration management, law enforcement, justice, and public service delivery. These systems may assess citizens' eligibility for social benefits, analyse tax risks, detect financial fraud, predict criminal activity, screen job applicants, and support administrative decision-making. Errors or biases in such systems may affect the rights and legitimate interests of individuals and may result in discriminatory outcomes. For this reason, the EU AI Act imposes specific requirements related to data quality, risk management, transparency, and human oversight.
- **Limited-Risk Systems.** The limited-risk category includes systems that may influence how people perceive information but do not significantly affect individual rights and freedoms. This category includes chatbots, virtual assistants, generative AI systems, and other tools used to facilitate interaction between governments and citizens. Such systems can support citizen consultations, provide information about public services, process enquiries, draft documents, and assist with information retrieval. The main risks arise from AI-generated errors that may mislead users, the dissemination of inaccurate information, and the user's potential lack of awareness that they are interacting with an AI system and not a human being.

- **Minimal-Risk Systems.** This category includes tools used for equipment maintenance, intelligent traffic management, automated quality control, image analysis, and monitoring the technical condition of infrastructure and facilities. Such applications do not directly affect the rights and freedoms of individuals and therefore do not require specific regulatory measures.

Table 1. AI risk categories and their application in public administration in accordance with the EU AI Act

Risk Category (EU AI Act)	Examples of Use in Public Administration	Regulatory Requirements under the EU AI Act
Unacceptable Risk	- Social scoring of citizens - Behavioural manipulation - Real-time facial recognition in public spaces	Generally prohibited. Limited exceptions apply to biometric identification by law enforcement authorities.
High-Risk AI Systems	- Social benefit administration - Tax administration - Migration control - Law enforcement activities - Judicial systems	Subject to mandatory risk management, data quality requirements, transparency obligations, human oversight, and conformity assessment procedures.
Limited-Risk Systems	- Government chatbots - Virtual assistants - Generative AI for document drafting - Processing of citizens' enquiries	Users must be informed that they are interacting with AI, and transparency requirements must be met.
Minimal-Risk Systems	- Infrastructure management - Equipment monitoring - Intelligent traffic management	No specific requirements under the EU AI Act.

Source: author's compilation.

International experience shows that AI is already an important tool for improving public administration. According to the European Commission and the OECD, governments use AI to automate public service delivery, analyse large volumes of data, support administrative decision-making, apply computer vision technologies, and improve the effectiveness of supervisory and regulatory activities. As these developments have taken root, international organisations have stressed that AI deployment should be accompanied by appropriate governance mechanisms, transparency safeguards, and meaningful human oversight in decisions that affect the rights and

interests of citizens. The main areas of AI use in public administration and relevant international examples are presented in **Appendix 1**.

Most of the examples discussed in Appendix 1 fall into the limited-risk or high-risk categories under the classification established by the EU AI Act. The level of regulation depends on the context in which the technology is used, rather than the technology itself, and its potential impact on individual rights. Consequently, any assessment of AI adoption in Belarusian public administration should consider, in addition to cases of potential use, the level of risk associated with particular systems and the governance and oversight mechanisms required to manage those risks.

2. DIGITALISATION IN BELARUS: FROM DIGITAL SERVICES TO AI INFRASTRUCTURE

2.1 A Retrospective of Public Sector Digitalisation: From Informatisation to e-Government

The development of the digital state in Belarus began after the adoption in 2010 of the "Strategy for the Development of the Information Society in the Republic of Belarus up to 2015." Subsequently, digitalisation became an integral part of socio-economic development programmes, informatisation initiatives, and broader strategic planning documents. These documents reveal four distinct stages in the digitalisation of public administration in Belarus between 2010 and 2030.

During the first stage, during the first half of the 2010s, the government focused on developing information infrastructure, creating the initial elements of e-government, and transforming selected public services into digital formats. This approach reflected the objectives of the Strategy, which identified among its key priorities the *"development of information and communication infrastructure capable of proactively meeting the growing information needs of citizens, businesses and the state"* and the *"formation of a state information policy that promotes the development of the information society on an innovative basis."* During this stage, many government bodies developed their own information systems, websites, and databases; these served primarily to meet their internal operational needs. Citizens interacted with the state mainly through official websites, while there was only limited information exchange between public authorities.

The second stage began with the government's adoption of "The State Programme for the Development of the Digital Economy and Information Society for 2016–2020." Whereas government bodies had previously focused on developing their own information resources and electronic services, attention now shifted towards integrating these systems and enabling data exchange between them. At the same time, the development of nationwide information infrastructure and mechanisms for interagency data exchange became a strategic priority. To support this objective, the government expanded the range of electronic services and introduced new mechanisms for data exchange between government information systems. Belarus gradually moved away from isolated agency-based systems towards a unified digital environment in which public authorities relied on shared digital platforms and integrated information resources.

The government launched the third stage of digitalisation through the state programme "Digital Development of Belarus for 2021–2025." The programme called for a transition to a platform-based model of digital government and the creation of conditions for the *"re-engineering of government processes based on digital technologies."* Key measures included the introduction of the Unified Data Model of e-government, ensuring interoperability between government information systems, and expanding proactive public services. As a result, digitalisation moved beyond the automation of individual functions and increasingly focused on building a unified digital infrastructure for public administration. This created the technological foundations for the future deployment and large-scale use of AI technologies in the public sector.

The fourth stage began when the government adopted the "State Programme for the Digital Development of the Republic of Belarus for 2026–2030," which remains in force today. Unlike previous programmes, the latest programme treats artificial intelligence as a distinct area of digital development. Among its key objectives is the *"implementation of applied digital solutions for the state, citizens and businesses, including those based on AI technologies."* The programme identifies AI as a priority and states that Belarus will use it primarily for data analysis, forecasting,

and decision-making support, including in the public sector. It also calls for further development of AI-related infrastructure, deeper integration of governmental information systems and datasets into a unified digital environment, and the *"development of the capabilities of the state unified information system for recording and processing appeals from citizens and legal entities using AI technologies."*

Since the authorities provide little public reporting on these programmes, it is difficult to assess their full impact. Nevertheless, Belarus has built much of the infrastructure needed for AI adoption across different areas of public life, including public administration. One of the key enabling factors is the high level of digitalisation of Belarusian society. According to DataReportal, around 94.3% of the population used the internet in 2025, while mobile communications and broadband internet access reached most of the country's population. This high level of digitalisation has occurred in a telecommunications sector effectively dominated by the state. According to Freedom House, the government continues to control key elements of internet infrastructure and the country's largest telecommunications operators. This facilitates the integration of governmental information systems, but it also expands the state's capacity for centralised control over data flows and digital services.

Overall, digitalisation has created the foundations for AI adoption in Belarusian public administration, moving from the computerisation of government functions and electronic services towards the integration of government data and information systems.

2.2 The Current Infrastructure of Electronic Services

The development of AI in public administration depends on the existing digital infrastructure. Specifically, the deployment of intelligent services depends on the existing level of digitalisation of public services, the degree of integration between government information systems, and the availability of mechanisms for interagency data exchange. For this reason, any assessment of AI adoption in Belarus requires an examination of the key components of the country's e-government infrastructure.

Belarus introduced the first building blocks of its digital state in 2008 with the Automated Information System of the Unified Settlement and Information Space (ERIP). ERIP created a unified mechanism for payments for both public and commercial services. It was one of the first examples of national digital infrastructure in Belarus, enabling payments through banks, mobile applications, and online banking platforms. As of 2026 the system connected approximately 48,000 service providers, offered access to more than 82,000 services, and processed over two million transactions per day on average.

In 2011, the government established its National Automated Information System (OAIS), which remains the central component of Belarus's electronic service infrastructure. OAIS integrated government information resources, reduced data duplication, and lowered the costs of interagency cooperation. It brought together government information resources and the Unified Portal of Electronic Services (EPES) for citizens and organisations, which later evolved into a single platform for interaction between users and the state. In addition to providing access to public services, the portal offers personal accounts, access to information from public authorities, user authentication services, and opportunities to interact with government information resources through APIs. According to the National Centre for Electronic Services, citizens used the OAIS

infrastructure to obtain more than 128 million electronic services in 2023, over 140 million in 2024, and 172 million in 2025.

The operation of OAIS and EPES reflects a gradual transition from fragmented agency-based services to a more integrated e-government model. This is based on interagency data exchange and interoperability across information systems. The integrated model has reduced the need for citizens to repeatedly submit the same information to different government bodies and created the foundation for integrated and proactive public services.

In the early stages of digitalisation, citizens accessed electronic services through separate websites and information systems using individual accounts. Services that required secure user authentication relied on electronic signatures. On 1 September 2021, however, Belarus introduced biometric passports and a national ID card system. The ID card simplified authentication through an embedded electronic signature and allowed citizens to access more services online without needing to visit government offices in person. A high level of digitalisation and integration of electronic services does not, by itself, indicate widespread AI adoption in public service delivery. Based on publicly available information, Belarus's current infrastructure still relies primarily on interagency data sharing and predefined administrative procedures rather than AI-driven decision-making.

2.3 Government Data Infrastructure

Alongside the development of electronic services, Belarus gradually built a substantial government data infrastructure. For citizens, digitalisation is most apparent in the availability of online public services. Behind these services, however, stands a complex network of government information resources and data exchange mechanisms that forms the foundation of the country's digital state. An analysis of the government information resources and databases connected to OAIS shows that this infrastructure covers virtually all major areas of public administration and social life. It includes systems for personal identification, the Population Register, the Passport System, the Unified State Register of Legal Entities and Individual Entrepreneurs, the Unified Register of Licences, the Unified State Register of Real Estate, the Address Register, the State Register of Taxpayers, and many others. Though from the perspective of digital state architecture, the significance lies not only in the existence of individual registers but also in the connections between them. By integrating government information resources, Belarus created a unified data infrastructure that allows authorities to access the information needed to perform their functions.

The Unified Data Model of e-Government serves as a key component of this infrastructure. Specialists developed the model in Belarus and published it on the website of the National Centre for Electronic Services (NCES). In practice, it functions as a detailed semantic model that describes the relationships between individual entities – such as citizens, organisations, documents, and services. As a result, government information systems rely on common concepts and shared data structure. This model also provides a useful basis for assessing the potential development of AI-enabled public services, which the following sections examine in greater detail.

Belarus has therefore created a digital infrastructure that combines integrated government data, interagency information exchange, and reliable electronic identification mechanisms. This infrastructure provides the technological foundation for the future deployment of AI in public administration.

3. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN BELARUS

3.1 Belarus: Features of the Emerging National AI Governance Model

The European Union has developed AI regulation through dedicated legislation, specialised institutions, and sector-specific policies. Belarus, by contrast, remains at an early stage of this process. Its system of public administration is characterised by a high degree of centralisation and institutional inertia. At the same time, Alyaksandr Lukashenka's personal views often shape key policy decisions. This may help explain why research institutions, standardisation bodies, and government agencies responsible for digitalisation currently play the leading role in shaping AI development and regulation, whereas many other countries have established specialised institutions or regulatory authorities for this purpose. As a result, Belarus is developing a distinctive model of "scientific-state" AI governance in which these institutions play the leading role in shaping both AI policy and regulatory approaches.

The National Academy of Sciences of Belarus (NASB) and the United Institute of Informatics Problems of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus (UIIP) occupy a central position in this process. In recent years, UIIP has become one of the country's leading centres of expertise on AI, contributing to research, AI development, and legislative initiatives.

The UIIP played a leading role in drafting the CIS Model Law on Artificial Intelligence Technologies, which the Interparliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) adopted in 2025.The CIS Model Law takes a comprehensive approach to AI regulation and provides a foundation for the development of national AI governance frameworks. It covers regulatory principles, governance institutions, risk assessment mechanisms, and related issues. The law explicitly incorporates the principle of human rights protection into the development and use of AI, introduces a risk-based classification of AI systems, prohibits certain categories of AI systems that present unacceptable risks, and calls for the creation of a competent public authority responsible for AI regulation. But its human rights safeguards are relatively weak. The law does not grant individuals the right to receive an explanation of automated decisions, challenge such decisions, or refuse decisions made solely on the basis of AI.

Overall, the CIS Model Law outlines broad directions for AI regulation but leaves many implementation mechanisms and human rights safeguards to national legislators. If Belarus develops dedicated AI legislation, policymakers could use the Model Law as a starting point, although they would need to revise it substantially to align it with international AI governance standards and human rights principles.

In 2025, the National Academy of Sciences created a working group to prepare proposals for future AI legislation. According to Academy representatives, the National Centre of Legislation and Legal Information planned to begin full-scale work on a legislative concept in 2026. At the time of writing, however, no publicly available information indicated what progress, if any, had been made. Nor did the legislative drafting plan for 2026 include this issue.

Some regulatory elements that could later become part of an AI governance framework already exist. In particular, the "Law of the Republic of Belarus on Personal Data Protection," adopted in 2021, together with the work of the National Personal Data Protection Centre, establishes basic requirements for personal data processing that could also apply to AI systems. However, these

mechanisms focus primarily on personal data protection and do not address broader issues such as transparency, accountability, or AI risk management.

International sanctions and export restrictions also shape AI development in Belarus. The European Union, the United States, and several other democratic states imposed these measures in response to the mass repression that followed the 2020 presidential election and for Belarus's involvement in Russia's aggression against Ukraine. The restrictions cover certain categories of microelectronics, software, and technologies that may serve both civilian and military purposes, including AI applications. In practice, the effect has largely been the exclusion of Belarusian organisations from Western research projects and technological cooperation. This has slowed the development of the national AI ecosystem and limited its integration into international networks.

Despite growing research and legislative activity, Belarus has yet to establish a comprehensive AI governance framework comparable to those emerging internationally. Legal analyses note that the country still lacks mechanisms for AI risk assessment, procedures for independent algorithmic audits, mandatory transparency requirements, rules governing automated decision-making, and a specialised supervisory authority responsible for AI.

In summary, AI development in Belarus has unfolded in the context of three interrelated factors: a highly centralised political system, the lack of a comprehensive AI governance framework, and international sanctions. Although research and legislative activity have increased, Belarus still lacks many of the institutional and regulatory mechanisms that other jurisdictions increasingly regard as essential elements of responsible AI governance. Within an authoritarian system of government, policymakers are unlikely to prioritise AI regulation centred on human rights protection. Belarus's international isolation and the sanctions regime further constrain the development of the national AI ecosystem.

3.2 National Standardisation in the Field of AI in the Republic of Belarus

At present, technical standardisation serves as the main channel through which Belarus is developing elements of AI regulation. The State Committee for Standardisation of the Republic of Belarus (Gosstandart) and the Belarusian State Institute for Standardisation and Certification (BelGISS) coordinate this work.

According to publicly available information, Belarus had adopted several national AI-related standards by 2025. This was especially evident in the field of intelligent transport systems, where it had adopted standards defining terminology and establishing requirements for algorithms that detect and recognise obstacles, predict the behaviour of road users, recognise traffic signs, and perform related functions. At the same time, Gosstandart, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Ministry of Communications and Informatisation announced plans to develop a number of general-purpose AI standards based on ISO/IEC standards. These initiatives cover issues such as terminology, data quality for machine learning, and data governance.

An important consideration is that, under Belarusian law, state standards, including those related to AI, remain voluntary by default and do not automatically bind AI developers or users. Standards become mandatory only when legislators explicitly reference them in legislation or technical regulations, when contracting authorities incorporate them into public procurement requirements, or when organisations voluntarily commit themselves to complying with them.

As of 2026, we found no legal acts requiring the mandatory application of either Belarusian AI standards or international ISO/IEC AI standards. This indicates that Belarus has not yet established a system of mandatory technical regulation for AI and continues to rely primarily on voluntary compliance with relevant standards.

3.3 AI Development Plans and Potential Areas for AI Integration to Improve Public Services in Belarus

Despite the absence of a national AI strategy and a specialised legal framework, government programmes and socio-economic development policies increasingly refer to AI. These references are often broad: policymakers identify AI as a priority area but rarely specify implementation mechanisms, measurable targets, or detailed action plans. One of the few policy documents that includes concrete AI-related indicators is the "State Programme for the Digital Development of Belarus for 2026–2030." For example, the programme sets a target that 15% of government organisations should use AI by 2030.

Within public administration, the programme identifies several areas for AI deployment, including:

- Processing citizens' appeals and enquiries
- Forestry
- Environmental monitoring
- Transport and passenger services
- Construction
- Tourism

At the same time, the programme places greater emphasis on agency-specific systems than on services designed to improve interactions between citizens and the state.

Despite this, the programme calls for the creation of a national AI infrastructure. This includes systems for data collection and processing, the adaptation of large language models *"taking into account the laws and national traditions of Belarus,"* and the development of language-model-based services operating *"without relying on foreign servers."* These plans suggest that Belarus views AI infrastructure as an important component of technological sovereignty and seeks to reduce dependence on foreign technology providers.

Plans for AI deployment in security and law enforcement deserve particular attention. The state programme calls for the further development of AI-enabled video surveillance systems and the creation of systems for the *"automatic intelligent processing of large volumes of unstructured data for special purposes"* and the *"processing of information using AI for information-technical and psychological confrontation."* The State Security Committee (KGB) is responsible for developing the latter two systems, increasing concerns that the authorities could use AI in ways that fall into the "unacceptable risk" category described earlier.

The use of AI in the security sector is hardly unique to Belarus. However, when such initiatives operate without any dedicated AI regulation or independent oversight of the law enforcement agencies, especially in an authoritarian state like Belarus, they create significant human rights risks. Under these conditions, assessing the scale, limits, and potential consequences of these technologies remains extremely difficult.

Discussions about AI are developing not only within government institutions, but also in academic and expert communities. Belarusian scholarly publications increasingly treat AI as a distinct area of research within law and public administration. Academic researchers often emphasise AI's potential to improve the efficiency of public authorities, including the use of big data and analytics to forecast the consequences of legislation and administrative decisions. They also examine the use of AI for information retrieval and structuring, personal identification, and the support of operational and investigative activities. By contrast, scholars devote considerably less attention to politically sensitive issues such as risk assessment, human rights protection, and mechanisms for independent oversight.

Within the Belarusian academic community, one of the most detailed proposals for AI legislation comes from N. Bondarenko and Y. Kananevich. Their publication *Strategic Plan for the Formation and Development of AI Legislation in the Republic of Belarus* proposes a comprehensive regulatory model that includes a dedicated AI law, amendments to sector-specific legislation, and mechanisms for state oversight. They do not discuss the political context or other factors that could affect the practical implementation of AI governance, however.

Belarusian officials also frequently refer to AI development, although these statements largely remain declaratory. In 2025, Siarhei Kruhlikau, Director General of UIIP, highlighted the importance of developing a national AI strategy and introducing national AI standards. The Minister of Communications and Informatisation, Kiryl Zalieski, has repeatedly argued that the further expansion of public services should rely on AI, big data, and digital platforms. He has identified the development of intelligent agents capable of delivering public services and improving interactions between citizens and public authorities as a promising direction.

At least at the level of strategic documents and official statements, policymakers increasingly view AI not simply as a promising technology but as a tool for modernising public administration. However, moving from rhetoric to implementation requires more than policy declarations. It also requires the technological foundations needed to support large-scale AI deployment. Government programmes call for the development of a national AI infrastructure, including domestic, large language models and AI services that operate without relying on foreign servers. Building such systems will require substantial financial resources, advanced computing capacity, large datasets, and highly skilled specialists.

At the same time, government programmes and official statements provide little information on how Belarus plans to secure these resources or finance the development and maintenance of a national AI infrastructure. Sanctions complicate the situation by limiting the Belarusian state's access to parts of the global AI ecosystem. As a result, policymakers may view domestic AI development not only as an element of digital sovereignty but also as a practical response to restricted access to foreign technologies. Whether this strategy is technologically and economically viable remains an open question.

Nevertheless, the existing Unified Data Model of e-Government already provides a technological foundation for introducing AI into public administration and public service delivery. Using machine-learning methods to analyse government datasets, registers, electronic services, and information systems, we identified several promising directions for AI deployment in the Belarusian public sector. The results suggest that the current digital infrastructure could support a wide range of AI applications without requiring entirely new government information systems.

Appendix 2 presents potential areas for AI integration based on the existing e-government infrastructure.

3.4 Risks of Integrating Government Data and AI Systems in Belarus for Repressive Practices

Authoritarian regimes often use technology to strengthen their control over society. As a result, researchers and policymakers increasingly focus on the risks of digital authoritarianism - the use of digital technologies to expand surveillance capabilities, restrict civil liberties, and reinforce political control.

In the absence of an independent judiciary, effective oversight mechanisms, free media, and public scrutiny, high-risk technologies may be used not to improve public services but rather to automate surveillance, analyse citizens' behaviour, and support the identification, monitoring, and prosecution of political opponents and other perceived dissenters. The examples below illustrate how existing government datasets, registers, and information systems could strengthen repressive practices and further entrench digital authoritarianism.

The Risk of Social Scoring

The integration of data from the Population Register, the Social Protection Fund, tax authorities, property registers, and vehicle registers could be used to enable the automated assessment of citizens' financial status, employment activity, family composition, and other personal characteristics. Combined with AI algorithms, these datasets could support the creation of social scoring mechanisms or systems that assess citizens' political or social loyalty.

China's Social Credit System provides the best-known example of this approach. The system uses government data to evaluate compliance by individuals and organisations with established requirements and can trigger a range of rewards or restrictions on them. Concerns about similar practices influenced the EU's decision to prohibit social scoring under the EU AI Act.

Population Profiling

The authorities could also use integrated government data to construct detailed models of social relationships. Family ties, joint ownership of property, shares in legal entities, and other connections make it possible to identify not only individual citizens but also the networks to which they belong. For example, after detaining an individual, authorities could use automated systems to identify close contacts based on shared addresses, family relationships, jointly owned property or vehicles, and participation in the same organisations.

When combined with video surveillance systems, facial recognition technologies, and geolocation data, such capabilities could evolve into tools for large-scale profiling and facilitate repression against particular groups of citizens.

Predictive Policing

Predictive analytics in law enforcement represents another potential risk. By analysing data from the Population Register alongside information on family ties, income, previous offences, and border crossings, algorithms could identify patterns that authorities classify as "anomalous behaviour" and assign risk scores to individuals.

These approaches underpin the concept of predictive policing. Governments often justify such systems as tools for crime prevention. In authoritarian settings, however, authorities may also use them to identify politically undesirable individuals. Combined with social media monitoring, geolocation tracking, and other digital traces, these systems could facilitate automated profiling and strengthen state control over society.

Cross-Border Control and Mobility Monitoring

The authorities could also use AI systems to analyse citizens' movements across borders. In an authoritarian context, such systems could help monitor politically active citizens, former political prisoners, journalists, human rights defenders, and civil society representatives.

By integrating information about foreign travel, relatives living abroad, and other cross-border connections, authorities could identify citizens engaged in political activities, as well as individuals whom the state regards as potentially disloyal or unreliable.

One of the best-known examples of AI-related technologies used by Belarusian law enforcement is the Kipod platform developed by the Belarusian company Synesis. According to the Council of the European Union's sanctions decision, the platform enables the search and analysis of video recordings using facial recognition and vehicle licence plate recognition technologies. The document also states that Belarusian authorities, including the KGB and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, have used the system, which contributed to the decision to impose sanctions against Synesis.

An investigation by Mediazona Belarus reported that the authorities used Kipod technologies after the 2020 protests to analyse video footage and identify protest participants. The investigation also found that officers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs received specialised training on the system. Synesis repeatedly denied that its platform was used to identify protesters. Nevertheless, the case illustrates how computer vision and AI technologies can serve not only public security objectives but also politically motivated repression.

The limited transparency of Belarusian state institutions makes it difficult to determine whether authorities already use additional AI-based monitoring systems. Publicly available information does not allow for a reliable assessment of either the scale of deployment or the specific purposes for which such systems may be used.

3.5 The Belarusian State's Use of Chatbots as an Example of Automation

The Telegram app has gradually become an important communication channel between the Belarusian state and society. Public authorities can quickly establish new communication channels at a relatively low cost by relying on a platform that remains popular among a large share of the population. At the same time, Telegram operates outside the state's digital ecosystem. Consequently, the government does not control the platform's infrastructure and has limited influence over Telegram's data processing, cybersecurity practices, and information protection.

Despite this, Belarusian government agencies have developed a network of Telegram bots. Most of them, however, serve merely to automate communication and they do not currently use advanced AI technologies.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs

The Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) operates several Telegram bots. The best known is “We Are Always Nearby” (@WeNear_MVD_bot), which allows citizens to submit reports. Users can send text messages, photographs, videos, geolocation data, and information about offences or suspicious situations.

Another MIA bot, @ScamBY_bot, focuses on combating cyber fraud. Users can check online shops, websites, Telegram channels, Instagram and TikTok accounts, and phone numbers for links to fraudulent activity. Functionally, the bot appears to rely on data search and matching. Publicly available information does not indicate any use of AI, although the service demonstrates a more advanced level of digitalisation than is usual for informational chatbots.

The State Border Committee

The State Border Committee operates @PressGPK_bot, which serves as a communication and feedback channel on border-crossing issues. The bot primarily collects information and facilitates communication with citizens. Available information suggests that it relies on conventional automation rather than AI technologies.

The Ministry of Health

The Ministry of Health maintains the “Virtual Reception Office of the Ministry of Health” (@mzbel_bot). Citizens and healthcare professionals can submit enquiries and send text, photographic, and video materials. The bot explicitly states that it does not provide medical advice and does not replace official communication channels. In practice, it functions as a digital reception desk that automates the handling of enquiries rather than using AI.

State Committee on Property

The chatbot “Boundaries of the Belarusian Border Zone and Border Strip” (@PublicCadastralMap_bot) was developed by the State Committee on Property’s subordinate body, the National Cadastral Agency, with support from the State Border Committee. Officials describe it as an AI-based solution. The bot uses geolocation data or coordinates provided by users to determine whether a location falls within a border zone and provides relevant information about nearby settlements.

However, official descriptions do not explain which AI methods the system uses. Based on its functionality, the bot appears to process requests and compare coordinates against geospatial datasets. Nevertheless, it remains one of the few examples where a Belarusian state institution explicitly claims to use AI, while providing no technical details.

The Ministry for Emergency Situations

The Ministry for Emergency Situations operates @MesQuestionBot, which it describes as a "guide to the world of safety." The bot answers citizens’ questions related to safety and emergency situations. Its interface suggests that it relies on predefined responses and scripted interactions rather than AI technologies.

Belarus currently focuses on automating administrative processes and developing communication-oriented Telegram bots that simplify interactions between citizens and state institutions. The

transition to generative AI systems and intelligent assistants therefore remains more of a policy aspiration than an established reality.

3.6 State Information Monitoring System

The InfoMonitor system, developed by the Belarusian Institute for Strategic Research (BISR), functions as a platform for monitoring the information environment. According to publicly available documentation, it automatically collects content from open sources, including news websites, Telegram, YouTube, and X. Users can track specific topics, organisations, events, and individuals, while the system generates publication statistics and analyses the spread of narratives and information campaigns of interest.

Government authorities can use tools of this kind to monitor public sentiment and information trends and to support decision-making. Although in an authoritarian context they may also monitor independent media, CSOs, and political activists, as well as analyse information that authorities consider undesirable. In terms of functionality, InfoMonitor resembles OSINT (Open Source Intelligence) platforms. Publicly available documentation does not indicate that the system uses AI technologies. It is therefore more accurate to describe it as an automated monitoring platform rather than an AI-based solution.

3.7 The Use of AI Systems in Different Sectors in Belarus

To better understand the current state of AI development in Belarus, it is useful to examine how organisations apply AI in sectors closely linked to the implementation of public policy. Such examples provide insight into the country's existing expertise and practical experience in developing and deploying AI-based solutions.

AI in the Defence Sector

The defence sector represents one of the most active areas of AI adoption in Belarus. Information about military AI projects appears frequently in open sources, whereas information about many civilian AI initiatives remains far more limited. This pattern suggests that the state considers AI applications in the defence industry a strategic priority.

Belarusian defence-related AI projects focus primarily on unmanned systems, electronic warfare technologies, computer vision, and automated command-and-control solutions. Many of these areas involve dual-use technologies that can serve both military and civilian purposes.

One example of AI in the defence sector is the Ross automated command-and-control system presented by the State Authority for Military Industry of Belarus. The system manages radio-monitoring and electronic warfare assets and uses AI elements to analyse the electromagnetic environment, forecast developments, and select countermeasures against unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs).

Another example is the SCANNER system, which detects and classifies drones based on their acoustic signatures. The system uses AI algorithms to distinguish between different types of UAVs and filter out background noise.

Regarding dual-use technologies, the United Institute of Informatics Problems (UIIP) has developed technologies for image and video analysis, Earth observation, geographic information systems, and decision support. These technologies have potential applications in both civilian and defence

sectors. Institute materials refer to UAV-based object tracking, drone detection, decision-support software for specialised tasks, and terrain-analysis tools for operational planning. However, publicly available information does not make it possible to determine whether defence organisations currently use these technologies or how widely they have deployed them.

AI in Agriculture

One example of AI adoption in Belarusian agriculture is the Cognitive Agro Pilot autonomous guidance system installed on GomSelMash combine harvesters and developed by the Russian company Cognitive Pilot. The system uses computer vision and machine-learning technologies to analyse the surrounding environment, identify field boundaries and obstacles, and maintain the optimal trajectory of the harvester.

Another example is a computer vision system developed by the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus for the automated sorting of apples. The system uses deep-learning algorithms to assess fruit size and colour and detect defects. OAO Ostromechevo uses the technology at its sorting facility. According to the developers, the system achieves at least 95 per cent recognition accuracy, processes up to 2.5 tonnes of apples per hour, and increases labour productivity by 2.5-3.2 times compared with manual sorting.

According to industry experts, the main obstacles to AI adoption and digitalisation in Belarusian agriculture include a limited understanding of agricultural processes among IT specialists, difficulties in collecting and managing data, a shortage of digital innovation centres, high infrastructure costs, and lengthy implementation timelines.

AI in Healthcare

Telemed AI is a commercial provider operating in the Belarusian healthcare sector. The company develops digital patient services, clinical decision-support systems, and tools for automating administrative processes. Its portfolio includes AI assistants for healthcare professionals, intelligent contact centres, and remote patient-monitoring services.

The Grodno Emergency Hospital introduced one such AI assistant in its admissions department. According to reports, the system conducts an initial interview with patients and transfers the collected information to medical staff, reducing processing times and easing the administrative burden on healthcare personnel.

Another developer of healthcare AI solutions is AIVIS, a company specialising in the analysis of radiological images. The company develops software that assists clinicians in interpreting diagnostic results, including systems for detecting lung abnormalities, analysing CT scans, and processing other medical images. Publicly available information does not indicate which healthcare institutions currently use these solutions.

Belarusian medical technology experts argue that broader AI adoption in healthcare will require a shift from isolated pilot projects to the sustainable integration of operational AI solutions into routine medical practice. Key prerequisites include further development of the regulatory framework, requirements for medical AI technologies, the use of anonymised medical data, certification mechanisms, and training programmes for healthcare professionals.

CONCLUSION

Belarus has already developed a relatively advanced e-government system. Digital identification mechanisms are in place, alongside a unified e-services portal, an electronic payment system, and modern government websites. Nevertheless, most electronic services remain, in essence, digital versions of existing offline public services and administrative procedures.

At the same time, state registers, information resources, and interagency data sharing mechanisms provide the foundation for more interactive, personalised, and proactive public services, including services based on AI technologies. Although government digitalisation programmes increasingly refer to AI in the public sector, most related provisions remain declaratory and do not include concrete mechanisms for developing and deploying AI systems.

Belarus developed the technological infrastructure needed for AI adoption much faster than the governance mechanisms required to regulate its use. The country still lacks a national AI strategy, dedicated AI legislation, risk-based regulatory frameworks, and institutions responsible for overseeing the development and deployment of AI systems. This reflects the early stage of AI governance development and, more significantly, the characteristics of Belarus's authoritarian political system. In Belarus issues such as risk assessment, oversight, and human rights protection receive limited attention. As a result, AI deployment lacks adequate safeguards and independent oversight. Addressing these gaps will require a comprehensive AI governance framework based on the risk-based principles that underpin the European approach to AI regulation.

The absence of a coherent AI strategy and regulatory framework increases the risk of serious human rights violations arising from the use of AI systems in Belarus. Analysis of existing databases, state registers, and the links between them shows that the state already possesses a highly developed digital infrastructure. Authorities can use this infrastructure both to improve public services and to develop more sophisticated tools for digital surveillance and control. In an authoritarian setting, such tools may facilitate the expansion of repressive practices targeting particular groups of citizens. Moreover, the limited transparency of the public sector and the lack of publicly available information make it difficult to determine whether some of these systems are already in use.

Particular concern arises from the development of dual-use technologies. Civilian research institutions and private companies in Belarus are developing technologies in areas such as computer vision, unmanned systems, video analytics, and decision-support tools. Many of these technologies have the potential to be used for military purposes, as well. The lack of transparency and dedicated regulatory mechanisms make it difficult to assess either the scale of these technologies' deployment or the nature of their use. Without an effective AI governance framework, further AI adoption in the public sector may improve the efficiency of public administration – it will also increase the risk of human rights violations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For Belarusian Democratic Actors, CSOs, and the Expert and Academic Community

1. Expand independent monitoring of AI use by public authorities, with particular attention to risks to human rights, personal data protection, and digital freedoms.
2. Develop alternative expert proposals for AI governance in Belarus based on international standards, including the approaches reflected in the EU AI Act and the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence.
3. Develop an alternative AI governance model for a democratic Belarus grounded in international standards. Such a model could provide a conceptual and regulatory foundation for AI governance following a future democratic transition.

For Democratic Governments and International Organisations

1. When shaping policy towards Belarus, take into account the growing use of AI technologies in the defence sector and strengthen export controls on dual-use technologies that may contribute to the development of military AI systems.
2. Strengthen international monitoring of AI use by the Belarusian authorities, paying particular attention to law enforcement activities, video surveillance systems, the processing of government data, and other areas associated with heightened risks to human rights.
3. Support independent research, expert initiatives, and documentation of AI-related practices in Belarus, including assessments of their compliance with international AI governance standards and human rights principles.

For Belarusian Businesses and AI Developers

1. Align the development of AI solutions with international AI governance standards regardless of the current state of national regulation. This includes implementing principles of transparency, risk assessment, personal data protection, and human oversight. Such an approach would strengthen the competitiveness of Belarusian AI solutions, facilitate participation in international projects, and reduce the risk of technologies being used in ways that are inconsistent with a human rights-based approach.

For the Belarusian Government

1. When developing legislation and introducing AI into the public sector, align regulation practices with international AI governance standards. Particular attention should focus on preventing the use of AI for mass surveillance and other human rights violations through risk-based regulation, transparency requirements, and independent oversight mechanisms.
2. Prioritise the use of AI to improve public services by building on the existing e-government infrastructure, state registers, and interagency data sharing mechanisms. Priority areas include intelligent assistants on the Unified Portal of Electronic Services, proactive public services, and decision-support tools for public officials, while ensuring meaningful human oversight of decisions.

Appendix No. 1. Main Areas of AI Application in Public Administration Worldwide

According to the European Commission report *Public Sector Tech Watch: AI and Blockchain in the European Public Sector*, which analysed around 1,000 cases of technological innovation in the public sector, AI helps reduce costs, make better use of administrative resources, improve the quality of public-sector processes, and reduce the risks of corruption and abuse. It can also improve coordination between public institutions and increase the overall effectiveness of government administration.

According to the OECD report *Governing with Artificial Intelligence*, AI-enabled public services can provide citizens with more accessible and higher-quality services, personalised support, and new channels for interacting with government. AI can also increase transparency, improve access to information, strengthen citizen participation in decision-making, and enhance public oversight of government activities.

Based on the OECD report, the main areas of AI adoption in public administration include the following:

Automation and Delivery of Public Services

One of the most common applications of AI involves citizen interaction and the personalisation of public services, making them easier to access and enabling faster processing of requests.

A notable example is the Estonian project Bürokratt, a network of virtual government chatbots that provides a single interface for interaction with public authorities. The system allows citizens to obtain information about public services, submit requests in natural language, and have enquiries automatically routed to the appropriate government agency.

Kazakhstan started experimenting with the direct integration of AI into public services by developing digital assistants capable of conducting conversations with users and guiding them through administrative procedures. One recent example is eGov AI, an AI-powered virtual assistant integrated into the eGov Mobile application. The service operates through a conversational interface that allows users to ask questions about public services, receive explanations of the required steps, and find the relevant service.

Data Analysis, Forecasting, and Decision Support

A significant share of AI systems in the public sector focuses on processing large volumes of data, identifying patterns, generating forecasts, and providing recommendations to decision-makers. Such systems help governments make better use of available information, improve service delivery, and optimise resource allocation.

At the same time, final decisions should remain subject to human judgement, in line with the principle of human oversight, which forms part of international approaches to AI governance.

One example is the municipality of Trelleborg in Sweden, where AI supports demand forecasting for social services and assists employment services. The system reduced application processing time from ten days to one day, lowered the workload of public officials, and allowed resources to be redirected towards more complex cases. However, applications resulting in a negative decision must still be reviewed by a human official.

Image Recognition and Computer Vision

Another important area of AI deployment involves computer vision and the automated analysis of images, video, and other forms of visual data. Governments increasingly use such technologies in transport, healthcare, public safety, and urban management.

For example, Deutsche Bahn operates the E-Check project for the automated inspection of high-speed trains. The system combines high-resolution cameras with AI-based image analysis to identify defects and maintenance requirements in railway carriages. This approach accelerates inspections, improves operational safety, and reduces the need for manual checks.

Inspection, Compliance, and Supervisory Functions

AI also supports anomaly detection, risk-based oversight, and the identification of potential violations. These systems help public authorities and financial institutions allocate resources more effectively and focus attention on the most problematic cases.

A notable example is the European Union's Import Control System 2 (ICS2), which supports pre-arrival risk analysis for imported goods. The platform collects and processes cargo information before shipments reach EU territory and helps customs authorities identify potentially dangerous or suspicious consignments. This enables customs services to concentrate inspections on higher-risk shipments, improving both the efficiency of customs supervision and the security of international supply chains.

Appendix No. 2. Potential Directions for Integrating AI into Public Service Delivery in Belarus

1. Intelligent Assistant for the Unified Portal of Electronic Services Based on Natural Language Processing

At present, obtaining many public services requires citizens to identify the relevant administrative procedure themselves, understand the structure of service catalogues, and navigate the necessary steps. Natural language processing technologies could support a shift towards a life-event-based model of interaction. Instead of searching for a specific service, citizens could submit requests such as *"I have had a child," "I have moved," "I want to register as an individual entrepreneur,"* or *"I have reached retirement age."*

Drawing on data from the Population Register, civil status records, the Unified State Register of Legal Entities and Individual Entrepreneurs, the real estate register, and other government information resources, the system could automatically identify relevant administrative procedures, verify the availability of the required information, and provide users with a tailored sequence of actions.

2. Expansion of Proactive Public Services

Another promising direction is a transition towards a proactive service-delivery model, in which the state initiates interaction rather than the citizen. By analysing information on family composition, age, place of residence, marital status, childbirth, retirement eligibility, and other life events, AI systems could automatically identify when an individual becomes eligible for specific public services or benefits.

For example, after the registration of a child's birth, the system could automatically notify parents about available benefits, verify the necessary information through government registers, pre-complete relevant applications, and invite users to confirm them electronically. Similar approaches could support marriage registration, changes of residence, business registration, and retirement procedures.

3. Support for Processing Citizens' Applications

When citizens apply for public services, AI could automatically verify that applications have been completed correctly and determine whether all required information is available. At the same time, the system could retrieve information already held in government databases and registers, allowing some fields to be completed automatically.

For example, when an individual registers a business or applies for social benefits, AI could verify information on residence, marital status, children, or business registration without requiring the applicant to resubmit documents already available to public authorities. If information is missing or inconsistent, the system could immediately notify applicants and suggest ways to resolve the issue. Such functionality could reduce paperwork, decrease the number of applications rejected on procedural grounds, and accelerate service delivery.

4. Intelligent Decision-Support Tools for Civil Servants

AI could also serve as an intelligent assistant for public officials. Such systems could rapidly analyse large volumes of information contained in government databases and information resources, helping officials make more informed decisions.

For example, when processing a citizen's request, AI could identify relevant legal provisions, locate related regulations, verify information contained in government registers, and highlight potential inconsistencies or missing data. During the drafting of regulatory or administrative documents, the system could identify conflicts with existing legislation, retrieve similar documents, and suggest alternative formulations.

These technologies could improve administrative efficiency and reduce bureaucratic burdens while ensuring that final decisions remain subject to human oversight and control.